

## V. REINSTATEMENT

SOMETHING had to be done to crush this heresy which was tearing the Church apart, and in June, 1891, came Pope Leo's celebrated Encyclical Letter, "Rerum Novarum" on the condition of labor, the publication of which fulfilled Bishop McQuaid's prediction made nearly three years before, marked an epoch in Dr. McGlynn's dispute with his Archbishop and the Church, and proved to be the Archbishop's "Gettysburg," so to speak.

In this letter, while counseling Capital to be more humane in its dealings with Labor, the Pope condemned Communism and Socialism, in which latter he seemed to include the Georgan school of thought that was denouncing and opposing property in land as universally practiced.

Archbishop Corrigan, the *Catholic Review* and the higher dignitaries of the New York Diocese were unanimous in regarding the Encyclical as utterly crushing the claims of the Georgians, and said so. Who could now dispute the decision of the Holy Father? A single sentence from the *Review* shows its editor's inability to distinguish between the Georgan philosophy of individualism which the Socialists had rejected and the Socialist philosophy of collectivism which both Henry George and the Pope rejected: "Under the name of

### 207 / REINSTATEMENT

Socialism the whole George fabric is overthrown." This article, like the Encyclical itself, was pervaded by this lack of clear discrimination.

"Rerum Novarum" was Henry George's supreme opportunity, and he seized it eagerly. Dropping all other work, including a textbook on *The Science of Political Economy* on which he was then engaged, he devoted the next month or two to an intensive study of the Pope's letter and penned a reply. This reply, translated into several foreign languages, including French and Italian, was held up until an Italian *edition de luxe*, printed on vellum and elaborately bound, was placed in the hands of Pope Leo himself by a high ecclesiastic who is said to have promised that the Pope should read it— "or I'll read it to him myself."

This reply, furnished whatever evidence the adherents of Henry George and followers of Dr. McGlynn needed to show that the Pope's "Rerum Novarum" had been written without an adequate examination of at least one of the social philosophies which he had condemned. They contended that the Holy Father, then fourscore and two years old, had depended too much upon his Archbishop in New York and his advisers in Rome, and had written his Encyclical without properly informing himself at first hand as to what the Georgan philosophy really was.

It will be seen, then, that the Encyclical, while con-

<sup>1</sup> "The Condition of Labor," Pope Leo's Encyclical "Rerum Novarum," and Henry George's reply, "The Condition of Labor," together with "The (Irish) Land Question" and George's debate with the Duke of Argyll, "The Prophet of San Francisco" and "Reduction to Iniquity" are published in a single volume by the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, New York City. Price \$1.00.

## 208 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

vincing enough to the Archbishop and his friends, quite failed to convince the many devout Catholics who had taken up the Cross of the New Crusade that they and their beloved priest were wrong. Though still willing to accept the rulings of the Pontiff on faith and spiritual matters, they believed that he had made a mistake in extending his jurisdiction to political and economic matters, and a still greater mistake by ruling wrongly.

The reactions to the Encyclical among the Catholics in this country, on the whole, were unfortunate for Archbishop Olorrigan and the Church. For a time the *Standard*, then in desperate financial straits, seemed to take on new life as Catholics of varying degrees of eminence wrote letters to it repudiating or explaining away the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility in so far as it pertained to mundane affairs like politics and political economy.

With the publication of George's reply the discussion took on a broader and deeper character. The Archbishop and his friends, including the bulk of the secular press, however, ridiculed the pretensions of the "Prophet of San Francisco" to debate these high matters with so great a personality as the Pope, and the authority of the Archbishop was exercised to compel acquiescence in the Pope's views. Fr. Ducey of St. Leo's Church, New York, having expressed regrets that "certain prelates and ~ priests had placed the Church in a ridiculous position" ~ by their unqualified support of the position taken by the Pope in regard to property in land, was compelled to retract. His retraction was general rather than specific, however. He disclaimed having intended any reflections on the Pope and said: "As a Catholic and a priest I

## 209 / REINSTATEMENT

must recognize the Holy Father as the authorized teacher of the faith and morals committed to the Church by Jesus Christ."

In his comment on Fr. Ducey's retraction the Archbishop committed another serious blunder, saying:

The whole matter is very simple. If Father Ducey had thought for an instant of the character of the Encyclical, he would have avoided the error he committed. He seems for a moment to have lost sight of the fact that *the Holy Father is the Teacher, and every Catholic must regard him as the Supreme Earthly Authority. The Holy Father, having advanced in the Encyclical the doctrine of private property in land, it becomes the duty of every one in the Church to accept it unquestioningly.*<sup>2</sup>

The Right Rev. Mgr. O'Breyn, one of the Pope's chamberlains attending the golden jubilee of Archbishop Kenrick in St. Louis, agreed with Archbishop Corrigan that the Pope's decision regarding property in land settled the question, and, asked by a *Tribune* reporter if a Catholic had not the right to believe the contrary, replied: "Certainly not, when the Holy Father has decided otherwise."

The comment of Fr. Sylvester Malone of Brooklyn probably was the sanest of any made by priest or prelate:

Mr. George makes many strong arguments, which any student of economics can see. It teaches the world one good lesson, namely, how to conduct an argument

properly . . .

I think it will be read as widely as the Encyclical itself, and I am sure the Pope will not only read it, but give it proper consideration . . . The Encyclical is the Holy

2 Italics the *Standard's*.

## 210 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Father's opinion on the matter, and does not settle the matter for all time. The argument is just beginning.

Father Malone was right—the argument was just beginning, however Archbishop Corrigan might contend that it was ended. But before the Pope had time to give the matter due consideration and act on his newer conclusions, the Archbishop's blunt claim that Pope Leo's letter dealing with labor and economic questions was binding on the beliefs and consciences of Catholics stirred up a veritable hornets' nest of adverse criticism and dissent, not only among Protestants, but among Catholics as well.

To mention only a few of the magazine articles dissenting from Archbishop Corrigan's view and showing American reactions thereto, there were "The Pope's Veto in American Politics," by J. Costa; "Self-Contradictory Claims," "National Defense Against Roman Catholicism in the United States," and "Is Catholicism Christianity?" all in *Our Day*; "Rome or Reason," by Robert G. Ingersoll in the *North American*; "No Need of a Roman Catholic Party in the United States," by J. G. Shea in *The American Catholic*; "The Anathema of the Roman Catholic Church," an editorial in *The Forum*; "Roman Catholicism and the American Republic," in *The Westminster Review*; "Aggressions of the Roman Catholic Church," in *The English Review*; "The Roman Catholic Church and the Coming Social Struggle," in *The American Magazine of Civics*; "The Roman Catholic Church as a Factor in Politics," and "Can the Roman Catholic Church Be Americanized?" in *The American Journal of Politics*; "Americanizing

## 211 / REINSTATEMENT

the Roman Catholic Church," in *The Andover Review*, and many others in less pretentious publications.

It seemed as if everybody except Archbishop Corrigan and his friends recognized the noose that he was placing about the neck of the Church in America. Many able Catholic pens labored valiantly against the views of their beloved Church expressed in these articles. Cardinal Gibbons in *The Cosmopolitan* presented a very different view of "The Rights and Responsibilities of Labor" from that entertained by Archbishop Corrigan. *The American Catholic* published a most interesting symposium on the authority of the Roman Church, participated in by Catholic and Anglican bishops, in which the Corrigan doctrine was harshly handled, yet the statement of the New York Archbishop continued to stand as a stumbling block in the way of many who sincerely desired to be both good Catholics and good Americans.

The *Standard* ran the Archbishop's comment on Fr. Ducey's qualified retraction in successive issues under the caption "Is the Roman Catholic Church a Menace?"

Many were the letters written to the *Standard* by Catholics who refused to believe the Archbishop had been correctly quoted, or who, endeavoring to defend the Church from the implications of the comment, doubted if he really had said it.

