THE RESPONSE OF THE PERIODICAL PRESS IN THE UNITED STATES TO THE INTERVENTION OF POPE LEO XIII (1878-1903) INTO MAJOR EPISODES OF AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORY

Thesis for the Degree of Ph. D.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
SAMUEL JOSEPH THOMAS

1971

This is to certify that the

thesis entitled
THE RESPONSE OF THE PERIODICAL PRESS IN THE UNITED STATES TO THE INTERVENTION OF POPE LEO XIII (1878-1903) INTO MAJOR EPISODES OF AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORY

presented by

Samuel Joseph Thomas

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph. D. degree in History

Douglas T. Miller
Major professor

Date 10-20-71

O-7639

THE RE
UNIT
LEO

In th

he nineteen

ni secular c

ostile manne

his attitud

tage of the

o XIII. O

hat relatio

Duri

XIII's, Amer

Catholic per

intervention

Roman Cathol

pontificate

hidden perio

establishmen

ABSTRACT

THE RESPONSE OF THE PERIODICAL PRESS IN THE UNITED STATES TO THE INTERVENTION OF POPE LEO XIII (1878-1903) INTO MAJOR EPISODES OF AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORY

By

Samuel J. Thomas

In the United States during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the various media of Protestant and secular opinion reacted in a suspicious and sometimes hostile manner to the Catholic Church in their midst. This attitude was related, in varying degrees, to their image of the Roman papacy and its current occupant, Leo XIII. One of the important media which reflected that relationship was the American periodical press.

During the 1880's, but especially during the 1890's, American periodicals of Protestant, secular, and Catholic persuasion paid considerable attention to the intervention of Pope Leo XIII into major episodes of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States; for Leo's pontificate coincided with the most important and crisis-ridden period of the American Church's history since the establishment of a hierarchy in 1789.

Many

ournals exp

e XIII were

ritual perce

erican life

reading, an

he perceptio

he periodic

similar jour

e XIII's a

ch which i

ievements i

The

Baricanize

o varying d

ditions prev

also in the

he nineteen

More

secular and

versions an

style of pap

served durin

Catholic per

ore conserv

intervention

principles a

Many of the opinions and attitudes which the journals expressed or implied in their response to Leo XIII were derived from what each category of periodical perceived as the actual or desirable ideals of American life. Exceptions to this statement notwithstanding, and despite sometimes glaring differences in the perception of actual or desirable American ideals, the periodical press, especially the Protestant and secular journals, showed a tendency to Americanize Pope Leo XIII's acts of intervention, both in the interest with which it responded to his interventions and in the judgements it made of them.

The extent to which the periodical press did Americanize the pope's acts of intervention reflected, to varying degrees, not only ideas, problems, and conditions prevelant in the American Catholic Church, but also in the nation generally during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Moreover, on more than one occasion, leading secular and Protestant journals perceived in Leo's interventions an indication of a different and more modern style of papal leadership than that which they had perceived during the pontificate of his predecessor, Pius IX. Catholic periodicals, on the other hand, especially the more conservative ones, tended to see in Leo's acts of intervention the utilization of essentially the same principles as those of Pope Pius IX.

During the early 1890's, the leading Protestant (and, to a much lesser extent, some important secular) journals tended to interpret Leo's acts of intervention into American Church affairs as signs of a papal desire to accommodate the Church to the modern world and, in particular, to accommodate the American Church to American democracy. However, during the last five years of the nineteenth century, these periodicals' image of Pope Leo XIII as spiritual ruler of the American Church declined because of papal acts of intervention which were interpreted as conservative and even reactionary.

On the whole, however, and despite the rather critical response of Protestant and secular periodicals to the last five years of Leo's intervention, these journals eulogized Pope Leo XIII as an improvement over his predecessor, if only by the more tactful and, at times, the more flexible way in which he ruled the Church, a fact which some of the journals believed had accounted for the improved relations between Protestant and Catholic Americans in the year of Leo's death, 1903.

THE RESPONSE OF THE PERIODICAL PRESS IN THE UNITED STATES TO THE INTERVENTION OF POPE LEO XIII (1878-1903) INTO MAJOR EPISODES OF AMERICAN CATHOLIC HISTORY

By

Samuel Joseph Thomas

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of History

1971

© Copyright by
SAMUEL JOSEPH THOMAS

1972

For

Paula and Michael

This
without the h
especially in
valuable guid
ast two and
fessors Madi
criticisms a
Spec
of the Unive
of Swarthmor
ersity of W
fessor Phili
their letter
which helped
ecture of th
I am
Microfilming
generous ass
am also grat
Library for

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the help and encouragement of many people. I am especially indebted to Professor Douglas Miller for his valuable guidance, patience, and encouragement over the past two and one-half years. I am also grateful to Professors Madison Kuhn and John Harrison for their valuable criticisms and encouragement.

Special thanks are due to Msgr. John Tracy Ellis of the University of San Francisco, Professor Robert Cross of Swarthmore College, Professor Edward Gargan of the University of Wisconsin, and to Rev. Thomas Blantz and Professor Philip Gleason of the University of Notre Dame for their letters of encouragement and for their suggestions which helped this writer to determine more precisely the nature of the study.

I am also indebted to Mr. Frank Clark, Director of Microfilming at the University of Notre Dame, for his generous assistance in providing resource materials. I am also grateful to the staff of the State of Michigan Library for allowing me access to their periodical

rks; to Mr.

rsity's inte

ouring resc

f the Univers

ne, the Univ

t. John's Se

holic Univ

r allowing

irectly or t

Thank

t the Depar

rsity, esp

Reeves, Ein

r their co

I al

heir faith

Mos

ella, to w

is dedicate

ave been e

stacks; to Mr. Walter Burinski of Michigan State University's interlibrary loan division for his aid in procuring resource materials; and to the library staffs of the University of Michigan, the University of Notre Dame, the University of Detroit, Detroit Public Library, St. John's Seminary of Brighton Massachusetts, the Catholic University of America, and St. Louis University for allowing me access to valuable periodicals either directly or through interlibrary loans.

Thanks are also due to several of my colleagues in the Department of Humanities at Michigan State University, especially Professors Charles Gliozzo, Richard Greaves, Einer Nisula, Jack Pollman, and William Schoenl for their constant moral support.

I also wish to thank my mother and father for their faith in me and for their constant encouragement.

Most of all, however, I wish to thank my wife, Paula, to whom, along with our son, Michael, this work is dedicated. Her faith and hope over the past six years have been exceeded only by her love.

INTRODUCTION

Chapter

I. THE AM

II. THE AM
DEATH
POPE J

III. THE PE
VENTIC

IV. THE PE
VENTIC

V. THE PE
VENTIC

VI. THE PE
VENTIA

VII. THE P
VENTI

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
INTRODUCTION		1
Chapter		
I.	THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, 1789-1878.	15
II.	THE AMERICAN PERIODICAL RESPONSE TO THE DEATH OF POPE PIUS IX AND THE ELECTION OF POPE LEO XIII	31
III.	THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: THE FIRST STAGE, 1884-1888.	58
IV.	THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: THE SECOND STAGE, 1889-1893	85
V.	THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: THE THIRD STAGE, 1893-1897.	118
VI.	THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: THE LAST STAGE, 1897-1903	150
VII.	THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: CONCLUSIONS.	180
BIBLIOGRAPHY		211

In th

ntury, the

nition react

n the Catho

lated, in

pacy and i

dia of Pro

nt relatio

Duri

nti-Catholi

ecular peri

ith such re

ttish reli

periodicals

n these phr

ecause of t

Sinc

nstitution

llowed with

It was very

INTRODUCTION

Nature, Scope, and Purpose

In the United States during the nineteenth century, the various media of Protestant and secular opinion reacted in a suspicious and often hostile manner to the Catholic Church in their midst. This attitude was related, in varying degrees, to their image of the Roman papacy and its current occupant. One of the important media of Protestant and secular opinion which reflected that relationship was the American periodical press.

During the generation before the Civil War, when anti-Catholic nativism reached its peak, Protestant and secular periodical articles and editorials were filled with such revealing phrases as "no-popery," "popish plot," "Romish religion," and "papal allegiance." Catholic periodicals responded defensively to the implications in these phrases, and often provoked further attacks because of the tactlessness of their responses.[1]

Since the Catholic Church was an international institution presided over by an authoritarian pontiff endowed with vast spiritual and temporal prerogatives, it was very difficult for Protestant and secular journals

n new the Amer

im what seemed

However,

nineteenth century,

nove to Protest

n Rome was in r

llegiance to th

Times. A class

nal loyalty wa

f Peoria, Illi

issue of The No

hat a loyal Ca

Spalding said,

> Catholics a
> ernment as
> worse and
> these are

Given

nd secular im

en Catholicis

study will be

More specifica

the primary pu

the American p

Pope Leo XIII

Church history

to view the American Catholic Church as an entity apart from what seemed to be the all-embracing arms of Rome.

However, throughout the remainder of the nineteenth century, Catholic journals persisted in trying to prove to Protestant America that spiritual allegiance to Rome was in no way incompatible with American Catholic allegiance to the constitutional ideals of the United States. A classic statement of American Catholic political loyalty was made by the liberal Bishop John Spalding of Peoria, Illinois in an article for the March, 1880 issue of The North American Review. Replying to a charge that a loyal Catholic could not be a loyal American, Spalding said,

> Catholics accept the principles of American government as they take their wives, for better or worse and until death. These are our honest and these are our heartfelt sentiments.[2]

Given this relationship between the Protestant and secular image of the papacy and their image of American Catholicism, part of the purpose of the present study will be to further explore that relationship. More specifically, as the title of the study indicates, the primary purpose will be to examine the response of the American periodical press to the intervention of Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) into major episodes of Catholic Church history in the United States.

The ti

m study will

me, Leo XII

eriod have l

holic hist

an any of h

d controver

Moreover, th

as also bee

eriod of po

nd America,

n the gener

The

t will con

intervention

he young a

affecting t

pattern of

he last q

scholars o

hose epis

Plenary C

he Knigh

'Cahensly

The title suggests three delimitations. First, the study will concentrate on the reign of a single pope, Leo XIII. He was chosen because scholars of the period have long regarded him as a key figure of modern Catholic history and because he intervened more frequently than any of his predecessors into the problems, affairs, and controversies of the American Catholic Church. Moreover, the particular era during which he reigned has also been widely regarded as a singularly important period of post-Tridentine Catholic history in both Europe and America, and as an especially significant period in the general histories of the old and new worlds.[3]

The second delimitation of the study is that it will concentrate on the American response to the intervention of Pope Leo XIII into major episodes of the young and growing American Church, specifically those affecting the Church's disciplinary organization, its pattern of growth, and its hierarchical leadership during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. As leading scholars of American Catholic history have indicated, those episodes revolved primarily around the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, the American Church and the Knights of Labor, the case of Father Edward McGlynn, "Cahenslyism," the question of public versus parochial

schools, the appointment of the first permanent Apostolic Delegate to the United States, and the alleged heresy of "Americanism."[4]

Rerum Novarum (On the Rights and Duties of Capital and Labor, May 15, 1891), the document most commonly associated with Pope Leo XIII, was addressed to the universal Catholic Church, and did not constitute an intervention into any of the aforementioned issues related to the American Church. As Chapter IV will note, the document did serve to enhance Leo's image in the eyes of two leading Protestant journals at a time when those journals were interpreting Leo's intervention in the American Church as a sign of a papal desire to accommodate the Church with the age and, in particular, to accommodate the American Church with American democracy. However, as Chapters V and VI will indicate, despite Rerum Novarum and despite those acts of intervention which had favorably influenced a portion of Protestant American opinion, Leo's intervention in American Catholic Church affairs during the last five years of the nineteenth century was to convince leading Protestant as well as other important non-Catholic journals that the pope was moving toward the camp of Church's conservative and reactionary forces.

The third delimitation indicated in the title of this study is that it will utilize one major source of American opinion, the periodical press, that is, popular and scholarly magazines and journals. The exclusive use of this source of public communication does not imply a disparagement of the others (books, pamphlets, newspapers, and lectures). It is rather that since a complete picture of the articulate American response to Leo XIII's intervention into major controversies of the Catholic Church in the United States depends on a systematic study of each of these valuable sources, an examination of the periodical press was deemed a good focal point for such a study. Its increasingly important status during the period under consideration, and the fact that its columns were often filled with the opinions of people who also contributed significantly to the other sources of public communication made it an especially valuable source of late nineteenth-century American thought.

During the post-Civil War generation, the periodical press developed into an influential molding and reflecting force of both scholarly and popular public opinion in the United States. Its importance as an index of American social, intellectual, religious, and political development was indicated by F. L. Mott in

his classic multivolume History of American Magazines:

> Magazines after 1865 came to reflect more directly than ever before the current thought of the country not only in literature and the arts but in politics, economics, and sociology.[5]

Although this statement must be understood as applying chiefly to the most articulate and educated segment of the American community, and therefore to a small but influential group, another of Mott's remarks may be taken with less qualification:

> . . . of all the agencies of popular information, none experienced a more spectacular enlargement and increase in effectiveness than magazines.[6]

Indeed, the total number of periodicals increased from 700 in 1865 to over 6,000 in 1905. Actually, over 17,000 periodicals were published during this time, but more than half did not survive or were merged into more successful publications. Also, of those that did survive, cheaper prices and a more appealing style were important factors behind their circulation growth from thousands in 1865 to millions in 1905.[7]

Popular and scholarly religious periodicals, for example, increased from 650 in 1865 to over 1,000 in 1905 and revealed a consciously didactic aim. Mott supported this conclusion in his History when he remarked that the writers and editors of

religious periodicals sounded more like teachers and prophets than like journalists.[8]

Some of the better known editors whose journals will be utilized to varying degrees in the course of this study confirmed the soundness of Mott's conclusion: Henry Ward Beecher and Lyman Abbott of The Christian Union, H. C. Bowen of The Independent, Isaac Hecker of The Catholic World, P. V. Hickey and J. Talbot Smith of The Catholic Review. The same didactic and prophetic tone was found to be evident in secular periodicals also, some of whose better known editors were: E. L. Godkin and W. P. Garrison of The Nation, B. O. Flower of The Arena, R. W. Glider of The Century, A. T. Rice of The North American Review, G. W. Curtis and H. M. Alden of Harper's, W. H. Page of The Forum, J. G. Holland of Scribner's, and W. D. Howells of the Atlantic Monthly. These editors, whether of religious or of secular periodicals, were supported by an often equally impressive list of contributors who, after 1870, were writing with a decreasing amount of anonymity.

