

DR. M'GLYNN MAKES REPLY

HE CANNOT COMPLY WITH THE
POPE'S CONDITIONS, HE SAYS.

HE WILL CONTINUE TO EXPOUND HIS
DOCTRINES—HE REGRETS THAT HE
CALLED ARCHBISHOP CORRIGAN THE
“LITTLE BISHOP.”

Cooper Union held a large and demonstrative audience last night, when Dr. McGlynn spoke on “The Latest Ultimatum from Rome.” If there were any in the audience who expected the unfrocked priest to express repentance for what he had said and done in the past they were disappointed, as the only thing for which he expressed regret was that he had described Archbishop Corrigan as the “Little Bishop,” for which speech, he said, he was sorry.

After an anti-poverty song had been sung by chorus the doctor said that a collection was next in order, which he explained was for the benefit of the Anti-Poverty Society, which had a propaganda of its own—a statement which was greeted with tremendous applause. The speaker prefaced his remarks in reply to the Pope's ultimatum by the statement that his utterances had often been misinterpreted. He had reduced this reply to writing. He read it as follows:

“As Archbishop Corrigan has recently caused to be published an account of a communication from the Propaganda in Rome concerning my case, it is due to myself, to my friends, and to the public that I should make public answer.

“The Roman authorities, we are told, are still disposed to use mercy, but that even any hearing of the case shall be granted only on the conditions:

“First—That I myself make the request and state my grievance.

“Second—That I publicly condemn all that I have said or done of an insulting character as against the Archbishop and as against the Holy See.

“Third—That I be ready to abide by the orders and submit to the judgment of the Apostolic See.

“Fourth—That I promise to abstain from any public utterance or assistance at any meeting on the matter under consideration.

“The penalties from which I might hope to be relieved by complying with these conditions are, first, suspension from my ministry; second, excommunication.

“Earnestly as I should wish to exercise my ministry and frequently to receive the sacraments, it is not possible for me to bring about so much desired a consummation by complying with the above-mentioned conditions. I was suspended from my ministry and from the administration of the church, of which I was pastor, by Archbishop Corrigan, because, as he alleged, of my insulting language against the Pope in an interview as reported in the New-York Tribune, in which report there was nothing about the Pope, nor even the remotest allusion to him or his teachings, but justice rather than charity was asserted to be the remedy for the poverty of the masses.

“I justified myself against the Archbishop's extraordinary charge in a letter to the Tribune, of which the Archbishop publicly stated that if I had withdrawn what he calls the main statement of the Tribune report ‘no censure would remain.’ This main statement is described by the Archbishop as a ‘declaration that the true and only remedy for social evils lay in the abolition of private ownership of land and in the restitution to all men of those rights in the soil that are now unjustly monopolized by a few. The phrase ‘no censure would remain’ means, in ecclesiastical language, that the suspension would have been removed. All this shows plainly that I was suspended, and my suspension continued because I taught and failed to retract the economic doctrines that the natural bounties belong to the community and their rental value should be taxed into the public treasury.

“Shortly after my suspension a cable dispatch from Cardinal Simeoni of the Propaganda ordered me to proceed to Rome forthwith, and six weeks later, on Jan. 16, 1887, a second cable dispatch to the Archbishop from Cardinal Simeoni said: ‘Give orders to have Dr. McGlynn again invited to proceed to Rome, and also 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. Should he disobey, use your own authority in dealing with him.’

“In the May following there came a written statement from Cardinal Simeoni that I must report in Rome within forty days of the receipt of the order or be *ipso facto* excommunicated. I could not obey the order to retract; I would not obey the order to go to Rome, because I denied their right, under the circumstances, to order me to go, and besides, I well knew that if I should go, my weak compliance, while injuring a good cause, would not have been sufficient to prevent my excommunication, the threat of which they surely would have renewed if I failed to comply with conditions of retractions and abject apologies and promises of silence in the future—conditions, compliance with which my conscience would absolutely forbid. I did not go to Rome, and I was excommunicated in July, 1887.

“Kind clerical friends wrote frequently and at great length about my case to Cardinal Simeoni, with little or no encouragement from me beyond my mere consent that they might say that if the injustice done me were undone to the extent of removing the excommunication and suspension, and I were invited to Rome for consultation, I would go. One of these clerical friends was a Bishop. Cardinal Simeoni treated their communications with such contempt that for many months he did not even condescend to barely acknowledge the receipt of their communication. Whereupon, in February, 1888, I sent the following cable dispatch to Cardinal Simeoni: “I will not go to Rome. I will not condemn the doctrine 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.”

“The receipt of this cablegram shamed or frightened Cardinal Simeoni into sending a very long letter to the friendly Bishop. This letter, more than three years old, is evidently the letter of which Archbishop Corrigan speaks in his recent newspaper utterances. The friendly prelate communicated the contents of the letter to me, and sent to Cardinal Simeoni my remarks and comments thereupon. To these I have received no answer till the publication of Archbishop Corrigan's ultimatum a few days ago.

“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. While 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 as such orders and such 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 economic 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 a letter which I wrote to Archbishop Corrigan, as follows:

NEW-YORK, April 8, 1890.

Most Rev. Archbishop:

I have received your letter from Jerusalem, in which you tell me that you were impelled to pour out your whole soul in supplications 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.

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 the grace of God, and that when, a few weeks ago, I was very near to death from 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 Reverend Archbishop, very respectfully, EDWARD M'GLYNN.

The address that followed was an amplification of the foregoing, interspersed at intervals with an arraignment of the Pope and his followers. In closing, Dr. McGlynn said that he would lecture next Sunday on the recent encyclical letter of the Pope and would endeavor to expose its fallacies.