Indeed, the specific question of the righteousness or unrighteousness of the Georgan land philosophy was almost lost sight of in this portentous claim of the Pontiff's jurisdiction over the political and economic consciences of American citizens.

In the months that followed it became apparent that

## 212 / -REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

the Encyclical had failed to accomplish its intended purpose. It seemed to have widened rather than healed the rift in the Church between the supporters of the Archbishop and those of Dr. McGlynn, and to have raised in strength outside the Church the ugly old Know-Nothing contention that no one owing allegiance to any foreign power should be eligible to public office, or even to vote. Dr. McGlynn's work of inspiring mutual respect and trust between Protestants and Catholics was undone to a large degree.

The *Catholic Standard* of Philadelphia, fully six weeks after Archbishop Corrigan's comment on the Ducey retraction was published, insisted that it must be garbled, that it simply was too absurd for a man in his position to say. But, so far as can be ascertained, the Archbishop himself never repudiated or modified it.

Father Ducey was indeed right, if we are to judge by events, in asserting that the priests and prelates who accepted the Pope's Encyclical as right because he said so had placed the Church in a ridiculous position, and no retraction by him could alter the fact.

All this was bitter indeed for Dr. McGlynn, who knew very well that the Pope had not spoken *ex cathedra*, and was but uttering the *opinion* of himself and his advisers, chief of whom was the Archbishop of New York, who, being on the scene, was presumed to know what he was talking about.

Of course the Doctor took due notice of all this in his speeches before the Anti-Poverty Society and elsewhere, never failing to make clear the limitations of the Pope's authority and of his infallibility. Strangely enough, the secular press, however much it was inter-

## 213 / REINSTATEMENT

ested in the abstract question of the Church's pretensions to authority over the political beliefs and conduct of Catholics, manifested comparatively little interest in the concrete exercise of this authority that was afforded by his case. Reports of the Doctor's meetings were meager, and comments on his view of the position of the Church were mostly unfavorable. Dr. McGlynn was among the first to read Henry George's reply to the Pope's Encyclical, but he appears to have said little or nothing publicly about it.

When we are at odds with someone for whom we have a high and sincere regard, a trait of human nature prompts us to act according to the old proverb, "Least said, soonest mended." We dislike telling anyone about it. We seek rather to hide or obscure it. We prefer to say nothing at all about the person, and even avoid mentioning him if we can. Dr. McGlynn and Henry George had been in this

position for a long time. They did not meet, and seldom mentioned each other. The skill displayed by the Doctor in preaching the Georgan philosophy without mentioning George was quite remarkable at times. The following from one of his speeches before the Society late in 18g i, preserved by Sylvester Malone, is a fair sample of what he was saying and Rome and the press were missing. It was aimed at current Malthusian notions and proposals for limiting immigration:

A large population will produce far more for each than a small population, and this goes to show that it is a mistake to suppose that there is danger of the human family becoming too numerous in this world. It is a beautiful law of God's civilization that where men come together in large

## 214 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

numbers, so far from there being any danger of their exhausting the bounties of nature, nature surrenders to them in still larger proportions her greatest mysteries and her most precious treasures.

Every able-bodied man, every able-bodied woman, every healthy child that comes into this country, whether from heaven or from Europe, is money in the pockets of the country. Why is there more talk of keeping out what is called pauper labor than there was forty or fifty years ago? Simply because land thirty or forty or fifty years ago was practically to be got for nothing all over a great part of this country, and today the land is all practically monopolized. Tear away the barriers that keep the people from the land! This country would not be one-half what it is today if there had been no immigration after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

The poverty that comes like a necessary horrid shadow of civilization today is no necessary consequence of civilization. It is the result of the enormous increase of value that comes to land in civilization, and because of our mistake in permitting that enormous value, that magnificent fund provided by a beautiful providential design for the benefit of the community, to become a curse by giving it into private pockets, and so making it profitable for some men to enslave their brethren by making artificially scarce the magnificent bounties of God, and, adding injury to injury, taxing industry to death to raise the public revenues.

No formal reply was ever made by Pope Leo to Henry George's rejoinder, but it was not without its effect in Rome.

Many were the efforts made by the Church authorities to induce or coerce Dr. McGlynn to come back into the Church in the way they desired him to come, by re

## 215 / REINSTATEMENT

pentance and retraction. Thus we find the Archbishop in November, 1891, publishing a letter of the Propaganda, approved by the Pope, defining the conditions upon which the Doctor could once more enter the Roman Catholic Church. It was called "Rome's Ultimatum. The conditions were:

1. That he must himself make the request and state his grievance.
2. That he should publicly condemn all he had said or done of an insulting character as against the Archbishop and as against the Holy See.
3. That he be ready to abide by the orders and submit to the judgment of the Apostolic See.

4. That he promise to abstain from any public utterance or assistance at any meeting on the matter under consideration.

Dr. McGlynn made his reply to this letter at the public meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society in Cooper Union on Sunday evening, November 22, 1891. The ultimatum and his reply put the Doctor again into the news in a big way. After a brief summary of his case as it had developed up to that time, he said, as reported by the *New York Tribune*:

My answer to this ultimatum is, that I cannot condemn or retract what I have “said and done of an insulting character as against the Archbishop and as against the Holy See,” for the excellent reason that I have not insulted the Archbishop or the Holy See, although I have criticised and differed with their policies, politics and opinions, as I had a perfect right to do. I am ready, if relieved from the excommunication and suspension, “to abide by the orders and submit to the judgment of the Apostolic See,” so far

216 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

as such orders and judgments are within the well-known and well-defined limits prescribed by right reason and the teachings of the Catholic religion.

I will not promise to abstain, nor will I abstain, from any public utterance or assistance at any meetings on the matter under consideration, namely, the doctrines of the Anti-Poverty Society.

In all this my judgment is perfectly clear as to my duty, and my conscience is at rest. As some illustration and proof of this, I will give the last letter ~ which I wrote to Archbishop Corrigan, as follows:

“New York, April 8, 1890.

“Most REVEREND ARCHBISHOP:

“I have received your letter from Jerusalem in which you tell me that you were impelled to pour out your whole soul in supplication that our Saviour might bring me back to the channels of His grace and you also tell me if you can help me in any way to reach this desired consolation, to write to you.

“I am thankful for your prayers; and I, too, have frequently prayed for you.

“You surely can do much to have the excommunication, to which you refer, withdrawn. I think that you ought, and I shall be glad if you will.

“I will not go to Rome. I will not condemn the doctrines that I have uttered. I have no case before your tribunal. I have not appealed, and I will not appeal to your tribunal, and if kind friends have made recourse for me I revoke and repudiate it.

“But meanwhile, I can assure you that in all that led to my suspension and excommunication I did not sin against my conscience, that I humbly trust that I am in

S This letter was a reply to the one written by the Archbishop when he was in Jerusalem in the spring of 1890.

## 217 / REINSTATEMENT

the Grace of God, and that, when a few weeks ago I was very near to death with pneumonia, I trusted that I was not wholly unprepared to die, even without any sacrament, and I had no thought that my duty to God demanded that I should make any apologies or retractions; but I rather felt that I should be sinning against God by making them. I remain, Most Rev. Archbishop, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

“EDWARD MCGLYNN.”

He followed this with a statement of why and how he became a priest, of his ordination and degree as a Doctor of Divinity and his conception of the functions and duties of the priesthood:

I fain, coming out from the Propaganda a missionary apostolic to preach the gospel to every creature, would have converted my country, converted the whole world. I speedily began to find that there were all sorts of obstacles in the way; that the policies and politics, I shall not say of the Church, but of churchmen, of Church rulers, were such as to estrange, to alienate, to make it morally impossible for our Protestant fellow-countrymen to come and stand upon the same religious platform with us.