Thus, a major supposition of this study was that the American periodical press represented an important index of articulate American opinion, and, as such,

was a valid focal point for the study of one facet of America's response to Pope Leo XIII.

In the course of researching this study, many of the periodicals for each major category (that is, Protestant, secular, and Catholic) were found to be mutually repetitive and therefore, mutually supportive. The text of this study, then, will utilize primarily those periodicals which research has deemed as particularly important within each category. Supporting materials from the same or other journals will be cited chiefly in the footnotes. "Maverick" journals which were not necessarily representative of the broader response, but, which contributed insights that enhanced overall understanding, will, of course, be commented upon in the text.

The following periodicals were found to be especially helpful to one or more aspects of the overall study, and will be cited in the footnotes in their abbreviated forms:

CATHOLIC-

The Catholic Review (CR), New York, 1872-1898.

The Catholic World (CW), New York, 1865-present.

The American Catholic Quarterly Review (ACQR), Philadelphia, 1876-1924.

The West

The Cash

n C., I

The Glob

herican

present.

MONTHLY

The Chri

The Inde

The Chris

ew Day

eformed

MONTHLY-

The Natio

The North

resent.

armer's

The Forum

ournals

ocals w

study, se

ales eit

The Western Watchman (WW), St. Louis, 1865-1934.

The Catholic University Bulletin (TCUB), Washington, D. C., 1895-present.

The Globe (TG), Philadelphia, New York, 1889-1905.

American Ecclesiastical Review (AER), New York, 1889-present.

PROTESTANT-

The Christian Union (CU), New York, 1870-1935.

The Independent (TI), New York, 1848-1928.

The Christian Advocate (CA), New York, 1826-present.

Our Day (OD), Springfield, Ohio, 1888-1900.

Reformed Church Review (RCR), Philadelphia, 1895-1926.

SECULAR-

The Nation (TN), New York, 1865-present.

The North American Review (NAR), Boston, New York, 1815-present.

Harper's Weekly (HW), New York, 1857-1916.

The Forum (TF), New York, 1886-1930.

The particular value of the aforementioned journals notwithstanding, more than one hundred periodicals were thoroughly researched in the course of the study, several of which will be mentioned in supportive roles either in the text or in the footnotes.

During the period of research, general questions were formulated which would enable the writer to elicit from the periodicals the most important aspects of their response to Leo XIII, and which would give a sense of unity to the study by helping the writer to discover the major themes from the mass of primary source material. Following are the general answers that were gleaned from the questions posed, answers which form the bases for the major conclusions of this study, and which will be elaborated upon and more precisely qualified in the concluding chapter.

During the 1880's, but especially during the 1890's, American periodicals of Protestant, secular, and Catholic persuasion paid considerable attention to the intervention of Pope Leo XIII into major episodes of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States; for Leo's pontificate coincided with the most important and crisis-ridden period of the American Church's history since the establishment of a hierarchy in 1789.

Many of the opinions and attitudes which the journals expressed or implied in their response to Leo XIII were derived from what each category of periodical perceived as the actual or the most desirable ideals of American life. Exceptions to this statement notwithstanding, and despite sometimes glaring differences in

the perception of actual or desirable American ideals, the periodical press showed a tendency to Americanize Pope Leo XIII's acts of intervention, both in the interest with which it responded to his interventions, and in the judgments it made of them. The extent to which the periodical press did exhibit this tendency reflected, on several occasions and to varying degrees, not only ideas, problems, and conditions prevelant in the American Catholic Church, but also in the nation generally during the last quarter of the nineteenth century.

Moreover, on more than one occasion, leading secular and Protestant journals, with the exception of a minority of more or less consistently anti-Catholic journals, perceived in Leo's interventions an indication of a different and more modern style of Catholic leadership than that which they had perceived during the pontificate of his predecessor, Pope Pius IX. Catholic periodicals, on the other hand, especially the more conservative ones, tended to see in Leo's acts of intervention the utilization of essentially the same principles as those of Pius IX.

Finally, during the early 1890's, the leading Protestant (and to a much lesser extent, some important secular) journals tended to interpret Leo's acts of

nervention into

n a sign of a pa

mize the growi

ive years of the

mage of Pope Leo

hurch declined t

which were interp

ordinary.

On the w

pontificate, lea

ologized Leo XI

ologized Pope P

ype of the Know

pparent in the

ecular journals

than in 1878, w

intervention into major episodes of the American Church as a sign of a papal desire to Americanize and democratize the growing Church. However, during the last five years of the nineteenth century, these periodicals' image of Pope Leo XIII as spiritual ruler of the American Church declined because of papal acts of intervention which were interpreted as conservative and even reactionary.

On the whole, however, by the end of Leo's pontificate, leading Protestant and secular journals eulogized Leo XIII more favorably than they had eulogized Pope Pius IX. The pope-as-bogeyman stereotype of the Know Nothing era was considerably less apparent in the columns of leading Protestant and secular journals in 1903, the year of Leo XIII's death, than in 1878, when Pope Pius IX ended his long reign.

FOOTNOTES--INTRODUCTION

[1]This feature of anti-Catholicism was revealed in R. A. Billington, The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of Nativism (Claucester: Peter Smith, 1938).

[2]Bishop John L. Spalding, "Mr. Froude's Historical Method," NAR, CXXX (March, 1880), 297-98.

[3]Numerous works have marked this period and pontiff as singularly important in Catholic history. A European context is provided in Carlton J. H. Hayes, A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900 (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1941); Kenneth S. Latourette, Christianity in a Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1958-1962); and Joseph N. Moody, ed., Church and Society: Catholic Social and Political Thought and Movement, 1789-1950 (New York: Arts, Inc., 1953). An American context is provided in Aaron Abell, American Catholicism and Social Action: A Search for Social Justice, 1865-1950 (New York: Hanover House, 1960); Robert D. Cross, The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958); and Rev. Thomas McAvoy, The Great Crisis in American Catholic History, 1895-1900 (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1957).

[4]Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism; McAvoy, Great Crisis; Rev. Thomas McAvoy, A History of the Catholic Church in the United States (Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1969); Rt. Rev. John Tracy Ellis, American Catholicism (2nd ed. rev.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969).

[5]F. L. Mott, A History of American Magazines (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), III, 280.

[6]Ibid., IV, 2.

[7]Ibid., III, 63-79.

[8]Ibid., III, 15-24; IV, 7-14, 28.

[9]The suggestions of Professor Douglas Miller; and the letters of the Rt. Rev. John Tracy Ellis of the University of San Francisco; Professor Robert Cross, President of Swarthmore College; Rev. Thomas Blantz of the University of Notre Dame; Professor Phillip Gleason, also of Notre Dame; and Professor Edward Gargan of the University of Wisconsin were very helpful in aiding this writer to determine the nature and scope of this study.

CHAPTER I

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC CHURCH, 1789-1878

Since the primary purpose of this study is to examine the American periodical response to Leo XIII's acts of intervention into major episodes of the Catholic Church in the United States, this chapter will briefly sketch the history of that Church whose official organization was already ninety years old when Leo was elected pope in 1878. The sketch will concentrate on that ninety year period, and especially on those events whose later development occasioned Leo's intervention and a corresponding response by the periodical press.

The pattern of Catholic life in the United States was not established by the efforts of French or Spanish missionaries and explorers of the colonial period, but by the minority of largely disfranchised and sometimes overtly persecuted Catholics of English, Irish, and German descent who settled along the Atlantic seaboard during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[1]

Maryland, in particular, the home of half of the estimated 30 to 35,000 Catholics in the United States by 1789, was the location where the organizational roots of the American Catholic Church were first planted.[2] It was here too as well as in the three other colonies with Catholic communities that the defensive character of American Catholicism took strong root.[3]

American Catholics aided their crusade for acceptance by supporting the American Revolution in proportionately the same numbers as the non-Catholic population of Colonial America. However, after the initial glory of victory subsided, the Catholic populace and especially the institution it represented endured as suspect in the eyes of the majority for decades afterwards.[4]

During the years immediately following the Revolution, the pope became convinced that the establishment of an American hierarchy was necessary, both to sustain the Catholic population in the face of prejudice, and to direct the maturation of the young Church so as to insure its continued growth. Thus, in 1789, at the bequest of his twenty-three fellow priests, Father John Carroll, superior of American priests and scion of the wealthy and respected Carroll family of Maryland, accepted

his confirmation by the pope as the first American Catholic bishop. From Baltimore, the location of the first diocesan see, Bishop Carroll and his successors guided the expansion and development of the institutional Catholic Church across the new nation.[5]

A formal hierarchical structure added a strong element of authoritarianism to the character of American Catholicism, but it did not usher in the millennium. Many problems occurred between 1789 and 1878. Some were anticipated and dealt with fairly successfully. Other problems were not solved, so that at times the very foundation of the American Church was shaken.

For example, the Church's organizational expansion was rapid, and, in terms of meeting the external religious and psychological needs of the nation's growing urban Catholic population, it was relatively successful. By 1835, almost every major city had its contingency of churches, schools, convents, and monastaries. By 1850, almost every major city was a diocesan see with its own bishop and staff of clerical administrators.[6]

Successful organizational growth, however, was often accompanied by serious internal problems of control. One such problem centered around the issue of lay trusteeism--the proclaimed right of the layman to

administer church property, including lay control over church revenues. Because most states, during the early national period, did not allow bishops to hold property, the problem of lay versus clerical control occasioned numerous conflicts between the clergy and their parisheners. However, by 1850, the problem had greatly subsided, and by 1860, most states allowed the bishops to hold property on the Church's behalf. This reestablishment of hierarchical and clerical control foreshadowed the generally subservient role of the laity for the remainder of the century, a fact that contributed to some of the periodical press's criticism of the Church as authoritarian and controlled by the pope and his clerical slaves in the United States.[7]

Later, during the reign of Leo XIII, the question of the Church's authoritarian structure and of the dominance of the pope and his hierarchs over the lives of both the priests and the laity in the United States would occasion periodical comments critical of Leo's intervention into the internal disciplinary affairs of the American Church, and of his alleged control of Catholic political life.

The source of another problem for the Church in the generation prior to the Civil War was the concern that its members be properly educated not only

in letters, but also in Catholic doctrine and discipline. During the 1840's and 1850's, when the common school was becoming free and public, the Catholic Church, unlike most other denominations, persisted in multiplying its own schools and demanding state aid.[8]

Although the Church never succeeded in attracting more than half of its children to parochial schools (a figure which remained constant during the remainder of the century), Church authorities denounced public schools, with some justification, as dangerous to Catholic faith and morals. Such a defensive and exclusivist stance, compounded by Church demands for public funds, helped to rekindle the embers of anti-Catholic nativism in the 1840's and 1850's.[9]

During the 1880's and early 1890's, the school question would reach a peak of intensity, and Leo's interventions in attempting to settle it would be followed with keen interest by the periodical press.

The most serious problem confronting the American Church between 1789 and 1878, was the difficulty encountered in trying to assimilate the more than 3,000,000 Catholic immigrants who arrived in the United States during that time. Following is a table which shows the importance of the Catholic immigrant as a factor in the growth of the American Catholic population:[10]

Decade	Catholic Population	Catholic Immigration During Preceeding Decade
1790	35,000	
1820	195,000	77,000
1830	318,000	54,000
1840	663,000	240,000
1850	1,606,000	700,000
1860	3,103,000	985,000
1870	4,504,000	741,000
1880	6,259,000	604,000

This large contingent, chiefly from Ireland and Germany, included only a small percentage of educated or skilled individuals, many of whom were clergy or nuns. The majority of Catholic immigrants, especially among the Irish, were unskilled, uneducated, and poor; and most of these people crowded into the emerging industrial cities of the East and Middle West. Later immigration would merely confirm the urban-immigrant nature of American Catholicism.[11]

A myriad of internal and external problems confronted the American Church because of the foreign shadow cast over it. The financially poor and generally unskilled condition of the Catholic immigrant, and the opposition of some bishops to any extensive westward movement, contributed to the formation of Catholic ghettoes in the major industrial cities of the United States. These ghettoes, which were often segregated according to nationality, became havens of

psychological security where the immigrant could perpetuate his old world ways in the midst of a seemingly hostile Protestant environment.[12]

With certain exceptions, these ghettoes hindered the Americanization of the immigrant, and added to the defensive, sectarian character of American Catholicism. Where assimilation did take place, it was chiefly among the Irish. Many of these immigrants and their children rose to positions of prominence in the Church. Indeed, by 1850, much to the distress of other nationality groups, the Irish clergy began their long monopoly of the American Catholic hierarchy.[13] This fact was later to become another source of Leo XIII's intervention in the American Church, and his attempts to settle the problem were to draw generally favorable comments from the periodical press.

Church authorities, in the decades before the pontificate of Leo XIII, tried to accomodate the successive waves of immigrants so as to preserve their faith and unify them as sons and daughters of the Church. The multiplication of parochial schools, the expansion of benevolent societies and instititions, and the promotion of a strong Catholic press were the principle means of helping the Catholic immigrant. Although these means were successful in meeting many

of the material and psychological needs of the new arrivals, ultimately, these aids tended to turn the Catholic community inward, and further isolated it from Protestant and secular America. This, in turn, helped to strengthen the mutual suspicions already existing between Protestants and Catholics, and thus contributed to the often intense and fairly widespread Protestant crusade against American Catholicism between 1830 and 1860.[14] Later, during the 1880's and especially the 1890's, another wave of anti-Catholic sentiment would provide an additional dimension to the periodical response to Pope Leo XIII's acts of intervention.

