

THE STANDARD

VOL. 2 JULY 23, 1887

Page 6

THE PARTY OF AMERICAN LIBERTY.

By William T. Croasdale

Though the newspapers and other professional society saviors are doing their best to mislead the people concerning the case of Dr. McGlynn, the truth is spreading despite the efforts to corral it, and the mass of the people are coming to see, understand and resent the impudent outrage on American citizenship committed by the Roman machine, at the instance of Archbishop Corrigan, on Rev. Dr. McGlynn. To readers of THE STANDARD the facts are too familiar to need elaborate representation, but a brief summary may be useful in enabling all concerned to call them to mind in due order.

First—The attempt was made, direct from Rome, four years ago, to have Dr. McGlynn suspended because, in his Irish land league speeches, he avowed his belief in the common ownership of land. Cardinal McCloskey refused to suspend him, but did induce him to promise to refrain from making further land league speeches.

Second—All of this excitement died out long ago through the reversal of Rome's policy toward Ireland. The doctrine of the land for the people was openly preached by Bishop Nulty and other prelates and priests in Ireland, while land league meetings were freely held, with Archbishop Corrigan's consent in the basements of the Catholic churches in this city.

Third—So far from objecting to participation of any kind by Dr. McGlynn in politics, Archbishop Corrigan deliberately sought to use the influence he supposed that the doctor had obtained by supporting Mr. Cleveland's candidacy for the presidency; and, at the archbishop's request, Dr McGlynn went to Washington to urge the promotion of General John Newton, then in the army and now the commissioner of public works for this city.

Fourth—Last summer, because of mere newspaper rumor, the archbishop presumed to caution Dr. McGlynn about his relations with Henry George, and intimated that the latter was in some way committed to socialism.

Fifth—When, at Dr. McGlynn's request, Mr. George called on Archbishop Corrigan to tell him what his views really were, the archbishop would not listen to the man he had misrepresented, but insisted on talking about the land league difficulty of four years before, and finally told Mr. George that he had called a meeting of his council for that day to consider the question of Dr. McGlynn's

suspension. Up to this time Dr. McGlynn had not spoken for George or taken any part in the canvass, and Mr. George carried with him the first authoritative information that the archbishop could receive, that it was Dr. McGlynn's intention to take part in the canvass. Yet so eager was the archbishop to suspend the doctor that he had actually, in advance of any such notice, called his council together to act in the matter, using the four-years' old letters from Cardinal Simeoni to Cardinal McCloskey concerning the Irish land league speeches as his authority. Here it is clear that the archbishop sought to suspend Dr. McGlynn for merely believing in the land doctrine, and in advance of any renewed public advocacy of it.

The actual suspension of Dr. McGlynn, on Oct. 2d, was for his disobedience to the Archbishop's command issued to him and to several other priests not to attend the Chickering hall ratification meeting on Oct. 1st. That suspension was for two weeks. It was respected by Dr. McGlynn, and at the end of that time he resumed his priestly functions.

Sixth—His next suspension was attributed to two offences, one contradicting the pope's declaration, the other declaring that private ownership in land is unjust. Dr. McGlynn disavowed any thought of contradicting the pope, and Archbishop Corrigan tacitly accepted the disavowal, but the prelate publicly declared that because "he never withdrew the main statement that private ownership in land is unjust " Dr. McGlynn was suspended for the remainder of the year.

Seventh—When the first telegram came summoning Dr. McGlynn to Rome he did not refuse to obey it, but truthfully declared that owing to his illness he was unable to go at once. While insuperable obstacles to obeying the order still existed a second dispatch came from Cardinal Simeoni, ordering Dr. McGlynn not only to come to Rome, but, before doing so, to condemn in writing the doctrines to which he has given utterance in public meetings, or which have been attributed to him in the press. This order remained unrecalled, and a necessary part of all subsequent orders up to the time of the excommunication; and it was thenceforward absolutely useless for Dr. McGlynn to go to Rome without previously recanting the truth. Under the circumstances, it is the very height of mendacious impudence for a man as familiar with the facts as Monsignor Preston to tell the public that Dr. McGlynn was not summoned to Rome because of any expression of opinion.

There is no possible escape from the evidence showing that an American Catholic priest, born in the city of New York, orthodox in belief, blameless in life, and of acknowledged ability and popularity, has been excommunicated by the Roman machine because he would not allow his archbishop to dictate his opinions and control his acts in American politics. Neither is there any doubt that the secular and Protestant religious press, as a whole, and the Protestant clergy, as a body, have lent their sanction to this proceeding and rushed unasked to the vindication and support of the papal claim of a right to interfere in American politics.

The cause of this remarkable exhibition is not difficult to find. Any one who has watched the long struggle between Bismarck and the pope in the new German empire will see the cause at a glance. Professor John Burgess, in an article in the current number of the Political Science Quarterly, in discussing the causes of Bismarck's final and humiliating surrender, says:

“But the government, especially the president of the ministry, Prince Bismarck, had now become fully possessed with the idea that the liberal, progressive and radical elements in German politics could no longer be relied upon for loyalty and patriotism and were resolved upon union with the conservative elements.”