He outlined the scandal connected with the “so-called” school question and presented his own view that the Church had been sent to preach the gospel and had no divine commission to teach reading, writing, arithmetic, etc., pointing out that this had been the beginning of his disagreement with the heads of the Church. He took up the doctrine of the temporal power of the Pope, his claim to be king, absolute monarch, with no Constitution, no charter to limit his power except his

## 218 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

own benevolence, and his conviction, reached when he had attained to years of discretion, that this was “one of the things most detrimental to the best interest of religion the world over.

Then, coming to the economic philosophy the teaching of which had led to his excommunication, he described it in as few words as has ever been done by anybody: “It is sometimes called the single tax doctrine, for the reason that we could and we should remove all other taxes, since by a beautiful natural law the fund produced in the rental value of natural bounties by the growth of the community will always be fully adequate to supply all the public demands. The greatest freedom and stimulus would thus be given to labor, whether of head or of hand, and thus would involuntary poverty be abolished. That is a demand for justice. And I have been suspended for teaching this!”

He then quoted from Archbishop Corrigan’s statement to the newspapers in January, 1887, in which “he makes it perfectly clear that my suspension would have been removed if I had only retracted this doctrine, and I will not retract this doctrine as long as I live!”

Appealing to his listeners to have no quarrel with Christ or with the Church, with

its holy creeds and sacraments, but to “learn to distinguish between the blunders and false policies, and politics and false political economy of these men, and the Catholic religion,” he made a devastating exposition of these policies as the real things that were undermining religion:

I say that I have not insulted the Archbishop and the Pope; but I have criticised their policies and politics. I have given reasons for it. And if they say that in order to

## 219 / REINSTATEMENT

be permitted to receive the sacraments of the Catholic Church people must either agree with all their policies and politics, or at least must not be guilty of the indiscretion of publicly disagreeing with them, I say they are grievously misrepresenting Catholic theology and making conditions morally impossible of acceptance not merely by those outside whom they should strive to win, but also by vast numbers inside the Church. And I predict with bitterness of soul, regretting exceedingly that I have so clear a vision of what I am predicting, that in another generation or two, the worst, the bitterest, the most relentless enemies of Catholic authority, of Pope, of bishop, and priest, will not be the children of those old-fashioned English or American Protestants, but will be the children or grandchildren of people who are thronging the Catholic Churches today. It is not any longer a matter of great surprise to hear that people who are supposed to be or used to be, very recently, pretty good Catholics, who a little while ago would have knocked down an Orangeman for saying “Booh!” to the Pope, are now actually willing to sing in chorus with the Orangemen, “To hell with the Pope!” Are not the Orange-men themselves the not very remote descendants of good Roman Catholics? I say I deplore all that; but whose will be the fault? . . . And if Rome shall make the accepting of its politics and policies a condition of accepting its creed and its sacraments, then the righteous instincts of men will rebel, then they will refuse to submit to its dogmas and illogically will throw up the whole thing.

The address contained other echoes of his prophetic address on “The Ecclesiastical Machine in Politics” delivered nearly four years before.

Seen in retrospect, it would seem that the leaven of George’s reply to the Encyclical of Pope Leo, recently

## 220 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

published, was at work in Rome as well as in this country, and was inspiring the “ecclesiastical machine” to extra efforts to get the Doctor into the Church on its terms before it had to take him back on his own terms. That the Doctor had some inkling of what was going on behind the scenes is evident, for he closed this most remarkable address with these words:

I have some reason to believe that rumors which have been going around about a possible restoration for me may have some connection with efforts made by certain laymen to make mischief for Archbishop Corrigan for reasons totally remote from



any case of mine. . . . When this thing was mentioned to me I said that it was a most unholy thing, and that I would have nothing to do with any such thing. . . . Now, for these reasons, I say, I am not going to Rome. If I have committed any fault, in the name of common sense let it be investigated here where it is alleged to have been committed. If I have taught a false doctrine, let them take my exposition of it and prove it false, and I am willing to submit. Rome is too far off. It costs too much to go there. It costs too much to live there. I have not the time. I have other concerns and other engagements. I am no longer at their beck and call—less now than ever before. .

As a student of the Propaganda College in Rome, the obligation that I took was, at the proper time, to accept priestly ordination and to return to my native place and to labor there in the work of my priestly ministry. That is all. I deny their right, at all sorts of inconvenience and loss to me, to my purse, to my health, to my time, to order me to Rome at their beck without telling me what they want to do with me, and giving me no idea how long I shall have to stay. I deny their right to forbid me, an Amen-

## 221 / REINSTATEMENT

can citizen, to confer with and to address publicly, my fellow citizens upon our political rights, interests and duties. I am not bound to pay any more attention to their economic theories than to their censure of the Copernican system of astronomy. I deny their right to order me to Rome, and I refuse to go until it suits my convenience; *and when I do go, I shall not go in the attitude of a suppliant, but to talk to the Pope on these matters and to assure him and those about him that they have made a very great mistake, and that for the very best interests of the Catholic religion they should make haste to undo, as far as they can, the very serious consequences of their blunder.*

And, though many weary months were to pass before the next decisive move was made, in this case the mountain at last came to Mahomet.

## POPE LEO ACTs

Mgr. Francisco Satolli had been called to Rome by Pope Leo in 1880, appointed Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Propaganda in 1882 and made Archbishop of Lepanto in 1888. He had visited the United States as the representative of the Pope to attend a great conference of Catholic prelates in 1890. He had then acquired a general knowledge of the American situation and had tried to see Dr. McGlynn, inviting him to meet him in New York, but the Doctor was on a lecture tour in the West and did not receive the invitation in time.

It so happened that Mgr. O'Connell, rector of the American College in Rome (and later Archbishop of Boston), had visited the United States in 1889 and had made a very thorough examination of the McGlynn case.

## 222 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

He had been given to understand by the New York ecclesiastical authorities that the issue was merely a local dispute and that Dr. McGlynn's followers were but a

handful of dissatisfied parishioners who had thrown in their lot with the excommunicated priest. But this did not agree with his observations in other parts of the country, especially in the West, for there he found thousands of McGlynn sympathizers and learned that the Doctor's condemnation was a most serious matter for American Catholicism.

That the findings of these two prelates were in due time laid before the Pope is entirely probable, though they do not appear to have hastened his action. In fact, had it not been for the broader and deeper discussion of the question that was provoked by his Encyclical in 1891 and by Henry George's rejoinder, it may be doubted if he would have acted at all. But now action was necessary.

Wherefore we find Mgr. Satolli again selected in 1892 as the Pope's representative to attend in the United States a great celebration of the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America, and he was accompanied by Mgr. O'Connell, rector of the American College in Rome. Moreover, Mgr. Satolli came clothed with extraordinary powers as the Pope's Alegate, powers superseding those of any American prelate, and with instructions to examine into and settle all disputes arising between priests and their bishops—especially that terrible McGlynn case, whose continuance was threatening to tear asunder the Catholic Church in America.

After attending the Columbian celebration, Mgr. Satolli came to the conference of Roman Catholic Arch-

## [223 / REINSTATEMENT

bishops of America in New York and addressed it on December 7 on the public school question. His presentation of the position of the Church of Rome on the question of public vs. parochial schools, though it constituted a defeat for Archbishop Corrigan in his uncompromising insistence on Catholics' sending their children to Church schools, was in reality a sensible compromise of the question, for it allowed Catholic children to be sent to public schools for their secular education, provided their parents fulfilled their moral duties in the matter of religious education and training at home.

Archbishop Corrigan at~d his party affected to treat this rebuff as a matter of no great importance, but it aroused much talk as to when and how Mgr. Satolli, in his capacity as head of the ecclesiastical court for the settling of differences between priests and their bishops, would take up the case of Dr. McGlynn. Archbishop Corrigan was inclined to doubt the extent of Mgr. Satolli's authority at first, but letters from Rome reassured him on that point. Some of his friends asserted that the McGlynn case, having already been settled by Rome in the order for his excommunication, could not possibly be within his scope, but they were mistaken.