Anti-Catholic prejudice in the United States, whose roots were found in sixteenth-century England, assumed its most virulant form during the two decades prior to the Civil War. This nativist agitation made often vicious attacks on Catholic doctrines and disciplines, and seriously questioned the loyalty of Catholics as citizens. While the Catholic press expanded and lashed out at the attackers, ultimately Catholics tended to isolate themselves more than ever from the mainstream of American thought and culture, and intensified their sensitivity "concerning the attitudes of outsiders toward their affairs."[15]

Nativist persecution was also partly to blame for the dearth in American Catholic intellectual life during the nineteenth century. Since the articulate segment of the Catholic population felt compelled to be on the defensive, they developed little besides a voluminous body of apologetic literature, much of which was as vindictive as the attacks it was meant to repel.[16] This apologetic approach would also characterize Catholic periodicals during the era of Leo XIII.

During the Civil War (when American Catholics took sides, but did not split organizationally) and Reconstruction, anti-Catholic and other forms of nativism subsided. Anti-Catholic prejudice did rear its head on several occasions during this period, but it never acquired anything like the virulence of the pre-Civil War years. Among the factors limiting the influence of such prejudice was the great demand for immigrant labor to satisfy the needs of business leaders eager to exploit the economic opportunities of the period.[17]

The Catholic immigrant made up a considerable portion of the unskilled labor force during the post-war years. His difficulties, and those of many other laborers victimized by the masters of capital, were part of a major problem that loomed ever larger after 1865. This problem may be summed up in one phrase, the social question.

Social awareness within the American Catholic Church before 1880, was geared almost entirely to its own membership. It took the depression of the mid-seventies, the episode of the Molly McGuires, and the great rail strike of 1877 to awaken the Catholic periodical press to the fact that the social question needed answering on behalf of the whole working class, Catholic or otherwise. However, even by this time, with certain exceptions, American Catholic social thought had not developed beyond the belief that it was man's selfishness alone that perpetrated social ills. The solution was even more simplistic: charitable works must be increased, and above all, men must return to the Catholic Church and its teachings. Few writers before 1880 perceived the complexities of both the problem and its solution.[18] Later, during the 1880's and early 1890's, Pope Leo XIII would give his stamp of approval to a more sophisticated approach to the social question, a fact widely acknowledged, especially by Catholic periodicals.

Problems notwithstanding, by 1878, the year of Pope Pius IX's death and Pope Leo XIII's election, the Catholic Church in the United States boasted membership of over 6,000,000, including 1 cardinal, 12 archbishops, 51 bishops, 5,000 priests, and several hundred schools spread over 53 dioceses. The majority of these Catholics were of non-English descent, and although

numerically predominant in only a few sections of the nation, Catholics as a whole comprised the largest single religious denomination in the United States.[19]

The relationship between Rome and American Catholic officialdom was rather meager before 1878. No papal delegate resided in the United States, and communication between the pope and the American Church was infrequent. However, a change was in the air. During the late 1870's, the pope exhorted the Roman Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, the missionary arm of the Church in charge of overseeing American Catholic developments, to pay closer attention to the rapidly growing young Church.[20]

Closer scrutiny by Rome during the late 1870's eventually resulted in the papal decision to impose formal canonical organization and discipline upon the American Church in 1884. This decision, which will be discussed later in connection with the periodical response, was a move intended to standardize the American Church with its European counterpart, thereby foreshadowing more direct papal control.[21]

At the same time that the decision for canonical organization was being considered by the pope, the question of rapid or gradual Americanization of the vast immigrant Catholic population was raised by the American

hierarchy.[22] In fact, these two developments, the decision for canonical organization and the question of Americanization, were to have far reaching effects on the future development of the American Catholic Church, and were to have a considerable effect on the response of the periodical press to the interventions of Pope Leo XIII.

A feature article in the December, 1879 issue of The North American Review dramatized Protestant alarm at the prospect of more complete papal control over the American Church. The article, "Romanism and the Irish Race," by English Protestant historian J. Anthony Froude, revealed an attitude which seemed to be derived more from the image projected by Pope Pius IX (1846-1878) than from his recently elected successor, Pope Leo XIII.

Froude's amazement at the size of the American Catholic community, especially its Irish contingent, helped to strengthen his belief that the pope was preparing to reinforce his control over the American Church. He said that if Catholics ever assumed a majority position in America, a clerically dominated theocracy would replace the constitution and its bill of rights.[23]

The author supported his argument that Romanism was incompatible with republican institutions by referring to Pope Pius IX's Syllabus of Errors (1864), and cited several passages to show that the pope was against

the principles of American government. He said that since American Catholics, and particularly the lay and clerical Irish, were puppets of Rome, American democracy was in great danger of being destroyed. As a solution to the potential danger of papal domination, Froude recommended "not repression which is self-defeating," but rather a renewal of Protestant American energy to resist such domination, and persistent appeals to patriotism.[24]

This brief sketch of American Catholicism between 1789 and 1878, has stressed those events whose later developments would occasion the intervention of Pope Leo XIII and the response of the periodical press to that intervention. The next chapter, which will briefly examine the general periodical reaction to the death of Pope Pius IX and the election of Pope Leo XIII, will serve as a springboard into the more specific study of the periodical response to Leo's intervention into major episodes of the American Church.

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER I

[1]Rt. Rev. John Tracy Ellis, American Catholicism (2nd ed. rev.; Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 19, 27, 31, 41-43; Joseph N. Moody, ed., Church and Society: Catholic Social and Political Thought and Movements, 1789-1950 (New York: Arts, Inc., 1953), pp. 846-47; W. W. Sweet, The Story of Religion in America (2nd ed. rev.; New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1950), pp. 202-03; Henry J. Browne, "Catholicism in the United States," in Religion in American Life: The Shaping of American Religion, ed. by J. W. Smith and A. L. Jamison (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), I, 74.

[2]Ellis, American Catholicism, p. 43; Browne, "Catholicism," p. 74. Although population figures differed somewhat among the authorities consulted, the figures cited in the text were based on Ellis, American Catholicism, p. 43, and on a widely acclaimed work by Rev. Gerald Shaughnessy, Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith? (New York: n.p., 1925), p. 52. Shaughnessy calculated that in 1790 nearly 275,000 Americans of Catholic descent lived in the United States; the fact that only 35,000 Catholics were counted in 1790 implied that some 240,000 had either left the Church or had returned to their homeland sometime during the Colonial Period.

[3]Daniel Callahan, The Mind of the Catholic Layman (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963, p. 7, discusses in detail the origins of the defensive character of American Catholicism: Sweet, Story of Religion, p. 203, cited Rev. John Carroll's distribution of Catholics living in Colonial America in 1784: 15,800 in Maryland, 1,500 in New York, 7,000 in Pennsylvania, and 200 in Virginia. This number included 19 priests in Maryland and 5 in Pennsylvania.

[4]Browne, "Catholicism," p. 77, remarked that about one-third of America's Catholics actively supported the American Revolution.

[5]Rev. E. A. Ryan, "The Holy See and the Church in the United States," in The Catholic Church, U. S. A., ed. by Louis Putz (Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956), pp. 41-44. Ryan said that although the pope permitted the American clergy to choose Carroll and his two successors, after 1833, only bishops could suggest their successors, and then only in the form of a recommendation to the pope.

[6]Sweet, Story of Religion, pp. 222, 271.

[7]Callahan, Mind of the Catholic Layman, pp. 17-27.

[8]Sweet, Story of Religion, pp. 272-73; Ryan, "Holy See," p. 59.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Rev. J. L. Thomas, "Nationalities and American Catholicism," in The Catholic Church, U. S. A., ed. by Louis Putz (Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956), p. 162.

[11]Callahan, Mind of the Catholic Layman, p. 29; Browne, "Catholicism," pp. 86-87; Ellis, American Catholicism, pp. 50-52, 62.

[12]Thomas, "Nationalities," p. 163; Callahan, Mind of the Catholic Layman, pp. 29-33.

[13]Thomas, "Nationalities," pp. 165-67. Thomas did point out that many of the German immigrants who arrived after 1848 were better able financially and psychologically to move westward and pursue their farming skills in Ohio, Wisconsin, and Missouri.

[14]Ellis, American Catholicism, pp. 56-59, 82.

[15]R. A. Billington, The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism (Glaucester: Peter Smith, 1938), see the last four chapters; and Ellis, American Catholicism, p. 69.

[16]Rev. J
the Intellectual
H, one of the e
ellectual life
century.

[17]Browne
that most Cathol
n the basis of
slavery was not
treated. See to
Patterns of Amer
New York: Athen

[18]Aaron
fare: The Early
XIV (July, 1952)
ics and the Soc
Catholic Histori
Studies, XLIII (

[19]Rev. T
Leo XIII and the
York: Sheed & W

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid.

[23]J. Ant
Race," NAR, CXX

[24]Ibid.

[16]Rev. John Tracy Ellis, "American Catholics and the Intellectual Life," Thought, XXX (Autumn, 1955), 357-88, one of the earliest and best articles on the intellectual life of American Catholics in the nineteenth century.

[17]Browne, "Catholicism," p. 90. Browne stated that most Catholics were anti-abolitionists, and in fact, on the basis of official Church teaching, could say that slavery was not necessarily evil if its victims were well treated. See too, John Higham, Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (2nd ed. cor.; New York: Athenaum, 1963), pp. 28, 15.

[18]Aaron Abell, "The Catholic Factor in Urban Welfare: The Early Period, 1850-1880," Review of Politics, XIV (July, 1952), 289-90; James Roohan, "American Catholics and the Social Question, 1865-1900," United States Catholic Historical Society, Historical Records and Studies, XLIII (1954), 3, 6-7, 12-18.

[19]Rev. Thomas McAvoy, "Leo XIII and America," in Leo XIII and the Modern World, ed. by Edward Gargan (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961), pp. 159, 162-63.

[20]Ibid., p. 162.

[21]Ibid., p. 163.

[22]Ibid.

[23]J. Anthony Froude, "Romanism and the Irish Race," NAR, CXXIX (December, 1879), 524.

[24]Ibid., pp. 528, 530, 531.

CHAPTER II

THE AMERICAN PERIODICAL RESPONSE TO THE DEATH OF POPE PIUS IX AND THE ELECTION OF POPE LEO XIII

In 1879, when The North American Review published J. Anthony Froude's hostile article about the papacy and the American Church, Leo XIII had been pope for less than two years. The general attitude which Froude expressed toward the papacy, therefore, was certainly influenced by his image of Leo's predecessor, Pius IX, a pontiff whose reactionary and often tactless style also convinced many articulate non-Catholic Americans that the head of the Catholic Church opposed all forms of liberalism, scientific progress, and modern culture. An examination of the response of some leading American journals to Pius IX's death will show that Froude's attitude was not unique.

Periodical articles and editorials responding to the death of Pope Pius IX (1846-1878) focused on four issues: the pope's reaction to the loss of his temporal power during the period of Italian unification (1859-1870), and the three major acts of what was deemed as his ultramontane policy: the ex cathedra pronouncement of

the dogma of

gation of th

on Papal Inf

Pope

Papal States

new Italian

and often bi

recognize th

Italian Cath

and consider

Earl

and quickly

alism, Pius

Conception,

the original

human beings

proclaimed

unconditiona

Ten

encyclical

supplement

Errors of O

Allocutions

Letters of

eighty prop

the dogma of the Immaculate Conception (1854), the promulgation of the Syllabus of Errors (1864), and the decree on Papal Infallibility (1870).[1]

Pope Pius IX considered the absorption of the Papal States as an act of illegal confiscation by the new Italian government. Until his death, he continually and often bitterly protested this act. He refused to recognize the Italian government as legitimate, advised Italian Catholics not to participate in Italian elections, and considered himself the "Prisoner of the Vatican."[2]

Earlier, in 1854, several years after a brief and quickly disillusioning flirtation with Italian liberalism, Pius had proclaimed the dogma of Mary's Immaculate Conception, that is, that Mary had been conceived free of the original sin that tainted the souls of all other human beings at the moment of their conception. The pope proclaimed this as an article of faith requiring the unconditional assent of all Catholics.[3]

Ten years later, in 1864, the pope issued the encyclical Quanta Cura and an authoritative non-infallible supplement entitled "A Syllabus, Containing the Principle Errors of Our Times, which are Noted in the Consistorial Allocutions, in the Encyclicals, and in the Apostolic Letters of Our Most Holy Lord, Pope Pius IX." Among its eighty propositions, the Syllabus condemned various

statements concerning Pantheism, Naturalism, Rationalism, Socialism, and Communism.[4]

Other propositions more specifically denied that miracles were myths, that reason alone decided good and evil, that Protestantism was as pleasing to God as Catholicism, and that there was salvation outside the Catholic Church. In addition, there were propositions which denied that the civil state was the source of all power, that Church and State should be separate, that divorce was moral, and that religious liberty should be granted to all non-Catholic citizens living in Catholic countries. Protestant and secular critics were particularly disturbed by the last proposition which denied that the pope could or should "reconcile and harmonize himself with progress, with liberalism, and with recent civilization."[5]

Finally, in 1870, at the bequest of the pope, the first Vatican Council issued the decree on Papal Infallibility. The official document stated that,

> . . . when the Roman Pontiff speaks ex-cathedra, that is, when discharging the office of the Shepherd and the Doctor of all Christians, in virture of his supreme apostolic authority defines a doctrine to be held by the Universal Church concerning faith and morals, he enjoys . . . that infallibility by which the Divine Redeemer wished His Church to be instructed in the definition of doctrine concerning faith and morals; and therefore, such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not by virture of the consent of the Church.[6]

When the news of Pope Pius IX's death reached the American press, three of the leading Protestant periodicals that responded were the interdenominational Christian Union of New York, the Presbyterian Princeton Review of New York, and The Unitarian Review of Boston. These journals were highly critical of Pius' pontificate but they also stressed that the pope had either been victimized by the necessities of his position and the expectations of institutionalized Catholicism, or duped by wily Jesuit manipulators.