In other words, Bismarck, having determined in his own mind that a monstrous and burdensome military despotism is essential to the maintenance of royal and aristocratic government in a united German empire, deliberately courted an alliance with the pope for effecting such a union of all kinds of arbitrary, autocratic power as would render the struggles of liberal Germans for greater liberty and for partial disarmament futile. Precisely the same motive has brought about the tacit understanding between the saviors of society, the press, the Protestant clergy and the Catholic ecclesiastic machine in New York. Themselves ignorant of the principles and purposes of the great political and labor movement, and unwilling to study or consider it, they fear to trust to a free debate before the great tribunal of the people and seek any alliance, however unnatural, that may be offered to them to resist the growth of a popular movement that they distrust and fear. It is needless to say that this huddling together of the alarmed and ignorant "classes" is gratifying though unintentional tribute to the strength of the new movement on the one hand and on the other a most disgraceful confession of the loss of the old-time American spirit of independence among a considerable number of our people.

Though such an exhibition of cowardice and want of faith in the people is humiliating to every American, it is by no means prejudicial to the prospects of the new party, looking at it merely from a partisan standpoint. The great heart of the American people still beats true to liberty and independence, and it will never injure any party to have it know that it stands alone in resenting and resisting foreign dictation in our politics. The old know nothing party, with considerable success, appealed to this sentiment long ago, but it was a party secret in its methods, narrow in its aims and representing hatred and prejudice rather than principle. This new party has gathered around a great principle. It has no prejudice against foreigners and no hatred toward the Catholic church. It believes in absolute freedom of conscience, and seeks to impose no restraints on religious convictions. It proposes not to interfere with the faith of our Catholic fellow citizens, but rather to rescue them from the tyranny of a machine which thousands of Catholic priests and lay men regard as well nigh unbearable. The new party has no quarrel with religion and, on the contrary welcomes the most devout priests

and preachers to its platform and cheers their most impassioned appeals to men to imitate the life and character of Christ. Such a party is equipped as no other ever has been to lead a new crusade to rescue the cross of Christ from the more than barbarian hands of a political ring that is using it as an instrument of political tyranny and as the means to gratify lust and greed. This new party is the first that in principle, attitude and leadership ever was in a position to attack the abuses of power by the Roman machine with the full concurrence of thousands of sincere and devout Catholics. If it must, then, stand alone as the champion of American liberty against all foreign aggression, papal or otherwise, it surely enters the field well equipped for the conflict.

But will it stand alone? That is a question that concerns the old parties more than it concerns the new one. The crowds that defied the terrible heat in the two principal cities on this continent on last Sunday evening to applaud every utterance in support either of Dr. McGlynn or of American freedom showed on which side the natural enthusiasm of the human heart is enlisted. Take, too, the pulpit utterances on that same Sunday. Read the ringing words of the venerable Dr. King of the Methodist church, lauding the courage and piety of Dr. McGlynn and glorying in his courage and patriotism; read Dr. De Costa's thoughtful words in the Episcopal church of St. John the Evangelist, rebuking the great majority of preachers for obeying capital rather than God in this matter, and contrast them with the utterances on the same day by two Baptist preachers, one in Brooklyn and the other in New York, who falsely or stupidly, as the case may be, insisted that Dr. McGlynn's suspension and excommunication were justifiable acts of mere church discipline. Can any one imagine the sermons of the latter appealing to any sentiments higher than narrow sectarianism or mammon worship? Can any one, on the other hand, imagine a generous or patriotic man listening to Dr. De Costa or Dr. King without feeling a glow of warmth and sympathy? In the long run, the people will flock to hear such preachers as these, and once again and in this materialistic age, as Mr. Pentecost puts it, Christian preaching will successfully meet the old time test, which is that the common people hear it gladly.

But the common people rule in America. If the old parties persist in ignoring the universal sentiment among such people against anything like foreign interference in American politics, so much the worse for the old parties and so much the better for the new. Pious members of the latter are already persuaded that it is providentially led. Its less devout members express amazement at its good luck. Whether it be providence or luck, certainly nothing could be more fortunate for the new party than that its confused and stupid opponents should thus abandon to it the sole defense of the great principle of American independence from foreign dictation. The people who enter it through that door will study with sympathetic interest and eager attention the doctrine that Protestant monopolists and boodlers

so hate, that, like Prince Bismarck, they welcome the power of the pope in suppressing it, and the result may be a growth so rapid that the expected success of 1892 will even be realized in 1888. However it may be with individuals, the new party can certainly thank God for the enemies it has made. Their cowardice, stupidity and ignorance have done more for the good cause than could have otherwise been accomplished by ten years of advocacy not thus aided. We have much cause to love our enemies, and to pray for those who have despitefully used us, and I am almost tempted to wish long life, and continuance of their present temper, to Pope Leo XIII, Cardinal Simeoni, Archbishop Corrigan, Monsignor Preston, Joe O'Donoghue and Dick Croker, since they have taught me the Christian virtue of suffering fools gladly—seeing how useful they are.