On December 7 the *New York Sun*, generally regarded as being at least a quasi-official organ of Archbishop Corrigan, published an alleged interview with Archbishop Corrigan, in which he was made to say that Dr. McGlynn was coming back into the Church—that Mgr. Satolli had arranged a settlement satisfactory to both the Anti-Poverty people and the Archdiocese of New York. But in the same issue appeared another interview with Mgr. Satolli and Bishop John W. Keane,

## 224 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

rector of the Catholic University of America in Washington, in which the statement contained in the Corngan interview was absolutely denied.

Reporters flocked to the Archiepiscopal Residence for further information. The Archbishop was not to be seen, but he sent out the following written statement to the press:

The Archbishop repudiates the interview in this morning's *Sun*, and declares that he said nothing whatsoever about Dr. McGlynn farther than that he expressed the hope that he would be reconciled with the Church.

Added to this, but erased before the note was sent out, were these words: "The various speculations about the future are due entirely to some one's lively imagination."

No further information was forthcoming, and the Catholic priests of New York were mum so far as interviewing them was concerned.

Mgr. Satolli took up his residence at the Catholic University in Washington and the permanence of his mission as Apostolic Delegate became evident. Opposition, covert, ill-concealed, and even open, developed and continued. Archbishop Ireland of St. Paul was moved to make a public statement regarding his mission, in the course of which he said in the *New York Times*, December 1~:

Mgr. O'Connell, who was especially chosen by the Pope to accompany Mgr. Satolli to America to introduce him to his new surroundings, sails tomorrow for Rome. His work is finished and his departure has no significance. Mgr. Satolli remains and will remain with us for a good while

## 225 / REINSTATEMENT

to come. The report that he has been recalled by the Pope or is likely to be soon recalled is simply absurd. Mgr. Satolli represents the Pope. Opposition to him is opposition to the Pope. Disrespect to him, criticism of him, is disrespect to and criticism of the Pope. . . . The Ablegate's address on the school question covers in its brief enunciations the whole ground, and with a master pen marks out the provinces of Church and State. To the Church, and to her alone, belongs religious instruction; but there is, and there can be, no objection to the State laying claim to busy itself with the secular part. .

Also there came from Rome expression of the Pope's displeasure at the opposition that was shown to Mgr. Satolli's recommendations and decisions.

Dr. McGlynn, together with his friend and adviser, Dr. Burtzell, were invited by Mgr. Satolli to the University in Washington. Perhaps "summoned" were the better word. They went to Washington. There it was agreed that the right method of determining whether the Doctor had been advocating a philosophy that was contrary to the Christian faith and Catholic doctrine would be by an examination of the philosophy itself, and the Doctor was asked to write a comprehensive statement of it. Then was done what Archbishop Corngan should himself have done in 1886 or earlier, the doing of which would have saved an immeasurable amount of mental and spiritual suffering and loss of prestige in the Church itself, to say nothing of what it might have saved the world at large.

Proceedings were behind the closed doors of the University from which little

more than rumors came except the “official” statements which probably con-

## 226 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

cealed as much as they revealed, but it is not difficult to imagine the argument advanced against the reopening of the case of Dr. McGlynn, for it had been advanced openly aforesaid. The case had already been adjudicated. Its reopening involved the possibility of a reversal of the verdict of the Vatican already rendered, which would not only discountenance the administration of the New York Diocese by Archbishop Connigan but result in great damage to the prestige of the Church of Rome itself, indicating that its judgments were whimsical, dictated or swayed by popular clamor. The one dominating fact that is known with absolute certainty is that Dr. McGlynn wrote the following masterly statement of the Geongean land philosophy as required and which excited Henry George’s warmest approval and admiration:

### THE DOCTRINAL STATEMENT

All men are endowed by the law of nature with the right to life and to the pursuit of happiness, and therefore with the right to exert their energies upon those natural bounties Without which labor or life is impossible.

God has granted those natural bounties, that is to say, the earth, to mankind in general, so that no part of it has been assigned to anyone in particular, and so that the limits of private possession have been left to be fixed by man s own industry and the laws of individual peoples.

But it is a necessary part of the liberty and dignity of man that man should own himself, always, of course, with perfect subjection to the moral law. Therefore, beside the common right to natural bounties, there must be by law of nature private property and dominion in the fruits of industry or in what is produced by labor out of those

## 227 / REINSTATEMENT

natural bounties to which the individual may have legitimate access, that is, so far as he does not infringe the equal right of others or the common rights.

It is a chief function of civil government to maintain equally sacred these two natural rights.

It is lawful and it is for the best interests of the individual and of the community and necessary for civilization that there should be a division as to the use and an undisturbed, permanent, exclusive private possession of portions of the natural bounties, or of the land; in fact, such exclusive possession is necessary to the ownership, use and enjoyment by the individual of the fruits and products of his industry.

But the organized community, through civil government, must always maintain the dominion over those natural bounties, as distinct from the products of private industry and from that private possession of the land which is necessary for their enjoyment. The maintenance of this dominion over the natural bounties is a primary function and duty of the organized community, in order to maintain the equal right of all men to labor for their living and for the pursuit of happiness, and

therefore their equal right of access directly or indirectly to natural bounties. The assertion of this dominion by civil government is especially necessary, because, with the very beginning of civil government and with the growth of civilization, there comes to the natural bounties, or the land, a peculiar and an increasing value distinct from and irrespective of the products of private industry existing therein. This value is not produced by the industry of the private possessor or proprietor, but is produced by the existence of the community and grows with the growth and civilization of the community. It is, therefore, called the unearned increment. It is this unearned increment that in cities gives to lands without any improve-

## 228 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

ments so great a value. This value represents and measures the advantages and opportunities produced by the community, and men, when not permitted to acquire the absolute dominion over such lands, will willingly pay the value of this unearned increment in the form of rents, just as men, when not permitted to own other men, will willingly pay wages for desired services.

No sooner does the organized community, or State, arise, than it needs revenues. This need for revenues is small at first while population is sparse, industry rude and the functions of the State few and simple, but with the growth of population and advance of civilization the functions of the State increase and larger and larger revenues are needed. God is the author of society, and has pre-ordained civilization. The increasing need for public revenues with social advance being a natural God-ordained need, there must be a right way of raising them—some way that we can truly say is the way intended by God. It is clear that this right way of raising public revenues must accord with the moral law or the law of justice. It must not conflict with individual rights, it must find its means in common rights and common duties. By a beautiful providence, that may be truly called Divine, since it is founded upon the nature of things and the nature of man, of which God is the creator, a fund, constantly increasing with the capacities and needs of society, is produced by the very growth of society itself, namely, the rental value, and the duty of appropriating the fund to public uses is apparent, in that it takes nothing from the private property of individuals, except what they will pay willingly as an equivalent for a value produced by the community, and which they are permitted to enjoy. The fund thus created is clearly by the law of justice a public fund, not merely because the value is a growth that comes to the natural bounties which God

## 229 / REINSTATEMENT

gave to the community in the beginning, but also, and much more, because it is a value produced by the community itself, so that this rental belongs to the community by that best of titles, namely, producing, making or creating.

To permit any portion of this public property to go into private pockets, without a perfect equivalent being paid into the public treasury, would be an injustice to the community. Therefore, the whole rental fund should be appropriated to common or public uses.

This rental tax will make compulsory the adequate utilization of the natural bounties exactly in proportion to the growth of the community and of civilization,

and will thus compel the possessors to employ labor, the demand for which will enable the laborer to obtain perfectly just wages. The rental tax fund, growing by a natural law proportionately with the growth of civilization, will thus be sufficient for public needs and capacities, and therefore all taxes upon industry and upon the products of industry may and should be abolished. While the tax on land values promotes industry, and therefore increases private wealth, taxes upon industry act like a fine or a punishment inflicted upon industry; they impede and restrain and finally strangle it.