An editorial in The Christian Union stated that Pius's sincere devotion to papal absolutism had marred the elements of greatness that had speckled his long reign. The editors argued that even Pius' initial concessions to the liberals in 1848 had been motivated by hopes for greater power. When he saw his acts frustrated, he struck back with "unwanted acts of spiritual prerogatives"--the dogma on Mary, the Syllabus, and the decree on Papal Infallibility. These acts, combined with his refusal to recognize the inevitable end of his temporal power, were explicit attacks on modern civilization and free government. Yet, concluded the editors, no single formula could explain the inconsistencies between his early and later career:

> But the verdict of history may perhaps be summed up in a sentence: His virtues were his own; his vices belonged to his system.[7]

Presbyterian Bishop A. C. Coxe, writing for the Princeton Review, offered a theological critique of Pius' ultramontane policies and acts. Coxe said that the dogma on Mary had the effect of replacing the Trinity with a Quaternity, while the Syllabus attempted to subject all human thought systems and government processes to papal whim. The decree on Papal Infallibility had the effect of minimizing the Holy Scriptures and making the pope a Holy Spirit incarnate. Worst of all, said Coxe, although no Catholic sincerely believed those decrees, many Catholics accepted them simply because it was impossible to prove them untrue.[8]

However, like the editors of The Christian Union, Coxe did not put the blame for those decrees directly on the pope. The culprits, he said, were the ultramontane Jesuits, who had successfully misused Pius in order to gain a firmer grip on the machinery of the Church.[9]

The editors of The Unitarian Review assumed a decidedly intellectual stance as they centered their criticism on the pope's decree on Papal Infallibility. The decree was referred to as

> . . . a wicked and blasphemous assumption of what belongs to God alone . . . and a successful attempt to set at defiance the authority of reason, the light of the age, and the progress of human intelligence.[10]

Such a decree, predicted the editors, would hasten the

downfall of

articles of

intelligenc

Nev

personally

concluded

to enhance

in the wor

in Pope Pi

Th

Pope Pius

exception

torialize

by contra

not desi

their ar

of Pius'

as The N

and the

tried t

tried t

Italian

spiritu

Syllab

downfall of the Catholic Church, for it would bring articles of faith into conflict with advancing human intelligence.[11]

Nevertheless, the Review did not blame Pius personally for issuing the decree. Pius issued the decree, concluded the editors, not for personal gain, but rather to enhance the office which he hoped to make the greatest in the world. In a word, the priest dominated the man in Pope Pius IX.[12]

The secular periodical response to the death of Pope Pius IX may be treated collectively. With the exception of Harper's Weekly of New York, which editorialized that the pope was a "humane man constrained by contrary [Jesuit] forces to do what his heart did not desire," several other leading journals focused their articles and editorials on the political aspects of Pius' reign.[13]

Two major themes predominated in such journals as The Nation, Atlantic Monthly, International Review, and the National Quarterly Review: first, that Pius had tried to preserve a medieval papacy; second, that he had tried to compensate for political losses accruing from Italian nationalism and unification by asserting strong spiritual powers as evidenced by the decree on Mary, the Syllabus, and the decree on Papal Infallibility.

The first theme, that Pius had tried to preserve a medieval papacy, was revealed through a variety of epithets. Among the most vivid were those which described him as "the last and greatest relic of the Middle Ages," the last of the priest-kings, an impractical and extreme idealist who had tried but had failed to stop the forward movement of human history, and as an impulsive man at war with the intellect and constantly anticipating miraculous powers.[14]

Equally critical was the periodical response on the second theme, that Pius had tried to compensate for political losses by asserting spiritual powers. An article in the Atlantic stated that Pius had aimed to exalt the grandeur of the papacy at all costs. He accomplished this, commented an article in the International Review, by going beyond the limits of human folly and decreeing his personal infallibility in faith and morals. This decree, remarked the editor of The Nation, completed his creation of a spiritual dictatorship. Yet, his success resulted, not from any strong desire of the faithful, but rather from their apathy.[15]

An Italian correspondent for the International Review was particularly critical. He argued that Pius' ultramontane policy inadvertantly promoted the cause of Italian unification. By refusing to cooperate with or recognize the government after 1870, the pope isolated

his governme

ened his dir

important, t

together wit

of Catholic

pushed Chri

of the Virg

Lea

Pius' deat

An editori

Quarterly

editor de

unmask an

revolutio

liberalis

constitu

itself t

the viol

that he

in sheep

of cons

the evi

progra

the Pr

decree

his government from the rest of Italy, and thereby lessened his direct influence on the course of events. More important, the decrees on Mary and on infallibility together with the Syllabus changed the essential nature of Catholicism. These acts, concluded the author, had pushed Christ into the background, promoted the adoration of the Virgin, and deified the pope.[16]

Leading Catholic periodicals that responded to Pius' death did so with strongly defensive overtones. An editorial in the conservative American Catholic Quarterly Review of Philadelphia was a good example. The editor described the reign of Pius IX as a mission to unmask and condemn the remnants of anarchistic French revolutionary liberalism. Pius' early courtship with liberalism was a gesture of charity designed to give constitutional government in Italy a chance to prove itself tenable. The courtship was cut short because of the violence of the revolution, and the pope realized that he had been a lamb who had fallen victim to wolves in sheeps' clothing. Pius therefore withdrew his offer of constitutional government and in the process, exposed the evil of the rationalistic liberalism of the era.[17]

In the same editorial, Pius' ultramontane program was defended in a point by point refutation of the Protestant and secular periodical response. The decree on Mary, said the editor, was simply a response

to the

mation

and th

a good

raw ne

decree

true r

relat

perio

a wor

metho

inter

on th

into

As s

to s

unde

foll

elec

rang

the

ele

to the desire of all Catholics, and an official confirmation of an already accepted truth. The Syllabus and the angry criticism it provoked showed it to be both a good and timely document in that it rubbed many of the raw nerves of the day. Finally, said the editor, the decree on infallibility was a means of teaching "the true meaning of authority and reason, and their mutual relations."[18]

Before proceeding to an examination of the periodical response to the election of Pope Leo XIII, a word of explanation is in order concerning the methodology employed in this chapter. This chapter was intended as a springboard into a study which will focus on the periodical response to Leo XIII's intervention into major episodes of the American Catholic Church. As such, it was felt neither necessary nor desirable to spend time on an extensive analysis of the topic under consideration in the present chapter. However, following the survey of the periodical response to the election of Pope Leo XIII, some general analytical remarks will be made concerning the differences between the periodical response to the death of Pius and the election of Leo XIII.

Wh

Cardinals

throne as

odical res

note of ho

odicals' i

moderate,

from his l

seemed to

during mo

Protestan

as more s

cause of

justify

periodic

educatio

ministra

those of

Carpine

and 183

After s

College

studies

losophy

When, on February 20, 1878, the College of Cardinals elected Vincent Cardinal Pecci to the papal throne as Leo XIII, the Protestant and secular periodical response in the United States conveyed a marked note of hope and quiet enthusiasm. Perhaps, the periodicals' image of Leo as an intellectual, an ideological moderate, and a practical man of the world was derived from his background. In contrast to Pius IX, who seemed to have severed himself from the modern world during most of his pontificate, leading secular and Protestant periodicals interpreted Leo's world outlook as more sympathetic and more closely aligned to the cause of scientific, social, and political progress.

Leo's pre-papal experience did not completely justify the nature of the initial Protestant and secular periodical response to his election. Nevertheless, his educational achievements as well as his civil and administrative experiences were much more extensive than those of his predecessor.

Vincent Pecci was born on March 2, 1810 in Carpineto, then part of the Papal States. Between 1818 and 1837, Pecci had developed as both priest and scholar. After studying grammar and the humanities at the Jesuit College of Viterbo until 1823, he pursued advanced studies in rhetoric, humanities, natural science, philosophy, and theology, and was awarded the degree, Doctor

of Sacred

he studie

In 1837,

Gregory

priest.

tensive

and dip

as civi

in the

acquir

in the

He al

diplo

syste

he es

of p

fee

the

est

im

of

th

r.

of Sacred Theology, in 1832. During the next five years, he studied canon and civil law at Sapienza University. In 1837, he was appointed domestic prelate by Pope Gregory XVI, and later that same year was ordained a priest.

In the following eight years, Pecci gained extensive and valuable experience in civil administration and diplomacy. Between 1838 and 1841, he served ably as civil governor of the pontifical city of Benvenuto in the territory of the Kingdom of Naples. Here, he acquired a reputation as a firm but just disciplinarian in the course of ridding the countryside of brigands. He also acquired a local reputation as a reformer and diplomat because of his reorganization of the local tax system, and because of the amiable diplomatic relations he established with Naples.

In 1841, Pecci began a two-year term as governor of Perugia, a province notorious for its anti-papal feelings. Pecci succeeded not only in quelling some of the hostility, but also updated the educational system, established a low interest loan bank for farmers, and improved the administration of justice. His term of office was cut short, however, in 1843, when he was made Archbishop of Damiata and sent to Brussels as papal nuncio for the next three years. Here he was able to

maintain

the latte

than Chu

and valu

Perugia,

During

of St.

of dio

traini

conce

ackno

annex

of P

fall

papa

Piu

Feb

as

maintain cordial relations with the royal family, despite the latter's strong feelings on behalf of state rather than Church controlled education.

Between 1846 and 1877, Pecci gained extensive and valuable ecclesiastical experience as Bishop of Perugia, where he had previously served as governor. During his long episcopate, he established the Academy of St. Thomas Acquinas (1872), organized an association of diocesan missionaries, and generally improved the training of seminarians and priests.

Even more important as far as his future was concerned, Pecci (who was made a cardinal in 1853) firmly acknowledged the dogma on Mary in 1854, protested Perugia's annexation to Piedmont in 1860, supported the Syllabus of Errors in 1864, readily accepted the decree on infallibility in 1870, and repeatedly protested the papacy's loss of its temporal power after 1870. In 1877, Pius IX appointed Pecci Cardinal Camerlengo, and on February 20, 1878, he was elected, on the second ballot, as the Supreme Pontiff of the Roman Catholic Church.[19]

Secular periodicals such as The Nation, Atlantic Monthly, Littell's Living Age, and Eclectic Magazine responded to Leo's election optimistically. While Leo's election was not viewed as an outright victory for liberalism, these journals both implicitly and explicitly conveyed the attitude that the election was a reaction

against the in

Leo was viewed

an of the wo

high characte

middle-of-the

An ar

not reinterpr

decree on Ma

bility). Ho

sanction fre

predecessor.

belief by re

his years a

those speec

world, the

theories.

Leo would n

An article

that Leo w

or dogmas,

Vatican" s

engage in

Church's

O

Review ar

author cr

against the inflexible policies and attitudes of Pius IX. Leo was viewed as a practical, non-fanatical, scholarly man of the world, and as an accomplished administrator of high character who, politically and socially, would be a middle-of-the-road diplomat.[20]

An article in The Eclectic predicted that Leo would not reinterpret the major decress of Pius IX (that is, the decree on Mary, the Syllabus, and the decree on infallibility). However, the author did believe that Leo would sanction free institutions much more readily than did his predecessor. An editorial in The Nation supported that belief by recalling some of Leo's speeches made during his years as Bishop of Perugia. The editor interpreted those speeches as favorable toward science, the modern world, the nature of progress, and some of the new economic theories. It was possible, concluded the editorial, that Leo would move to the left of the idelogical spectrum. An article in the Atlantic went even further by predicting that Leo would not resist Protestantism through decrees or dogmas, that he would abdicate the "prisoner of the Vatican" status assumed by Pius IX, and that he would engage in ecclesiastical reform which would increase the Church's influence in the world.[21]

One note of criticism was sounded by a Contemporary Review article reprinted in Littell's Living Age. The author criticized the new pope for a speech he made before

the College of Cardinals immediately following his election. In the address, he asked the cardinals for help and advice to make his pontificate successful. The author interpreted this address as a surrender to the ultramontane forces which dominated the sacred College. Henceforth, predicted the author, any liberal inclinations manifested by the new pope would be met by the passive resistance of the ultramontane cardinals.[22]

Although the Protestant periodical response to the election of Pope Leo XIII was not extensive, one of the nation's leading and most widely circulated Protestant journals, The Christian Union, spoke cautiously but hopefully about the new pope. In general, the editors said that Leo would not suddenly or radically break with the policies of Pius IX, but that he would quietly ignore his predecessor's policies. Leo's silence as well as his utterances would reveal the change toward a more flexible policy.[23]

More specifically, the editors of the Union viewed Leo's initial pontifical acts as indicative of a man with what they called conservative liberal tendencies. They then cited as examples, Leo's "protestant" emphasis on Christ, and his corresponding deemphasis on Mary and on infallibility. Even more indicative of the new pope's character was his desire to reestablish cordial relations between the Vatican and the Italian government, and his

decision to p

lege of Cardi

from the absc

article had

forces.[24]

The

be a more da

there was ho

fact that

> . . . L
> liberal
> himself
> church.

Bot

which respo

beginning

were adama

a good exa

Catholic

Th

influenti

secular a

deluding

argued th

policies

ultramon

decision to place more reliance on the advice of the College of Cardinals. The latter was a democratic move away from the absolutism of Pius, and not, as the Eclectic article had contended, a surrender to ultramontane forces.[24]

The Christian Union did editorialize that Leo would be a more dangerous man to antagonize than was Pius; yet, there was hope, concluded the editors, in the apparent fact that

> . . . Leo XIII, in reconciling himself to progress, liberalism, and modern civilization, is reconciling himself to the best thought and life of his own church.[25]

Both the Protestant and the secular periodicals which responded to the election of Pope Leo XIII as the beginning of a more modern era in the history of the Church were adamantly refuted by The Catholic Review of New York, a good example of the predominantly conservative nature of Catholic journalism in 1878.