In the desired condition of things land would be left in the private possession of individuals, with full liberty on their part to give, sell or bequeath it, while the State would levy on it for public uses a tax that should equal the annual value of the land itself irrespective of the use made of it or the improvements on it.

The only utility of private ownership and dominion of land, as distinguished from possession, is the evil utility of giving to the owners the power to reap where they have not sown, to take the products of the labor of others without

### 230 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

giving them an equivalent—the power to impoverish and practically to reduce to a species of slavery the masses of men, who are compelled to pay to private owners the greater part of what they produce for permission to live and to labor in this world, when they would work upon the natural bounties for their own account, and the power, when men work for wages, to compel them to compete against one another for the opportunity to labor, and to compel them to consent to labor for the lowest possible wages—wages that are by no means the equivalent of the new value created by the work of the laborer, but are barely sufficient to maintain the laborer in a miserable existence, and even the power to deny to the laborer the opportunity to labor at all. This is an injustice against the equal right of all men to life and to pursuit of happiness, a right based upon the Brotherhood of Man which is derived from the Fatherhood of God. This is the injustice that we would abolish in order to abolish involuntary poverty.

That appropriation of the rental value of land to public uses in the form of a tax would abolish the injustice which has just been described, and thus abolish involuntary poverty, is clear; since in such cases no one would hold lands except for use, and the masses of men, having free access to unoccupied lands, would be able to exert their labor directly upon natural bounties, and to enjoy the full fruits and products of their labors, beginning to pay a portion of the fruits of their industry to the public treasury only when, with the growth of the community and the extension to them of the benefits of civilization, there would come to their lands a rental value distinct from the value of the products of their industry, which value they would willingly pay as the exact equivalent of the new advantages coming to them from the community; and again in such case men would not be compelled to work for employers

### 231 / REINSTATEMENT

for wages less than absolutely just wages, namely, the equivalent of the new value created by their labor; since men surely would not consent to work for unjust wages when they could obtain perfectly just wages by working for themselves; and, finally, since when what belongs to the community shall have been given to

the community, the only valuable things that men shall own as private property will be those things that have been produced by private industry, the boundless desires and capacities of civilized human nature for good things will always create a demand for these good things, namely, the products of labor—a demand always greater than the supply, and, therefore, for the labor that produces these good things there will always be a demand greater than the supply, and the laborer will be able to command perfectly just wages— which are a perfect equivalent in the product of some other person's labor for the new value which his own labor produces.

The statement was examined by Mgr. Satolli with the utmost care lest any part of it that might be contrary to the doctrine of Mother Church escape him, and, having formed his own judgment, he referred it to the University theologians and experts in canonical law for their examination.

Bishop Keane, rector of the University, and the Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Shehan, its head, being friendly to the Doctor, stood aside, leaving the examination of the statement to these eminent authorities: Rev. Dr. Bouquillon, Dean of the Faculty; Rev. Dr. Thomas O'Gorman, afterward Bishop of Sioux Falls; Rev. Dr. Charles Grannan and Rev. Dr. Edward A. Pace.

It would be interesting to know the mental states of

## 232 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Dr. McGlynn and his party as compared with those of the Archbishop and his party while they awaited the verdict. Which party may be supposed to have been praying "Thy will be done" with the greater sincerity?

The judgment of Mgr. Satolli and the University professors of theology and canonical law, rendered unanimously, was that *there was nothing in the land philosophy preached by Dr. McGlynn that was contrary to the Christian faith or to Catholic doctrine!*

This judgment was promulgated by Mgr. Satolli himself at the Catholic University in Washington on December 23, 1892. Late that evening Mgr. Satolli gave to the press this statement:

To end the many contradictory telegrams sent out to the university for inquiry, it is thought expedient to state that at 9 o'clock P.M. Dr. McGlynn was declared free from ecclesiastical censures and restored to the exercise of his priestly functions, after having satisfied the Pope's legate on all the points in his case.

Dr. McGlynn immediately wrote to Mgr. Satolli the following letter:

Monsignor—I am very happy to learn that it has been judged that there is nothing contrary to Catholic doctrine in the doctrine taught by me in the exposition of the same which I sent to your grace, and I rejoice that you are prepared to remove the ecclesiastical censure.

I assure you that I have never said, and I would never say, consciously, a word contrary to the teachings of the Church and the Apostolic See, to which teachings, and notably to those contained in the Encyclical "Rerum Novarum." I give and

have ever given a full adhesion, and, if whatsoever word may have escaped me which might seem

## 233 / REINSTATEMENT

not entirely conformable to those teachings, I would like to recall it or to interpret it in a sense conformable to them.

I have not consciously failed in the respect due to the authority of the Holy See; but if whatsoever word may have escaped me not conformable to the respect due to it, I should be the first to repent it and to recall it.

As to the journey to Rome, I will make it within three or four months, if the matter be not otherwise determined by the Holy Father.

It will be noted that the Doctor expressed his adherence to the doctrine contained in Pope Leo's Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum." Was it a retraction? On its face it looks somewhat like one. That depends, however, on a rather fine-spun interpretation of the meaning of the Encyclical, as will appear on succeeding pages.

Great was the sensation created by Dr. McGlynn's restoration to the priesthood. The surprise lay not so much in his restoration as in his complete vindication. He was not required to retract or recant one word or syllable of the land philosophy which Archbishop Corrigan had so strongly condemned. The judgment meant that a great mistake had been made and a great injustice had been done to Dr. McGlynn, an injustice that could be remedied only by the removal of all censure and his restoration to full standing in the priesthood. There was no taint of a "pardon" in his restoration.

"To err is human." Anybody, regardless of place or power, can make mistakes, but it takes a superior sort of person to acknowledge his mistakes. Acknowledgment of error is no less admirable in an organization, even so great an organization as the Church of Rome, than in an individual, and to the eternal honor of the Church

## 234 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

the Sovereign Pontiff, through his Ablegate, had made this acknowledgment.

Beyond expressing his pleasure at Dr. McGlynn's reconciliation with the Church, Archbishop Corrigan had nothing to say, but there was bitterness and rebellion of spirit among his friends, and much talk of a protest of the laity, led by John D. Crimmins, a wealthy contractor and a Sachem of Tammany Hall, to be forwarded to Rome. Mgr. Satolli, while much gratified by the general approval of Dr. McGlynn's restoration manifested throughout the country, felt compelled to condemn this disposition to prolong the controversy and on Christmas Day issued this statement to the press:

This proceeding on the day of peace to men of good will, on the day of the Doctor's first mass after the estrangement of years, is neither Christian nor gentlemanly. The Doctor has been absolved, the past is forgotten and should be forgotten. To recall it is cruelty to him and disrespect to the authority that knows and has done what was necessary before absolving him.



## His FIRST MASS

It was on the morning of this Christmas Day, 1892, as Mgr. Satolli had said, that Dr. McGlynn said his first mass before the altar of his God where for six long years, years which had aged him greatly, he had been forbidden to minister because he had dared to preach what he believed to be the truth. It was in the small oratory attached to St. John's College, Lewis Avenue, Brooklyn, that he resumed the full exercise of his

### 235 / REINSTATEMENT

priestly functions. There were present only the acolyte and members of Dr. McGlynn's family.

It is said his voice trembled as he began the familiar and appropriate "I will go unto the altar of my God, who giveth joy to my youth," and the moment of consecration was prolonged, the only sound heard being the chime of the tiny bell and the low voice of the celebrant as he once more repeated the words, "This is my body. This is my blood." At the communion the members of his family partook of the sacrament from his hands. After this mass the celebrant began the second and then the third mass, the special privilege allowed a priest on Christmas Day. It was nearly eight o'clock when Dr. McGlynn finished his thanksgiving.

He rested the remainder of the day and in the evening went to his old stamping ground or lecture room, Cooper Union, where an audience that packed the hall to the doors waited to greet and congratulate him. That the Anti-Poverty Society was there to the last one able to walk or hobble goes without saying, but besides these were many who, sympathizing with him in their hearts, had been frightened away after the ban of excommunication had fallen on him. There were priests, too, in the audience, in this latter group, who still for obvious reasons declined to give their names. The greeting the Doctor received was warm and flattering beyond that usually accorded him. Women and strong men wept in their joy and were not ashamed. A large bouquet of flowers and a wreath of laurel tied with white ribbon were sent up to the platform. The Doctor was radiant in his happiness. The choir, the old St. Stephen's choir which had stuck to him throughout,

### 236 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

sang several Christmas carols and then the Doctor began to speak, but from the beginning to the end of his discourse there was not one word of regret for the stand he had taken during the six long years in his campaign against poverty, in defense of the public schools or in resisting ecclesiastical meddling with the political views of priests. Moreover, he announced his intention to continue preaching and lecturing on the same topics for the same cause every Sunday night in the same old place. One customary feature of his talk was notably absent, however. There was no caustic allusion to or criticism of Archbishop Corrigan or the "ecclesiastical machine."

His sermon was on the significance of the Christmas message, "Peace on earth to men of good will," and was filled with quotations of the Carpenter of Nazareth as He sought to show men how the will of God should be done on earth as it is in heaven, but he prefaced it with a brief résumé of his experience earlier in the day. I

quote from the New York *Times* ' report of his sermon:

Ladies and gentlemen, and my dear friends, I feel that it would be but disappointing to not unreasonable expectation if I should proceed further without saying that something has happened during the week. Though by merely glancing at your responsive faces provoked by such a hint, I know that you think that this is of no small importance to you, it would be strange affectation for me to deny or by silence to imply that it is not of paramount importance to me. I have told you this same thing for years, ever since you came to hear me in this place, not so much to show your affection for me as to prove your devotion to

## 237 / REINSTATEMENT

a holy and a glorious cause. It wrought, as you know, some six years ago a great change in my life, a most bitter change for me. I have told you this again and again.

I was not born to be a mere agitator or a professor of political economy. I was born to be a preacher of God's truth to men. I was born to minister to His laws, to look after the spiritual welfare of my fellow-men. From my infancy I had a call to be a priest of Christ's Church. It was my holy vocation. Surely it was no small sorrow to me to be torn from this altar and to come among you in this hail bereft of my priestly functions, but I now feel that I have suffered for the truth, and I shall always preach the Word of God, the glorious principles of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, even if it be from a platform, a barrel, or the tail of a cart.

I have been with my God this Christmas morning. I have stood before His altar. I have offered up the holy sacrifice. I have tasted of the body and the blood of my dear Redeemer, and I, who was excommunicated, today have communed from my own hands and taken from them the body and blood of my Lord. You know why I have not done so for the past few years. Since last Friday this glorious privilege has been given me, and I have been invited to these altars.

I thank you for the sympathy which you have so kindly shown to me in my trials and in the great joy and the great happiness which today has come again to me.

There was much speculation as to the terms of the Doctor's reinstatement. It was said by some that he had recanted his doctrines, and, strange to say, there are some who hold this view to this day. However, at the meeting of the Anti-Poverty Society at Cooper Union on January 8, 1893, Dr. McGlynn had this to say on

## 238 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

that point, after some preliminary compliments to Mgr. Satolli:

I have said often that, with the help of God, I would die under the most adverse circumstances, I would lay my head on the block and have it chopped off; I would die at the stake—rather than take back what I taught you, believing it to be the truth.

No such retraction, I repeat, has been demanded of me as a condition of the removal of the ecclesiastical censure. Most of you are willing to take my word for

it, but there is obvious proof in the fact that I am here tonight to preach the same doctrine I have preached all these years.

At this meeting he told this story:

A priest had the honor of being received into the presence of the Pope not many months ago. A Cardinal who was there remarked jestingly, speaking of this priest: “By the way, Holy Father, he is a great friend of that terrible McGlynn.”

The Pope seemed interested. Turning to the American priest he asked: “Tell me, is Dr. McGlynn really a good Catholic?”

The conversation was in Italian. The priest replied:

“Yes, Holy Father—eccellentissimo Cattolico!”

I cannot tell you all the priest imparted to the Pope, but he said it was a pity things were allowed to go on as they were, as a great injustice had been done.

“Do you mean to say that an injustice has been done?” demanded the Holy Father.

“Dr. McGlynn has been treated most unjustly,” replied the priest.

Whereupon the Pope said, smilingly, but in earnest:

“Tell him to write to the Pope.”

This message was carried to me, but I had no occasion

## 239 / REINSTATEMENT

to write. His Holiness had already sent an eminent scholar to this country.

But the vindication of Dr. McGlynn had important retroactive effects for others also. The ban had been placed on the Anti-Poverty Society and on those who attended its meetings. Many of these had been refused communion and absolution by their priests. Members who had died had been denied burial in consecrated ground for the reason that they persisted in their attendance. All this was undone by the vindication of the “contumacious” priest, for if he had not been at fault, how could the condemnation of his followers stand? It is said that a number of bodies were reinterred in Catholic cemeteries, but of these I have no record, nor did I seek one. John McGuire, at least, rested at last in consecrated ground.

## A PLACE FOR DR. MCGLYNN

Now that Dr. McGlynn was back in the Church, it was observed that he was a priest without a church. If, where and when he would be assigned to a church became absorbing questions among Catholics and interested non-Catholics as well. A leading parishioner of St. Stephen’s, whose allegiance to the Doctor had been unbroken, expressed himself in this fashion in a statement published by the *New York Times*:

We appreciate the delicate circumstances surrounding Dr. McGlynn’s reinstatement, and so does Dr. McGlynn himself. We know that we won our fight over Archbishop Corrigan’s head, and that he feels keenly the position in which Satolli has placed him. There is no disposition to

## 240 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

“rub it in” or to bring Dr. McGlynn back into the Church with a brass band. If Dr. McGlynn tried to get back into St. Stephen’s, the present priest in charge there would have to be forced out. If Dr. McGlynn settled anywhere permanently in New York, there would, it is likely, always be more or less friction due to the former position of the Archbishop respecting his conduct and his doctrines, and while Dr. McGlynn feels that it is merely a great wrong that has been righted and that he is entitled to reinstatement in St. Stephen’s or in some other church in this diocese, other considerations are more than likely to prevail, and when he comes to attach himself to a church permanently it will probably be under Archbishop Ireland. He can accomplish a great work in the Northwest.

This disinclination of Dr. McGlynn and his friends to crow” over their victory and celebrate it with brass bands is understandable and commendable, but it has been carried too far. It has helped the “machine” wing of the Church to establish and maintain a sort of “conspiracy of silence” which threatens the memory of the great priest with oblivion. The memory of Dr. McGlynn and his heroic fight to make men free must not perish from the earth.

It was suggested that his appointment to the Chair of Sacred Oratory, which it was believed would soon be established in the Catholic University at Washington, would not only be an ideal one because of his eminent qualifications for the place, but would be advantageous for the future peace of the Church, which had been so broken by the controversy. Bishop Keane would have welcomed him, but for some reason this plan was not followed.

## 241 / REINSTATEMENT

Still another possible disposition of the Doctor lies in the Land of Might-Have-Been. Grover Cleveland had been elected a second time to the Presidency in November, a few weeks prior to the Doctor’s vindication. While the Doctor does not appear to have taken any noticeable part in the 1892 national campaign, it is known that each had a high regard for the other, the esteem and sympathy of two men of pluck for each other, at least. There is a story, vouched for by members of the Doctor’s family, that President Cleveland had selected Dr. McGlynn as an eminently proper Ambassador to Italy, and that the Italian Government had signified that his appointment would be most agreeable. Preparations for the removal of the family to Italy were made. One of the boys has told me of his disgust when a Little Lord Fauntleroy suit, with which fond mothers at that time loved to torture their boys, was purchased for him.