The editor of this widely circulated and highly influential Catholic journal began by criticizing the secular and Protestant response to Leo's election as self-deluding and misleading to the public. Leo's election, argued the editor, was not a reaction to the inflexible policies of Pius IX. Rather, it was the power of the ultramontane cardinals that elected Leo XIII.[26]

editor, r

Pius, wh

to drive

That is,

he resig

power.

fact, th

their e

Pius IX

pontifi

at leas

Leo XI

the te

for th

the C

to th

early

temp

More

Wil

Oth

Ca

Ca

Any description of Leo as a moderate, said the editor, must be qualified. Leo will be as moderate as Pius, who could have but did not call an army into Italy to drive out Victor Emanuel. Leo will be equally moderate. That is, he will not shake hands with revolution, nor will he resign himself to the loss of the papacy's temporal power. Once the Protestant and secular press realize that fact, they will begin to curse Leo for not living up to their expectations, just as they ultimately denounced Pius IX.[27] Later, as the study of the response to Leo's pontificate will show, the editor's prediction would prove at least partially correct.

Another major point of the Review's response to Leo XIII's election focused on the necessity of restoring the temporal power to the papacy. Temporal sovereignty for the pope, said the editor, was " . . . as vital to the Church as the independence of Washington city is vital to the United States."[28]

Leo, said the editor as he recalled the pope's early support of Pius IX's policy on the question of the temporal power, will be as firm as Pius was on this matter. Moreover, Leo, like Pius, will not resort to force, but will wait patiently and steadily for restoration. On the other hand, the editor insisted, " . . . we Catholics cannot rest until we have driven the invaders from our capital [Rome]."[29]

F

and secul

not only

also in

and the

would be

ples of

think ot

Leo's v

would b

the pre

period

Cathol

alized

opinio

under

liber

hope

cours

serv

titl

revi

try

Finally, the Review's editor refuted Protestant and secular press remarks that Leo would be conciliatory not only with the various governments of the world, but also in his views on science, progress, modern civilization, and the spiritual life. Leo, the Review editorialized, would be uncompromising in his devotion to Mary, the principles of the Syllabus, and the decree on infallibility. To think otherwise was to engage in self-delusion. Moreover, Leo's views on progress, science, and modern civilization would be essentially the same as his predecessor's.[30]

If the remarks of The Catholic Review exemplified the predominantly conservative character of Catholic periodical writing in 1878, the remarks of the more liberal Catholic World of New York permit conjecture (later factualized) that a portion of articulate Catholic American opinion hoped for a more modern style of papal leadership under Leo XIII.

This journal (which was developing into the leading liberal Catholic periodical in the nation) expressed its hope quietly and somewhat implicitly. For example, in the course of commenting upon a recently published and conservatively written biographical sketch of Leo XIII entitled Leo XIII and His Probable Policy, the World's reviewer advised everyone, including the author, not to try and predict the new pope's future policy. Indeed, the

reviewer argued, Leo must act with extreme caution and not draw any "hard-and-fast line of policy. . . ."[31]

In a later article describing the coronation of the new pope, a foreign correspondent of The Catholic World commented favorably upon the fact that Leo's newly appointed Secretary of State was a skilled diplomat with an accomodating disposition, and that, in general, the liberal press of Europe had given Leo more enthusiastic coverage than had the predominantly conservative Catholic press on the continent.[32]

As Leo's pontificate began to unfold, it was clear that there were elements of truth in the Protestant and secular predictions, the conservative Catholic counter-predictions, and in the quiet hope of The Catholic World.[33]

Conclusions

A threefold quality of disappointment, hostility, and a sense of relief characterized the Protestant and secular periodical response to the death of Pope Pius IX and the election of Pope Leo XIII. There was disappointment that Pius' early courtship with liberalism had been so short-lived; and there was disappointment that it was followed by what was viewed as thirty years of reactionary pontificating against liberalism, democracy, and the concept of a free church in a free state.

Hov

not of the

respect fo

sincerity

Jesuits or

that the P

Pr

symbol of

ultramonta

Protestant

and to the

ration of

in the Uni

policies c

could be

endangeri

of predom

H

pointment

of Pope I

out of t

realitie

as a dup

ideals c

basic ou

similar

However, the disappointment of the Protestant if not of the secular periodicals, belied an undercurrent of respect for the dead pontiff. His personal piety and sincerity were unquestioned. It was as a dupe of the Jesuits or as a victim of institutionalized Catholicism that the Protestant journals criticized Pius IX.

Protestant periodicals perceived in Pius IX the symbol of an authoritarian and exclusivist church whose ultramontane outlook posed a theological affront to the Protestant doctrine of the priesthood of all believers and to the Protestant American preference for the separation of church and state. Protestant periodical writers in the United States still strongly doubted whether the policies of such a pope and the dogmas he pronounced could be faithfully followed by American Catholics without endangering the religious and other constitutional ideals of predominantly Protestant America.

Hostility overshadowed the element of disappointment in the secular periodical response to the death of Pope Pius IX. Personal attacks against Pius as a man out of touch with modern social, political, and religious realities predominated over the Protestant view of Pius as a dupe or as a theological threat to the cherished ideals of Protestant religious and political life. The basic outlook of the secular periodicals was essentially similar to their Protestant counterparts, but there was

more of a pur

often pungent

The s

America with

sensitivity

Constitution

odical respo

In a

substantial

for public

Maguires, o

of their se

tants, and

immigrants

than Americ

and the dec

periodical

were to ini

periodical

into major

United Sta

On

disappoint

common to

sponding t

more of a purely ad hominem orientation in the former's often pungent criticism of Pius.

The social and political milieu of post-Civil War America with its increasing nationalism and its consequent sensitivity to anything that appeared to threaten the Constitution no doubt influenced the non-Catholic periodical response to the death of Pius IX.

In addition, these periodicals were aware of the substantial numbers of American Catholics, of their demands for public funds to support their schools, of their Molly Maguires, of their Irish American draft rioters in 1863, of their sectarian and defensive attitude toward Protestants, and of the fact that the majority of these Catholic immigrants came from countries which were less democratic than America. These factors, combined with the Syllabus and the decree on Papal Infallibility contributed to the periodical response to the death of Pope Pius IX, and were to influence a substantial portion of the non-Catholic periodical response to the intervention of Pope Leo XIII into major controversies of the Catholic Church in the United States.

On the other hand, transcending the sense of disappointment and hostility was the feeling of relief common to both Protestant and secular periodicals responding to the election of Pope Leo XIII. During the

first few m

generally v

felt sure v

of his pre

into line

(the highe

United Sta

F

a powerfu

many secu

the scept

inflexibl

Leo's pre

of Leo as

conveyed

live up

The Chri

American

new pope

pope as

secular

the hope

in sympa

and who

first few months of his pontificate, these periodicals generally viewed him as something of a savior whom they felt sure would quietly abandon the medieval character of his predecessor's policies and lead the Catholic Church into line with their conception of modern civilization (the highest standard of which they deemed to exist in the United States).

For the first time in centuries, the pope was not a powerful temporal soverign. Without this added burden, many secular and Protestant periodicals felt that perhaps the sceptre of spiritual power would not be weilded so inflexibly, so absolutely as it had been in the hands of Leo's predecessors. In addition, their personal estimate of Leo as a practical man in touch with the modern world conveyed the notion of a direct plea to the new pope to live up to that expectation. A Roman correspondent for The Christian Union, for example, wondered whether the American hierarchy would ever realize and convey to the new pope that it was the pope as temporal ruler, not the pope as spiritual ruler who was hated.[34]

Hence, implicit in the Protestant and also the secular periodical response was the belief (or at least the hope) that a pope such as Leo who seemed to be more in sympathy with the modern world than Pius IX had been, and who had no vast temporal domains, would be less likely

to issue infallible dogmas, and might even quietly de-emphasize those of his predecessor.

The most explicit and vocal Catholic periodical response to the death of Pius IX and the election of Leo XIII was, more than anything else, a rebuttal of Protestant and secular press criticisms and hopes. Moreover, the response revealed the theologically conservative and defensive quality of Catholic periodical writing in 1878. This conservative and defensive quality was, as noted in the previous chapter, also inherent in the majority of American Catholics, most of whom were immigrants or the children of immigrants living in the cities of the East (where the leading Catholic journals were published).

The response of The American Catholic Quarterly Review and The Catholic Review to the death of Pius and the election of Leo XIII had a degree of consistency that one scholar alluded to when he described the typical American Catholic immigrant in the 1880's and 1890's:

> . . . the one real hold the immigrant had on his old life was his Catholicism. It became a solid rock in a country where everything else was constantly changing.[35]

Only the quiet hope of The Catholic World gave some implicit indication that at least a portion of articulate Catholic opinion was awaiting a new style of papal leadership which, among other things, would alter in a more

favorable direction the Protestant-secular image of the papacy and especially of its relationship with the American Catholic Church.

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER II

[1]The term "ultramontane" as used here referred to the pope's attempts to increasingly centralize the Catholic Church organizations of various nations under papal and away from local and secular control.

[2]S. William Halperin, "Leo XIII and the Roman Question," in Leo XIII and the Modern World, ed. by Edward Gargan (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961), pp. 101-05.

[3]Kenneth S. Latourette, Christianity in a Revolutionary Age (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1958), I, 270.

[4]E. E. Y. Hales, Pio Nono, A Study in European Politics and Religion in the Nineteenth Century (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1954), pp. 256, 257-58.

[5]Latourette, Christianity, I, 275-78; Syllabus quoted in Hales, Pio Nono, p. 258. The full text of the Syllabus is in Ann Freemantle, ed., The Papal Encyclicals in Their Historical Context (New York: G. P. Putnam & Sons, 1956), pp. 143-52.

[6]Quoted in J. B. Bury, History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century: Liberty and Authority in the Roman Catholic Church (New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1964), p. 134.

[7]Editorial, "Pope Pius IX," CU, XVIII (February 13, 1878), 137-38.

[8]Bishop A. C. Coxe, "The Pontificate of Pius IX," The Princeton Review, I (March, 1878), 523, 525, 531.

[9]Ibid., p. 523.

[10]Editorial, "Pius IX," The Unitarian Review, IX (March, 1878), 335.

[11]Ibid., p. 333.

[12]Ibid., p. 338.

[13]Editorial, HW, XXII (February 23, 1878), 146.

[14]E. L. Godkin, "Pius IX," TN, XXVI (February 14, 1878), 107, 108; William C. Langdon, "The Old Pope and the New," Atlantic Monthly, XLI (May, 1878), 649, 651-53; Editorial, "The Position of Leo XIII," TN, XXVII (October 24, 1878), 251.

[15]Langdon, "Old Pope and the New," p. 651; Angelo Gubernatis, "The New Kingdom of Italy and the New Pope," International Review, V (May, 1878), 304; Godkin, "Pius IX," pp. 107, 108.

[16]Gubernatis, "New Kingdom of Italy," pp. 307-08. See too, "The Papacy of Pius IX," The National Quarterly Review, XXXVII (July, 1878), 124-26.

[17]J. A. Corcoran, "Pius IX and His Pontificate," ACQR, III (April, 1878), 349-50.

[18]Ibid., pp. 352, 356-57, 353.

[19]The major sources for the biographical sketch of Leo XIII were: Justin McCarthy, Pope Leo XIII (New York: Frederick Warne and Company, 1897); Katherine Burton, Leo the Thirteenth: The First Modern Pope (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1967); Etienne Gilson, ed., The Church Speaks to the Modern World: The Social Teachings of Leo XIII (New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1954), pp. 1-6; and "Leo XIII," The Catholic Encyclopedia, IX (New York: The Gilmary Society, 1910-1913), pp. 169-72.

[20]"What's Going on at the Vatican: A Voice from Rome," The Contemporary Review, reprinted in Littell's Living Age, CXXXIX (December 14, 1878), 644-45; Langdon, "Old Pope and the New," p. 655; E. L. Godkin, "Italy and the New Pope," TN, XXVI (March 14, 1878), 181; "Leo XIII," The Spectator, reprinted in The Eclectic Magazine, XC (May, 1878), 214.

"Italy
the Ne

178; "
Editor
300.

"The O

1878),
137; N

Hour,"

137.

269;
XIII
CR, X
CR, X

269;
CR, X
This

Polic
1878)
of Pi
(Apri

Leo X
Lette
State

[21]"Leo XIII," The Spectator, p. 215; Godkin, "Italy and the New Pope," p. 182; Langdon, "Old Pope and the New," p. 658.

[22]"What's Going on at the Vatican," p. 650.

[23]"The Outlook," CU, XVII (February 27, 1878), 178; "The Outlook," CU, XVII (March 13, 1878), 217; Editorial, "The New Romanism," CU, XVII (April 10, 1878), 300.

[24]"The Outlook," CU, XVII (March 13, 1878), 217; "The Outlook," CU, XVII (April 3, 1878), 279.

[25]Editorial, "The New Romanism," p. 300.

[26]Editorial, "Leo XIII," CR, XIII (February 26, 1878), 144; "Topics of the Hour," CR, XIII (March 2, 1878), 137; Mott, History of American Magazines, III, 70.

[27]Editorial, "Leo XIII," p. 144; "Topics of the Hour," CR, XIII (March 2, 1878), 137.

[28]"Topics of the Hour," CR, XIII (March 2, 1878), 137.

[29]"Topics of the Hour," CR, XIII (April 27, 1878), 269; "Pope Leo's Policy," The Spectator, reprinted in CR, XIII (April 13, 1878), 242; Bishop Lynch, "Pope Leo XIII," CR, XIII (March 23, 1878), 190; "Topics of the Hour," CR, XIII (March 2, 1878), 137.

[30]"Topics of the Hour," CR, XIII (April 27, 1878), 269; "Pope Leo's Policy," The Spectator, reprinted in CR, XIII (April 13, 1878), 242; Editorial, "The Church at this Crisis," CR, XIII (February 26, 1878), 144.

[31]Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, Leo XIII and His Probable Policy, reviewed in The Catholic World, XXVII (April, 1878), 143. See too, Foreign Correspondent, "The Death of Pius IX: The Conclave and the Election," CW, XXVII (April, 1878), 129-36.

[32]Foreign Correspondent, "The Coronation of Pope Leo XIII," CW, XXVII (May, 1878), 284-85. See too, "The Letter of Pope Leo XIII to Cardinal Nina--On Church and State in Italy," CW, XXVIII (December, 1878), 419-23.

centra
XIII's
the An
approp
were e
Cathol
betwee
predec

predic
papal
essent
explic
diplon
encycl

which
decree
pope's
his p

encycl
wise,
power
but o
encyc
reall
the p
in pr
well

Mary
conta
Carle
Pius
1958)

conta
tempo
the f
Dicti
155,

(Marc

[33]Although the research done for this study concentrated on the American periodical response to Pope Leo XIII's intervention into episodes which developed within the American Catholic Church, an explanatory note is appropriate here to indicate more specifically that there were elements of truth in both the Catholic and non-Catholic predictions concerning the general relationship between the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII and that of his predecessor, Pope Pius IX.

Those Protestant and secular periodicals which predicted that Leo would not emphasize the doctrine of papal infallibility as much as Pius IX did, were to be essentially correct. Leo's encyclicals contained no explicit ex cathedra decrees, and in general were more diplomatically and moderately worded than were the encyclicals of his predecessor.

On the other hand, those Catholic periodicals which predicted that Leo's policies with regard to the decree on Mary and with regard to the question of the pope's temporal power would be essentially the same as his predecessor's were also correct.

Between 1883 and 1898, Leo dedicated ten of his encyclicals to Mary and the devotion to the Rosary. Likewise, the papal demand for the restoration of the temporal power was not only included in numerous papal allocutions, but occupied an important place in several of the pope's encyclicals between 1878 and 1898. While the pope never really expected to regain all the territory lost during the period of Italian unification, he at least persisted in protesting what he deemed as his prisoner status as well as his right to rule Rome.

A brief synopsis of all of Leo's encyclicals on Mary and on the Rosary, as well as references to works containing the full texts was in Sister Mary Claudia Carlen, Dictionary of Papal Pronouncements: Leo XIII to Pius XII, 1878-1957 (New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1958), pp. 156, 155, 113, 94, 87, 82, 14, 63, 23, 49-50.

Likewise, a brief synopsis of Leo's encyclicals containing protests on behalf of the restoration of the temporal power, as well as references to works containing the full texts was in Sister Mary Claudia Carlen, Dictionary of Papal Pronouncements, pp. 19, 50, 59, 60, 155, 73, 90, 145, 42, 41-42, 79, 153.

[34]J. A. S., "Letter from Rome," CU, XVIII (March 25, 1878), 249.

[35]Callahan, Mind of the Catholic Layman, p. 33.

ing th

accomp

Churc

zatio

These

XIII.

to th

resea

venti

the

and

Inde

Week

com

Chu

CHAPTER III

THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: THE FIRST STAGE, 1884-1888

The rapid expansion of American Catholicism during the last quarter of the nineteenth century was accompanied by several major episodes related to the Church's pattern of growth, its disciplinary organization, and the nature of its hierarchical leadership. These episodes occasioned the intervention of Pope Leo XIII. This chapter will examine the periodical response to the pope's intervention into those episodes which research has deemed as the first stage of papal intervention: the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore (1884), the American Church and the Knights of Labor (1886-1888), and the case of Father Edward McGlynn (1886-1887).

Late in the summer of 1882, an editorial in The Independent, a leading non-denominational Protestant weekly published in New York, declared that the time had come for Pope Leo XIII to release the American Catholic Church from its state of Roman tutelage (that is, from

its s
of th
The
enou
and
Nowh
was
wors

Chur
by
it
papa
Piu
cog
wid

Cat
of
Ple
ica
ha
bi
22
sc
an

its status as a missionary church under the jurisdiction of the Congregation of the Propaganda in the Roman Curia). The American Church, argued the editor, was competent enough to rule itself. No country, he said, had clergy and people more loyal to Rome and the pope than America. Nowhere was Peter's Pense so amply provided, and nowhere was the Catholic population so intelligent in religious worship and so morally pure in conduct.[1]

Leo XIII, however, was not to release the American Church from its missionary status. That act was performed by his successor, Pope Pius X, in 1908. On the other hand, it was during Leo's pontificate that several important papal decisions were made which laid the groundwork for Pius X's act, and which very clearly indicated Rome's cognizance of the American Church's importance to world-wide Catholicism.

Indeed, the sheer numerical growth of the American Catholic Church since the 1840's was in itself a source of great pride to Rome. In 1884, on the eve of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, the membership of the American Church was over 6 1/2 million. Organizational growth had kept pace; by 1884, there were 13 archbishops, 57 bishops, 6,835 priests, 1651 seminarians, 6,630 churches, 22 seminaries, 87 colleges, 599 academies, 2,532 parochial schools with nearly 1/2 million students, 294 asylums, and 139 hospitals.[2]

sive f

the Ca

number

Europe

to co

durin

speak

not c

to a

incr

pres

into

Chu

Uit

suc

rei

ica

or

in

t

z

A

c

The prime source of concern amidst these impressive figures was the predominantly immigrant make-up of the Catholic population, and especially the increasing number of non-English speaking southern and eastern European Catholics who were coming and were to continue to come to the United States between 1880 and 1900. Even during the 1870's, more than 600,000 mostly non-English speaking Catholics had arrived on American shores.[3]

The immigrant status of so many American Catholics not only added to the problem of getting Protestant America to accept the Catholic Church on friendly terms, but also increased the difficulty among Church officials trying to preserve the faith of the immigrants, assimilating them into American life, and maintaining a unified Catholic Church free of nationalistic and ideological conflicts. Ultimately, the Church hierarchs were not completely successful in solving any of these problems during the reign of Leo XIII, particularly the one concerning Americanization.

Problems notwithstanding, the pope's decision to order the American hierarchy to meet in plenary session in 1884, was ostensibly for the purpose of imposing upon the growing Church canonical uniformity both in organization and discipline. In one sense, Leo was telling American Catholics that their rapid growth merited more official attention; in another sense, the pope wanted to

insure more direct control by Rome, particularly over the solution of the myriad of problems besetting the American Church because of its unique growth pattern since the 1840's.[4]

Rome's call for a plenary council was ultimately to compound some of the problems confronting the American Church, but at that time, to the initial dislike of many of the American bishops who desired no interference from Rome, Leo XIII believed that such a council was the wisest course of action. So, early in 1883, a delegation of American bishops was called to Rome to discuss the issues that would be presented at the plenary council the following year.

In Rome, the American bishops accepted, with only minor modificiations, a series of proposals which they were instructed to act upon in conjunction with the other bishops at Baltimore in November, 1884. The major proposals concerned the training of priests, the building of seminaries and parochial schools, the establishment of a Catholic university in the United States directed by the American bishops, the organization of ecclesiastical courts, the question of Catholic participation in non-Catholic organizations (especially such recently condemned secret societies as the Masons), and care of Italian immigrants, Negroes, and Indians.

The periodical press had relatively little to say about the upcoming council or about Leo's intervention

in American Catholic Church affairs. The only significant responses were made by the Protestant Independent and by the conservative Catholic Review of New York. The Independent's editor recognized that the council's chief business would be to secure unity in discipline and administration within the American Church, and thereby to "correct existing abuses, repress hastiness and rashness, and excite more vigorous action."[5] Yet, late in July, 1884, on the eve of the council, another editorial in the same periodical warned Rome that American Catholics disliked papal interference even more than the English Catholics who, in the sixteenth century, broke with Rome on that count.[6]

The Catholic Review, in 1883, carried an editorial which tried to dispel any rumors predicting a spirit of non-cooperation with the pope in connection with the upcoming council. The bishops, stated the editor, would be absolutely docile to Leo's wise guidance.[7]

In 1886, several months after the council's decrees were finally sent to Rome for Leo's approval, the editor of The Catholic Review declared that although the decrees had been only partially released for publication, their promulgation by way of sermons and a major pastoral letter indicated that the council fathers had acted in complete harmony with Leo's desires

> . . . to root up abuses if there were any; to strengthen ecclesiastical discipline; to so order

> the state of the Dioceses that they may more nearly approach, as far as it can be secured, the Common Law of the Church, and to spread far and near and give due impulse and progress to the Catholic religion.[8]

Periodical response, then, to Leo's intervention and Romanization of the American Church was minimal, despite the political atmosphere surrounding the Church in 1884, when Republican presidential candidate James Blaine had allowed the Democrats to be called the party of "rum, Romanism, and rebellion."

The Independent had revealed its awareness that the council would result in more papal control over the Church. The journal also revealed rather explicitly a fact that was denied by such periodicals as The Catholic Review, that is, that there was some reluctance in the American hierarchy to any additional controls by Rome. The Independent, of course, strongly implied that such reluctance would hopefully gain momentum in the years ahead.

The Catholic periodical response to Leo's call for a plenary council was also minimal. The only significant comments, from The Catholic Review, were little more than refrains of the conservative Catholic party line; that is, that only a very fine distinction separated the authoritativeness of the pope's doctrinal and disciplinary acts and teachings. In a word, while his doctrinal teachings were to be accepted absolutely and

unconditionally by the faithful, even his disciplinary teachings, though not infallible, were binding on all true Catholics.*

Moreover, The Catholic Review had tried, in its editorial of 1883, to give its readers the impression that harmony reigned within the American hierarchy with respect to the bishops' response to Leo's call for a plenary council. Later developments, as subsequent sections of this study will show, were to prove that claim false.

The reputedly liberal Catholic World of New York, which might have provided some insights into the divisiveness within the hierarchy, instead chose to remain silent on the matter of the pope's intervention. This silent

---

*A more detailed discussion of the differences between a liberal and a conservative Catholic will be made in Chapter VI, in relation to the periodical response to Leo XIII's intervention into the "Americanist" controversy. Until then, suffice it to say that a conservative Catholic was generally less friendly and more defensive than was his liberal counterpart in his attitude toward Protestants; that liberals were more willing to reconcile the Church with democracy and science without fearing that they would undermine their faith; that liberals tended to be loose constructionists, while conservatives tended to be strict constructionists in their interpretation of the pope's authoritative, non-infallible teachings and actions; that conservatives desired a greater degree of Romanization than did the liberals in the operation and policies of the American Church; that liberals placed less emphasis on external religious guidance than did the conservatives; that liberals stressed the importance of developing active virtues far more than did the more authoritarian conservatives; and that conservatives were numerically in the majority in the American hierarchy.

approach

'response

haps, al

conserva

jecting

or calun

influen

call fo

Gibbons

served

This f

suspic

the c

sessi

decre

nifi

the

a sm

late

Cat

se

in

e

C

approach would be used again by the World's editor in "response" to Leo's intervention. Such an approach, perhaps, allowed the editor a way of not agreeing with the conservative response to Leo's intervention without subjecting his journal to possible charges of unorthodoxy or calumny by the conservative Catholic press.

Two other factors should be mentioned as probable influences on the minimal periodical response to Leo's call for and control of the council. First, Archbishop Gibbons of Baltimore, rather than an Italian prelate, served as the pope's Apostolic Delegate to the council. This fact may have lessened the non-Catholic periodicals' suspicions of the council proceedings. Second, most of the council proceedings were carried out in private sessions, and all of the sessions as well as the final decrees were recorded in Latin, hence limiting any significant news coverage of the council. In fact, none of the decrees were ever translated into English, and only a small portion of them were ever released for publication late in 1886.

Likewise, given the minimal nature of the non-Catholic periodical response, it was surprising that the secrecy surrounding the council did not provoke any inuendoes from the anti-Catholic journals. It was equally surprising that none of the leading periodicals, Catholic or otherwise, ever printed the pastoral letter

release

summed

effect,

America

comment

most pr

that th

of papa

America

We
we
Chu
we
pri
. .
is
tut
Chu

1885,

ter, a

the id

Americ

any re

the ne

journa

Pastor

schoo

Revie

the p

released by the bishops in December, 1884, a letter which summed up the major decrees of the council and which, in effect, represented the wishes of Pope Leo XIII for the American Church. Non-Catholic journals did not even comment on what, perhaps, was the letter's potentially most provocative claim; a statement strongly implying that there was perfect compatibility between the doctrine of papal infallibility and the civil loyalty of the American Catholic:

> We repudiate with equal earnestness the assertion that we need to lay aside any of our devotedness to Our Church to be true Americans, and the insinuation that we need to abate any of our love for our country's principles and institutions, to be faithful Catholics. . . . No less logical would be the notion, that there is aught in the free spirit of our American institutions, incompatible with perfect docility to the Church of Christ.[9]

The American Catholic Quarterly Review, in January, 1885, published a lengthy paraphrase of the pastoral letter, and mentioned that the council fathers had refuted the idea that a loyal Catholic could not also be a loyal American, but even this lone commentary did not provoke any response from leading non-Catholic journals. Over the next few years, however, Protestant and secular journals would respond critically to another of the pastoral's decrees, the directive to build parochial schools to combat what The American Catholic Quarterly Review referred to as "an instrument of debauchery," the public school.[10]

Likewise, in the years following the council and its pastoral letter, Leo's continued intervention into major episodes of American Catholic history would provoke a portion of the secular and Protestant periodical press to seriously question the compatibility between Catholicism and Americanism. Those critical responses will be documented in the course of discussing subsequent occurrences of Leo's intervention during the next fourteen years, 1886-1899.

Five major areas of concern had helped prompt Pope Leo XIII to call for a plenary council in 1884: the question of Catholic membership in secret societies; the question of episcopal discipline of allegedly refractory priests; the question of public versus parochial education for Catholic students; the problem of caring for and Americanizing Catholic immigrants; and the desire to Romanize the American Church, thereby insuring a greater measure of papal control. The remainder of this chapter will be focused on the periodical response to the pope's intervention into the major episodes arising from the first two areas of papal concern. Those episodes involved the Knights of Labor and Father Edward McGlynn.