But something intervened. Political considerations? Probably. Ecclesiastical opposition? Perhaps. At any rate, it was James J. Van Alen, son-in-law of William B. Astor, reputed contributor of **\$50,000** to the Democratic national campaign fund that year, who carried off the Ambassadorial prize.

How the Doctor would have enjoyed entertaining his recent ecclesiastical enemies in Rome in the capacity of American Ambassador may be better imagined than described.

A gift of **\$2,400** to Dr. McGlynn as a Christmas present, made by Dr. Henry Carey and a committee of the Anti-Poverty Society, was the occasion for shedding a side light on the effects of the controversy on

## 242 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Church revenues. Dr. Carey, who throughout had managed the McGlynn fund, made a statement to the press on the subject, and I quote from the *Times*:

The excommunication of Dr. McGlynn had one very serious effect on the Vatican and Propaganda. It greatly decreased the sum realized by the Pope from the contribution known as Peter's Pence. It is on this collection, drawn annually from every Catholic church in the world, that the Vatican is sustained. The Pope and the Cardinals of the Propaganda are supported by the Peter's Pence. Since Dr. McGlynn's excommunication this collection has fallen off very greatly, especially in Ireland and America. Indeed, the Cardinals of the Propaganda have all had their salaries reduced since the excommunication.

You have no idea how much attention the McGlynn case has aroused the world over. When I was in Europe last year I met a priest from South America who told me that Father McGlynn's excommunication had considerably lessened the amount of Peter's Pence collected in his country. From many trustworthy personal sources I learned that there had been a similar result here. I know that the collection of Peter's Pence in New York has been seriously affected. Even the Cathedral collections and the income of Archbishop Corrigan have been reduced. The shortage in Peter's Pence has aggregated millions of dollars. Very many of the St. Stephen's parishioners have stuck to their resolve, made soon after McGlynn's deposition, not to contribute to the Church until his reinstatement. I myself put my first contribution for several years in the box of St. Stephen's yesterday. Many others did likewise.

The reconciliation of "the Priest and the Prophet" dates from Dr. McGlynn's reinstatement as a priest of

## 243 / REINSTATEMENT

the Church. "When Henry George heard the news of his reinstatement," says Henry George, Jr., in writing the life of his father, "his rejoicing swept all other considerations aside. He at once sent a telegram: 'My wife and I send our heartfelt congratulations.' Sentiments of warm feeling were returned, and thus the relations of friendship, interrupted for four years, were renewed."

Dr. McGlynn continued his lectures at the AntiPoverty Society meetings and elsewhere, interrupted only by a lecture tour in Florida to which he was invited by Bishop Moore of St. Augustine, on his usual topics. The only change in his style was that he no longer criticised and berated the Archbishop and the "ecclesiastical machine." Sad to relate, his considerateness was not reciprocated by the friends of the Archbishop.

For a time the Anti-Poverty Society took on new life as many who had fallen away during the Doctor's excommunication returned and thousands flocked to Cooper Union to hear the famous priest whose long struggle for vindication had been successful. But the work for which the Society had been chiefly organized was now accomplished, he no longer had occasion to belabor the "ecclesiastical machine," and there was little for him to do except expound his philosophy of economic liberty. It was a wholesome change. He revamped some of his old speeches, though from him they never seemed old. One of these was a discourse on

“The Politics of the Lord’s Prayer,” which always brought that prayer home not merely to the individual but to the community and the nation, for in it was a threat as well as a promise:

#### 244 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

Make practical among men the doing as well as the saying of the Lord’s Prayer, “Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done *on earth* as it is in heaven.” This is the gospel and the prophets. In the sublime prayer that He Himself taught us He has given us the epitome of all His teachings, of all beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount, that tell us of our God-given and God-like capacities here, to which is added a God-like life hereafter.

These are the principles which, carried into practice, form the politics of the Lord’s Prayer. The immortal preamble of the Declaration of Independence is founded on these precisely—that all men are created equal, and that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. If it be true that God is our Father, and we all are brothers, then this preamble is true. If not, then it has nothing to stand upon. If there be no brotherhood of man founded upon our mutual relationship with the Creator, then there are no equal rights, and there can be no regard for these rights or obligations to one another. Without that, society only waits for the man on horseback, the man with the drawn sword, who shall trample out the liberties and the rights of men under his horse’s hoofs, and with all our boasted progress we are also doomed to such a destiny. For we are of common clay with others, and if there is no brotherhood of man sprung from God, then the law of force, of lust, of appetite, must rule; might, not right, must be supreme.

Does not the state of the world today suggest that this prophecy is in the way of being fulfilled?

In another sermon he pictured the “economic trinity” as follows:

Where did the first man get his capital? Man, with his bare hands and the land, has produced all things. All the

#### 245 / REINSTATEMENT

wonders of our civilization, this magnificent temple of art, the mightiest dome that the genius of man has ever raised over the altar of God, everything, is ultimately but the product coming from a naked man on a naked earth. And God sent him down from heaven with no other capital, no other machinery, but the magnificent capital of his brain, of his muscular energies, and the magnificent natural bounties of which He has made him the lord and sovereign.

We have the duty as well as the right to labor. It is necessary to the fulfillment of the law of God.

The right to labor upon what? Punching the air? No; there may be some gymnastic exercise in that, but nothing to speak of. We have the right to labor upon what? Why, upon our environment, of course, in this goodly habitation, and not in the moon or in Mars. This earth must be the workshop, a goodly workshop, that the Father, the Master Workman, has stocked with wonderful materials, but raw materials, which require the use of human labor in order to evolve more of those wonders that man has already evolved by his labors.

The restoration of Dr. McGlynn by Mgr. Satolli as has been said, was not pleasing to the friends of Archbishop Corrigan. Loud were their complaints against this “foreign intruder” in the Catholic press. The reaction of the Rochester *Union and Advertiser*, Bishop McQuaid’s semi-official mouthpiece, to Dr. McGlynn’s continued advocacy of the Georgean land doctrine was:

“And intelligent people are asked to regard this communistic blatherskite and disciple of Henry George as a sane and holy man of God! What blasphemy!”

But the only effect of all this was to confirm the step taken by Pope Leo—the appointment of a permanent representative in the United States “to keep the bishops

## 246 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

in order,” as Bishop McQuaid had expressed it. Mgr. Satolli, instead of returning to Rome, was continued as the first permanent Apostolic Delegate to the United States, and the “Americanization” of the Church took a forward step.

## VISITS ROME

In the spring of 1893 the Doctor made his long-delayed visit to Rome, as suggested by Mgr. Satolli and as he had always said he would do if he could go as a priest and in full communion. He told the story of this visit in an article in the September, 1893, issue of *The Forum*, “The Vatican and the United States,” which was primarily a statement of the reasons impelling the Pope to make Cardinal Satolli the first permanent Apostolic Delegate to the United States. I quote a part of the article:

The Pope has long desired to send here some man enjoying his esteem and confidence, unbiased and unprejudiced by local factions, jealousies or ambitions, through the eyes and ears of whom he could, as it were, see and hear for himself, and through whom, by the highest delegated authority, he could promptly redress wrongs and lift burdens and make wise and effectual provision for the more perfect doing of the great work in behalf of religion and humanity for which our country offers to the Church the freest, fairest and most promising field in all this world....

The Pope has become painfully aware of the grave disaffection and increasing bitterness of not a few Catholics, caused by the senseless antagonism of certain archbishops, bishops and priests to the legitimate aspirations of masses

## 247 / REINSTATEMENT

of men for improved social and economic conditions, and their preposterous interference with the clear rights and even duties of Catholic parents in the matter of the education of their children. He has been disturbed and vexed by a fierce controversy that has been provoked and carried on by members of certain religious orders and by bishops and priests, especially of foreign nationality and speech, and even by foreign politicians, to maintain on the one hand a sort of monopoly of education and on the other hand, under the plea of religion, to perpetuate in our

country, through churches and schools, foreign nationalities. This constructive treason against the unity of our American nationality, now known by the odious name of Cahenslyism, fortunately found no favor with the Pope. .