The pastoral of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore included a prohibition against Catholic membership in "Masonic and kindred societies" because they

were deemed hostile to the faith. That prohibition was in accord with Leo XIII's encyclical Humanum Genus (On Freemasonry, April 20, 1884) in which the pope exhorted the bishops of the world to warn their people against the Masons.[11]

In 1885, Montreal's Cardinal-elect Taschereau issued, with Rome's consent, a circular to the clergy of the Archdiocese of Quebec condemning the Canadian branch of the Knights of Labor. The secret nature of the labor organization's ceremonies as well as certain disturbances involving the Canadian Knights had convinced the Cardinal-elect that the union was somewhat kindred to the Masons and therefore, potentially dangerous to the Catholic faith.[12]

In 1887, Taschereau went to Rome to receive the red hat and to secure a more formal denunciation of the Knights. Cardinal-elect James Gibbons of Baltimore was also in Rome to receive the red hat, and was determined to prevent Taschereau's influence from affecting the American Knights. Gibbons' conferences during the previous October with the Knights' president, Terence Powderly, had convinced him that the Knights were essentially compatible with Catholicism.[13]

On February 20, 1887, therefore, Gibbons presented to Curia officials a formal written defense of the Knights. After establishing the essentially Christian

character of the organization, he warned that if the Knights were condemned in America, Catholic workers, who composed at least half of the Knights, might leave the Church and be drawn into the camp of the revolutionaries. As a result of Gibbons' effort, the pope, through the Congregation of the Propaganda, issued a formal tolerari possunt (they can be tolerated), thus lifting the ban on the Canadian Knights and giving tentative, but conditional approval to the American Knights. The papal decision was rendered in August, 1888, when rank and file disillusionment with the Knights' ineffectiveness over the previous two years had sent the organization's membership plummeting down from a peak of over 700,000 in 1886 to 200,000 in 1888.[14]

Between the time of Gibbons' memorial on behalf of the Knights in February, 1887 and the promulgation of the pope's tolerari possunt in August, 1888, the ban on the Canadian Knights was lifted provided that they would abide by the final papal decision. It was during this interim period that the press coverage was quantitatively the greatest.[15]

The widespread coverage of Gibbons' actions on behalf of the Knights was not paralleled by an outpouring of periodical editorials and articles concerning the intervention of Pope Leo XIII. The most significant Catholic periodical response to Leo's intervention into

the Knights of Labor episode was made by the conservative Catholic Review. The editor, P. V. Hickey, stressed that the pope's decision to lift the ban on the Canadian Knights until a final decision could be made was not to be interpreted as a papal approval of the organization. It was simply a withholding of judgment to give the Knights (in America as well as in Canada) a chance to "approve itself to reason, to the law of the land, and to the law of God."[16]

In a more optimistic tone, the Protestant Independent commended Gibbons and anticipated an affirmative response from the pope. The Christian Union's editors, months before Leo's final decision on the Knights, said that the pope's refusal to condemn the Knights had put the Church at the head of the labor movement in America and had done much to weaken the schemes of the socialists. The Episcopal Churchman of New York was less amiable when its editor stated that Gibbons' action had opened the door for the pope's intervention into the political and social affairs of the United States.[17]

Among secular journals, the Journal of United Labor, the official organ of the Knights in America, favorably publicized Gibbons' defense of their organization, but made no predictions as to what the pope's final decision would be. The Nation, on the other hand, a consistent foe of the Knights, admonished Gibbons for

seeking the approval of "the Vicar of Jesus Christ" for "one of the most antisocial and despotic organizations ever" established.[18]

When, in 1888, the pope's tolerari possunt was issued, the Knights of Labor in America, as mentioned earlier, had dwindled to less than one-third of its 1886 membership. Perhaps this helped to account for the sparse response from the periodical press, Catholic and otherwise. The editor of the conservative American Catholic Quarterly Review, however, was not convinced that the Knights were no longer a powerful force. He did stress that Leo's tolerari was not an approbation of the organization, but rather that it was an inducement for the Knights to more carefully select their members and to avoid anything savoring of socialism, even the state socialism of its president, T. V. Powderly. Only then, concluded the editor, could the Knights be an effective bulwark against the encroachments of capital on the rights of the worker. The anti-Catholic Protestant Standard, on the other hand, simply dismissed the pope's decision as a result of his having been outfoxed by the Irish blarney of Cardinal Gibbons.[19]

The rather limited direct periodical response to Leo XIII's intervention into the Knights of Labor episode need not be taken as a sign of indifference to the pope's intervention. The Knights declining importance by 1888

must certainly be taken into account as a factor influencing the sparsity of periodical comments about Leo's decision. On the other hand, after the papal decision of 1888, both liberal and conservative Catholic opinion was to be more tolerant of unionism. Gibbons' defense and Leo's decision, despite a few conservative bishops' efforts to prevent the tolerari, had placed the Catholic Church on the side of the workers.[20] Even the responses of the influential Independent and The Christian Union gave indications that a substantial portion of articulate Protestant opinion had perceived that more than charity and the improvement of human nature were necessary to secure justice for all in the industrial society of the late nineteenth century.

Another major episode of the American Catholic Church related to the social question of the day and resulting in the intervention of Pope Leo XIII was the case of Father Edward McGlynn. The response of the periodical press to Leo's intervention in this episode was both qualitatively and quantitatively more revealing of the periodicals' image of the pope than was their response to his intervention into the episodes revolving around the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore and the Knights of Labor.

In 1886, McGlynn, the pastor of St. Stephen's parish in New York, and a priest widely known for his disagreement with the conservative Catholic advocates of charity and patience as a solution to the social injustices of the day, openly campaigned for the mayoral candidacy of Henry George and became an avowed supporter of the single tax theories of his candidate. Because of his position, McGlynn was suspended by his conservative Archbishop Michael Corrigan, and was called to Rome to defend his views. McGlynn chose to ignore both the suspension and the order to go to Rome to defend himself against charges of heresy. In 1887, at the bequest of Corrigan, Pope Leo XIII excommunicated the priest. Five years later, in December, 1892, the personal ablegate of the pope, Archbishop Francesco Satolli, under the influence of the liberal bishops in the American hierarchy, reinstated McGlynn after the priest had made only minor retractions of his earlier economic creed.[21]

The year before McGlynn's excommunication, 1886, was a year wrought with strikes, lockouts, and shutdowns, and the year when the Haymarket Square riots in Chicago brought charges of anarchism and socialism to the labor movement, despite the Knights of Labor official policy against any violent tactics. It was also the year when McGlynn, along with a coalition of "single taxers, socialists, union members, and thousands of citizens

who we

suppo

misse

McGly

his e

Catho

suppo

The

but

refu

egot

Worl

and

libe

sig

the

men

sor

the

sa

th

he

ag

who were just plain irritated [with social injustices] supported Henry George with such fervor that he barely missed winning the mayorship of New York."[22]

Conservative Catholic journals were aghast at McGlynn's involvement, and following the announcement of his excommunication, the influential Catholic Review and Catholic News, both of New York, voiced strong editorial support of Leo's action against the rebel priest-reformer. The journals' editors agreed that the pope had no choice but to excommunicate McGlynn because of the priest's refusal to heed the call to Rome and because of his egotistical, cowardly, and communistic insanity.[23]

The leading liberal Catholic journal, The Catholic World, made no comment concerning the pope and McGlynn, and in 1892, when the priest was reinstated, neither liberal nor conservative Catholic journals made any significant comments one way or another. In fact, for the most part, they did not even mention the reinstatement.[24]

Among influential secular journals, W. P. Garrison's laissez-faire oriented Nation was delighted over the pope's action in the McGlynn case. Leo's action, said the editor, would have the effect of destroying the priest's considerable Catholic following. Moreover, he argued (in a journal which was not known for its agreement with many aspects of Catholic discipline and

organization), the priest brought the excommunication upon himself by his refusal to go to Rome, an act of blatant disobedience against his rightful superior, the pope.[25]

Other important secular journals whose editors did not seem to have the same axe as Garrison had to grind, were critical of the pope's intervention into what they deemed the true spirit of American freedom. In such journals as Harper's Weekly, The Forum, and Public Opinion, editors and writers never denied the basic fallacy of McGlynn's economic theories, but all of them argued or implied that the pope had not been justified in depriving the priest of the right to hold a personal view in any economic or political matter. Moreover, an editorial in Harper's and an article in The Forum both agreed that Leo had excommunicated McGlynn not primarily because of his economic theories, but because of his refusal to obey the call to Rome. The excommunication, they agreed, was an example of the tyrannical authority of the pope and a confirmation of the frequent charge that the pope controlled his American clergy both spiritually and temporally.[26]

Harper's editor added, however, that there was one redeeming factor to the whole affair--namely, that McGlynn's steadfastness as well as the large numbers of American Catholics who had rallied to his support

il
to
Rom
Pub
in t
poli
who
prej
of f

natic
New Y
criti
affai
nor Ly
with M
hold t
person
Leo a
to an
had ear
Cardina
f.n. 17
as orde
Gibbons
Labor. 28

illustrated how the American spirit of freedom was able to influence even so uncongenial an institution as the Roman Catholic Church. Hopefully, added an article in Public Opinion, more and more American Catholics would, in the future, refuse to allow themselves to become the political slaves of an unsympathetic Italian priest who "from out of the graveyard of buried bigotry and prejudice . . . [has] stalked forth to chill the blood of free and intelligent thought."[27]

Two leading Protestant journals, the nondenominational Independent and The Christian Union, both of New York, expressed less impassioned but nonetheless critical views of Leo's intervention in the McGlynn affair. Neither H. C. Bowen, editor of The Independent, nor Lyman Abbott, editor of The Christian Union, agreed with McGlynn's theories, but both defended his right to hold them. On the other hand, Abbott criticized McGlynn's personal attacks against Leo XIII (McGlynn had called Leo a bag of bones, among other things, in an address to an almost exclusively Catholic audience). Bowen (who had earlier anticipated a papal decision favorable to Cardinal Gibbons in the case of the Knights of Labor [see f.n. 17]) editorialized that had the priest gone to Rome as ordered, he might have emerged as victorious as did Gibbons after the latter's defense of the Knights of Labor.[28]

Catholi

silent

Christ

victor

the Am

viewed

of ind

the Am

had be

Indepe

to the

series

reinst

next c

Cathol

Pope L

the qu

his di

McGlyn

theori

its ar

only a

for th

When McGlynn was reinstated in 1892, while Catholic and secular periodicals were for the most part silent, the editors of both The Independent and The Christian Union interpreted the reinstatement as a victory for American democracy and for the liberals in the American hierarchy. Moreover, the reinstatement was viewed as a sign that the pope was approving the spirit of independence and progress which had become manifest in the American Catholic Church since the Knights of Labor had been vindicated in 1888. Finally, the editor of The Independent added that the pope's increasing committment to the liberal bishops (a conclusion derived from a series of papal interventions in addition to McGlynn's reinstatement, all of which will be discussed in the next chapter) was applauded by all Americans, whether Catholic or Protestant.[29]

The central point of the periodical response to Pope Leo XIII's intervention in the McGlynn affair was the question of the pope's authority, and not primarily his disagreement with the economic theories of Edward McGlynn. None of the journals defended McGlynn's theories, for Georgism was allegedly socialistic in its arguments against private property ownership, and only a minority of Americans viewed socialism as a cure for the ills of an increasingly industrialized society.

view of

critici

critici

afterth

authori

than th

the lea

was, pe

agreeme

servat

itself

The Na

interv

popula

especi

the ai

pope's

episod

ammuni

the in

Cathol

tone,

The Ch

Catholic periodicals reflected the conservative view of ecclesiastical authority by concentrating their criticism on McGlynn's disobedience toward Leo, and by criticizing the priest's economic theories almost as an afterthought. The conservative view of ecclesiastical authority over faith and morals was more encompassing than the liberal Catholic view. Indeed, the silence of the leading liberal Catholic journal, The Catholic World, was, perhaps, a timid yet implicit way of "voicing" disagreement with the pope's intervention, and with the conservative view of that intervention without subjecting itself to charges of unorthodoxy.[30]

Important secular journals, with the exception of The Nation, projected a "pope-as-bogeyman" image of Leo's intervention in the McGlynn episode. This image was a popular one during the late 1880's and early 1890's, especially in the columns of journals sympathetic to the aims of the American Protective Association. The pope's intervention in the McGlynn affair (among other episodes to be discussed in subsequent chapters) provided ammunition for editors and writers determined to prove the incompatibility between American democracy and Roman Catholicism.

The Protestant periodicals, despite their critical tone, were more accommodating than the secular journals. The Christian Union's editor revealed a basic respect for

the per

his nam

far as

than he

appeale

Corriga

periodi

the rei

more ar

fit int

period

with t

a few

was ne

ing to

to Leo

affair

column

The Ind

orable

journa

episode

Cathol

the person of Pope Leo XIII when it derided McGlynn for his name calling. The more friendly Independent went so far as to editorialize that Leo was actually more liberal than he was reputed to be, and that McGlynn should have appealed directly to the pope instead of allowing only Corrigan's side of the story to be told. Moreover, both periodicals were consistent and honest enough to report the reinstatement of McGlynn, a fact which some of the more anti-Catholic periodicals would have found hard to fit into their "bogeyman" stereotype of the pope.

Between 1884 and 1888, the response of the periodical press to the interventions of Pope Leo XIII, with the exception of conservative Catholic journals and a few remarks in the columns of leading Protestant journals, was neither quantitatively great nor particularly flattering to the image of the pope.

During the early 1890's, the periodical response to Leo's acts of intervention into American Catholic affairs would become quantitatively greater, and, in the columns of two of the most influential Protestant journals, The Independent and The Christian Union, much more favorable, despite the efforts of critical or anti-Catholic journals to discredit Leo XIII. Equally important, the episodes which brought about Leo's intervention, and the Catholic periodical response to that intervention would

refle

betwe

hiera

and w

reflect, among other things, an increasingly serious rift between conservative and liberal bishops in the American hierarchy, and between conservative and liberal editors and writers.

XXXIV

[base
XXXVI

p. 16
nal Gi
The Br

is the
more,
any ge

XXXV (

TI, XX

256-57

LXXV (
Cathol

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER III

[1]Editorial, "Cardinals vs. Independence," TI, XXXIV (August 3, 1882), 16.