It is cause for congratulation that the instrument of establishing and beginning the beneficent work of the Apostolic Delegation is Archbishop Francisco Satolli. He is a man of great ecclesiastical learning, possessed of an open, perspicacious and logical mind. He is transparently modest and simply honest. He would be the first to disavow that he is a diplomatist. But he has that highest diplomacy, absolute simple-mindedness in the perception of righteousness and absolute fearlessness in doing, and compelling the doing, of justice.

Bishops and archbishops who have been hitherto parading their devotion and obedience to the Holy See have scarcely taken the trouble to conceal their hostility to the new order of things, and a bitterness hardly distinguishable from downright malignity has been manifested by some of them whose unrighteous judgments he has promptly reversed, whose excessive severity he has restrained and whose disregard of even the laws of the Church he has authoritatively rebuked. It is a sort of open secret here and in Rome that they have entered into a conspiracy to drive

## 248 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

this man out of the country by intrigue and misrepresentation. .

The Holy Father is not uninformed of their purposes and arts, and is immovable in his determination to thwart them. It was even my good fortune during my recent visit to Rome to give information on this subject to the Pope. The memory of this visit to the Sovereign Pontiff I shall ever cherish. I went to Rome in May last, at the wish of the Holy Father himself, conveyed to me through Monsignor Satolli. Cardinal Ledochowski, the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda, whom I saw first, at the Pope's desire, showed a disposition to proceed immediately to some discussion or explanation of the economic doctrines, the teaching of which by me had led to the complications that were happily ended by the decision of Mgr. Satolli, given last Christmas. I made haste to assure him that I had not come to Rome to defend myself and that any reopening of my case was entirely out of the question, since it had all been settled by the authority of the Pope through his delegate six months before. .

At noon of the day following the secret consistory (in which the Pontiff was already engaged) I was admitted promptly to the presence of the Holy Father, and was alone with him for about twenty-five minutes in the audience room, in which he occupied the gilded chair he generally occupies in public audience. With filial reverence I knelt and kissed the consecrated ring on his finger, and asked his blessing. I said in Italian:

“Holy Father, I have come to Rome to fulfill a duty, to keep my word given to your delegate; and, being here, I gladly avail myself of the opportunity to pay my respectful homage to your Holiness, to thank you for the reconciliation which was brought to me by the hand of your delegate, and to ask you to bless me.

## 249 / REINSTATEMENT

With reference to my previous reluctance to come to Rome, the Pope at once very affectionately assured me that I need not have had any fear, “in view of the wide-armed hospitality with which Rome receives all who come to her in a



friendly visit.”

He had no doubt already seen the copy of Mgr. Satolli’s letter to me, left with Cardinal Rampolla, and was only too ready to confirm what his delegate had done. He therefore contented himself with a reference to those new questions by saying:

“But surely you admit the right of property?” To which I answered, “Why, of course I do, and we would make absolutely sacred the right of property in the products of individual industry.”

The Pope led me immediately into a conversation about Mgr. Satolli and the Apostolic Delegation. Intrigues, the Pope assured me with great earnestness and solemnity, could not affect him. “Whatever may be said concerning intrigues,” he said, “I, the Head of the Church, am above all such intrigues, and am utterly uninfluenced by them.”

When I referred to the opposition of certain archbishops from the very beginning of the institution of the Apostolic Delegation itself, the Holy Father said to me:

“Yes, but now they see it in a different light and have written to that effect.”

To which I replied: “Because they cannot help themselves. These bishops cannot rebel against the Pope. The people, as a rule, are not much concerned for or devoted to the persons of their respective bishops, who have not been elected by the clergy or the people, but have been placed over them by the Pope; and the same Pope who places them there can take them away and put others in their places who will be equally well received.”

The Pope rejoined with increasing emphasis: “Have not

## 250 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

I, the Head of the Church, the same right to have my representative in America as in Madrid, Paris or Vienna?”

I said to the Pope that, now that the bishops are compelled to have a delegate in America, they want to make a scapegoat of Satolli because of his uprightness and fearlessness, and to have somebody else in his place whom they can more readily manage or capture. At this the Pope’s eyes flashed, and, striking the arm of his chair, he said, with increasing emphasis:

“Satolli! I know Satolli. It was I who brought him up, and so long as he does his duty and obeys my instructions, I will support him.”

After this the Pope turned his attention with great kindness of manner to my own future. Mgr. Satolli’s letter had said:

“Your visit to Rome will be particularly gratifying to the Holy Father, because he will see before him a priest to whom God has given particular gifts and aptitudes to do great good for the Church in this country.”

Apparently with reference to this the Pope inquired as to the exercise of my ministry and said, “Do you feel like going with Bishop Moore to Florida?”

I replied, “It is very remote. There is little to do there, and it is too far from my home and my associations.”

He then said, “Could you not accommodate matters with Corrigan?”

I said, “It would be difficult. He himself recently said to a priest who said to him that I might now soon be demanding a parish, ‘I am sure it would be very embarrassing for me.’”

The Pope asked me whether the Bishop of Brooklyn, in which city I said I was living, was friendly to me.

I said, “No. He grudgingly gave me permission to say mass in his diocese and

that only in strict seclusion, and

## 251 / REINSTATEMENT

would not change his policy even when I wrote to him informing him that the Apostolic Delegate had advised me to request him to do so.”

The Pope then inquired, “Are there not priests in Brooklyn who would be glad to invite you to preach?”

I answered: “Very many, but the bishop will not let them.”

I had already said to Cardinal Rampolla that for the present I preferred to remain as I am, and no doubt it was with reference to this wish of mine that the Pope said:

“Well, you may abound in your own sense.” [Meaning, doubtless, “You may do as you think **best**”—**AUTHOR.**]

I had told Cardinal Rampolla that my affairs made me desire to make my stay in Rome as brief as possible. With reference to this, the Pope said: “As you tell of your necessities, I of course cannot oppose your wishes. Are you now satisfied?”

I replied, “Yes, Holy Father, and I thank your Holiness, and I beg you to bless me.”

He laid his right hand upon my head, then raised it and, making the sign of the cross over me, repeated the liturgical words of the benediction.

I had not seen Leo XIII before. I was not overawed by his majesty, which is great, but was rather won by his evident desire to show me truly paternal kindness. I was impressed with his dominant intellectuality, which seems to be accompanied with equal vigor of will, although he is very thin and white, his face being nearly as white as his hair and his cassock. I thought him all mind and soul, in a body that one might almost call transparent.

When the second National Single Tax Conference was held in Chicago in 1893, Dr. McGlynn, who had returned from his visit to Rome and the Holy Father, was there taking an active part. The conference photo-

## 252 / REBEL, PRIEST AND PROPHET

graph shows him seated at a central table on the platform with Henry George and Louis F. Post, later Assistant Secretary of Labor under President Wilson.

Henry George and Dr. McGlynn were the star speakers at this conference. Mr. George, as usual, spoke extemporaneously, but Dr. McGlynn, departing from his usual habit of speaking without notes, read with care from a manuscript which he had prepared. The reason was obvious—his ecclesiastical enemies, still smarting from his restoration to the priesthood over their protesting heads, would have been only too glad to seize upon any careless expression to make more trouble for him.

He did not long continue this habit, however, for it cramped his style and detracted from the effectiveness of his speeches, if not from their quality.

On October 14, 1894, a vast number of Catholic priests, prelates, laymen and clergymen and public men of all religious faiths and walks in life assembled in Brooklyn to do honor to Fr. Sylvester Malone, who was then rounding out half a century as pastor of SS. Peter and Paul’s Church, and in that time had come to be regarded by the whole population as all that a priest of God should be. Dr. McGlynn was among the principal speakers on this occasion, and gave eloquent

expression to his regard for his old friend who had stood by him so manfully in the years of his troubles and thereby earned the displeasure of his ecclesiastical superiors.