[2]"Roman Catholic Statistics in the United States," [based on Sadlier's The Catholic Directory, 1884], TI, XXXVI (February 28, 1884), 14.

[3]Shaughnessy, Has the Immigrant Kept the Faith? p. 161, in Rev. John Tracy Ellis, The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, 1834-1921 (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1952), I, 203.

[4]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 203-57, is the best account of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, and unless otherwise indicated, is the source of any general information pertaining to the council.

[5]Editorial, "The American Catholic Church," TI, XXXV (June 28, 1883), 816.

[6]Editorial, "Flexibility of American Catholicism," TI, XXXVI (July 31, 1884), 17.

[7]Editorial Note, CR, XXIV (December 15, 1883), 369.

[8]"The Plenary Council," CR, XXIX (April 17, 1886), 256-57.

[9]Acta et Decreta Concilii Baltimorensis Tertii, LXXV (Baltimore, 1886), quoted in McAvoy, History of the Catholic Church, pp. 261-62.

[10]"Pastoral Letter of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore," ACQR, X (January, 1885), 8, 13.

[11]"The Pastoral Letter of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1884, on Sunday Desecration, Intemperance, and Forbidden Societies, in The National Postorals of the American Hierarchy, 1792-1919, ed. by Peter Guilday (Washington, D.C.: The National Catholic Welfare Council, 1923), pp. 253-62, reprinted in Aaron I. Abell, ed., American Catholic Thought on Social Questions (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1968), p. 119.

[12]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 492. Ellis' biography of Gibbons contains an excellent account of the Knights of Labor episode (486-546). The definitive work on the Knights and the Church is Henry Browne, The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor (Washington: Catholic University Press, 1949). A briefer account is in Robert Cross, The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America (2nd ed. rev.; Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1958), pp. 115-19.

[13]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 506-08.

[14]James Cardinal Gibbons, "The Knights of Labor," reprinted from James Cardinal Gibbons, A Retrospect of Fifty Years (Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1919), 186-209, in American Catholic Thought, ed. by Aaron Abell, p. 161; Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 521; Samuel P. Hays, The Response to Industrialism, 1885-1914 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), pp. 36-37.

[15]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 512, 514-15; and Browne, Catholic Church, pp. 243-55.

[16]Editorial, "Rome and the Knights of Labor," CR, XXXI (May 1, 1887), 296. See too, James Cardinal Gibbons, "On the Question of the Knights of Labor," CR, XXXI (April 30, 1887), 279, 383; Editorial Note, CR, XXXI (April 30, 1887), 273; "The Knights of Labor," CR, XXIX (May 8, 1886), 318; and, "James Cardinal Gibbons and the Knights of Labor" [An Interview], CR, XXIX (May 30, 1886), 386.

[17]The Churchman (May 9, 1887), and TI (April 7, 1887), in Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 512; "The Outlook," CU, XXXVII (January 5, 1888), 3.

[18]"The Church and the Knights," Journal of United Labor, VII (April 16, 1887), 2356; and, Cardinal Manning, "The Liberty of Association," Journal of United Labor, VII (May 7, 1887), 2377-78; "The Week," TN, XLIV (March 17, 1887), 218. See too, "The Week," TN, XLIV (March 24, 1887), 247, and "The Week," TN, XLIV (March 31, 1887), 261.

[19]C. Jannet, Land and Labor in France and the United States, reviewed in ACQR, XIV (January, 1889), 21-22; The Protestant Standard (July 26, 1887), in Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 521.

[20]See, for example, J. Talbot Smith [associate editor of the conservative Catholic Review], "Workman Should Not Only Act But Think," in the liberal Catholic World, XLVII (September, 1888), 838-43, wherein he advocated that labor unions should utilize legislative procedures rather than strikes and boycotts to effect an improved condition in their ranks. See too, Henry O'Keeffe, "The Church and the Toilers," CW, L (January, 1890), 539-42; and, Editorial, "State Socialism and Social Reform," CR, XXXV (February 3, 1889), 88.

[21]Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, pp. 118-24; more detailed accounts are in Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 546-94, and in F. Zwierlein, The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid (Rochester: n.p., 1925-1927), III, 1-83, for the liberal and conservative sides, respectively.

[22]Eric F. Goldman, Rendezvous With Destiny: A History of Modern American Reform (2nd ed. rev.; New York: Vantage Books, 1956), p. 35.

[23]Editorial, "McGlynnism," The Catholic News, I (May 1, 1887), 4; Editorial Note, CR, XXXII (July 16, 1887), 33. See too, Editorial, "McGlynn's Mistake," The Catholic News, I (April 17, 1887), 4; and, Editorial Note, WW, XVIII (February 12, 1887), 4; Editorial, CR, XXXIII (January 22, 1888), 56.

[24]See "Topics of the Hour," CR, XLIII (January 7, 1893), 1, for a brief mention of his reinstatement.

Week,"
TN, XLV
of Amer

XXXI (J
Republ

II (Ja
Sacram
McGlyn

34; "T
torial
(April
Knees,
"The R
Editor

Cathol
CU, XL
XLVII
XLVII

the fa
bishop
did th
Henry
of For
Gibbon

[25]"The Week," TN, XLV (July 7, 1887), 3; "The Week," TN, XLV (July 14, 1887), 21-22; and, "The Week," TN, XLV (November 10, 1887), 362. See too, Mott, History of American Magazines, III, 342.

[26]Editorial, "The Vatican and Dr. McGlynn," HW, XXXI (July 9, 1887), 482; L. Boulard, "Romanism and the Republic," TF, V (July, 1888), 555-59.

[27]"Henry George and the Papacy," Public Opinion, II (January 22, 1887), 313, reprinted from the Daily Bee, Sacramento, California; and, Editorial, "Rome and Dr. McGlynn," HW, XXXI (July 23, 1887), 518-19.

[28]"The Outlook," CU, XXXVII (January 12, 1888), 34; "The Outlook," CU, XXXVII (May 31, 1888), 674; Editorial, "Dr. McGlynn and Cardinal Gibbons," TI, XXXIX (April 17, 1887), 17; Editorial, "An Archbishop on His Knees," TI, XXXIX (April 28, 1887), 17-18; Editorial, "The Roman Machine," TI, XXXIX (June 30, 1887), 17; and, Editorial Note, TI, XL (January 12, 1888), 44.

[29]Editorial, "Another Victory for the Liberal Catholics," TI, XLIV (December 29, 1893), 11; Editorial, CU, XLVI (December 31, 1892), 11; "The Outlook," CU, XLVII (January 14, 1893), 57-58; "The Outlook," CU, XLVII (January 21, 1893), 103.

[30]This inference may, perhaps, be strengthened by the fact that both Gibbons and Ireland, two leading liberal bishops, were not in favor of McGlynn's condemnation, nor did they favor Archbishop Corrigan's attempts to have Henry George's Progress and Poverty placed on the Index of Forbidden Books. See Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 509, 550-58.

CHAPTER IV

THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: THE SECOND STAGE, 1889-1893

The bogeyman stereotype of Leo XIII persisted in a small portion of the periodical press during the 1890's, but two episodes which induced the pope to intervene into American Catholic Church affairs during the early 1890's helped to discredit that stereotype and to inspire the two leading nondenominational Protestant periodicals to project a decidedly improved image of the pope in terms of his role as spiritual leader of the American Church. Those two episodes were the Cahensly affair and the school controversy.

In April and again in June, 1891, Peter Cahensly, a German merchant and a leader of the European branch of the international immigrant welfare organization, St. Raphael's Society, presented formal written memorials to Pope Leo XIII on behalf of the spiritual welfare of Catholic (especially German Catholic) immigrants to

Amer

effo

ing

bish

by

comm

July

of

popu

Ame

all

min

in

re

rea

di

in

Pr

ag

si

ci

ab

pe

America. Among his proposals were requests for a greater effort to organize parishes, priests, and schools according to nationality, and for the appointment of more German bishops to the American hierarchy.[1]

The majority of the American hierarchy, dominated by Irish prelates, opposed the plan. Their opposition was communicated to the pope through Cardinal Gibbons, and in July, Gibbons received a letter from the pope's Secretary of State, Cardinal Rampolla, in which he was told that the pope had rejected the idea of deliberately fragmenting the American Church according to nationality, especially by allowing a system of national bishops to be established.[2]

The periodical response to Leo's intervention was minimal but revealing. The Catholic Review editorialized in glowing terms the pope's political astuteness in his rejection of the Cahensly memorials; that is, Leo's realization that Americans desired no European influences directing their affairs, particularly in matters concerning the assimilation of immigrants. The editor of the Protestant Independent and of the secular Public Opinion agreed, and added that Leo was a statesman not only for simply refusing to accept Cahensly's scheme, but especially for realizing that language assimilation was absolutely necessary to promote unity of ideas among peoples of diverse national origins.[3]

par
Ame
bis
Cat
num
Iri
lar
Ame
cor
to
tha
mai
wou

hie
bi
to
Th
to
an
in

le
Po
in

The Catholic periodical response reflected, in part, the dominant position of the Irish bishops in the American hierarchy, and the bitterness of the German bishops who felt that the large numbers of German Catholics in the American Church justified a greater number of German bishops in the hierarchy. Unlike the Irish bishops, who were unanimous in their belief that language assimilation was a necessary first step to Americanization, the German bishops, most of whom were conservatives, were more cautious about their approach to Americanization. They tended to cling to the belief that unless old world language and cultural ties were maintained in the new world, the faith of their flocks would be endangered.[4]

The nationalistic divisions within the American hierarchy, particularly among the German and Irish bishops, were relatively, though not absolutely parallel to the liberal-conservative split in the hierarchy. This source of tension and divisiveness was to continue to plague the American Church for the rest of the century, and would occasion additional acts of papal intervention into American Church affairs.

At any rate, the generally favorable response of leading Catholic, Protestant, and secular periodicals to Pope Leo's rejection of the Cahensly memorials reflected, in broader perspective, the vast and complexed problems

rela

the

teer

Cath

Duri

mos

Uni

but

alo

gro

who

new

qui

tar

era

agi

old

se

fo

Pr

ta

ve

re

ur

related to the influx of large numbers of immigrants to the United States during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Immigration added more than 1 1/2 million Catholics to the American Church between 1880 and 1900. During the 1880's alone, over 600,000 Catholic immigrants, mostly from southern and eastern Europe, came to the United States. Irish and German immigration continued, but on a much smaller scale than in the 1840's.[5] Hence, along with the German population, there were rapidly growing numbers of other non-English speaking peoples who perpetuated their native language and customs in the new world.

The Catholic Church in the United States was quickly taking on the qualities of a prism, and inadvertantly becoming the victim of an identity crisis. In an era of heightened national feeling and of increasing agitation for immigration restriction, the shadow of the old world which hung so heavily over the American Church served to enhance its susceptibility to charges of foreignism and un-Americanism. This fact made the Protestant and secular periodical press, whether blatantly anti-Catholic or not, more alert to papal intervention into the problems of American Catholicism.

Needless to say, had Leo complied with Cahensly's requests, the already difficult problem of attempting to unify the membership within the American Church and of

tryir

would

Morec

Assoc

durir

provi

sade.

affai

schoo

bilit

eyes

of imr

ing th

contr

questi

of edu

contr

cussed

period

outset

in par

public

trying to minimize suspicions from non-Catholic circles would have been compounded for the American hierarchy. Moreover, such organizations as the American Protective Association which was growing in power and popularity during the first half of the 1890's, would have been provided with additional fuel for its anti-Catholic crusade. Certainly, Leo's intervention in the Cahensly affair (and subsequently, his intervention into the school controversy) did not serve to enhance the credibility of the American Protective Association in the eyes of leading non-Catholic journals.[6]

The problem of Americanizing the large proportion of immigrants among the Catholic minority without endangering their religious faith was related to another topic of controversy which reached a peak in 1892-1893--the question of public versus parochial schools as a means of educating Catholic children.

Pope Leo XIII intervened more directly in this controversy than in any of the preceding episodes discussed, and there was a correspondingly more direct periodical response to the pope's intervention. At the outset of the controversy leading non-Catholic periodicals, in particular, reflected a widespread belief that the public school system was a primary bulwark of American

democ

at al

weake

contr

to hi

schoo

Balti

betwe

meani

based

requi

child

bisho

what

schoo

resol

liber

resol

part

equa

pare

paro

felt

is,

democracy, and therefore, must be protected and defended at all costs against any apparent attempts to minimize, weaken, or destroy it.

The question of Leo's intervention in the school controversy of the period, and of the periodical response to his intervention must be understood in light of the school resolution passed by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884, and by the subsequent disagreement between liberal and conservative bishops as to the real meaning of the resolution. The Baltimore resolution, based on an earlier papal request, was a formal order requiring pastors to build parochial schools for the children of their parishes. Although the conservative bishops were the most vocal in their denunciations of what they deemed the Godless character of the public schools, both liberals and conservatives supported the resolution.[7]

Problems subsequently arose, however, when liberals and conservatives began to interpret the resolution in terms of its practical application to particular circumstances. Liberals believed that wherever equal or superior parochial schools did not exist, Catholic parents should not be forced to send their children to parochial schools. Conservatives, on the other hand, felt that an inferior parochial school (inferior, that is, in the teaching of secular subjects) was still

prefer

religi

charac

public

Libera

to wor

whereb

mainta

portio

secula

effor

Catho

inter

The N

polic

react

Error

charg

build

minds

obedi

journ

as Le

preferable to the public school because of the absence of religious instruction and the allegedly anti-Catholic character of the latter.[8]

Both liberals and conservatives believed that public funds should be provided for parochial schools. Liberals, however, unlike the conservatives, were willing to work out compromises with the public school authorities whereby the principle of church-state separation could be maintained and the public monies used only for the secular portion of the Catholic child's education.[9]

During the period between 1884 and 1890, leading secular and Protestant periodicals concentrated their efforts on criticizing the more vocal conservative Catholic view on the school question, a view widely interpreted as coming from the pope. An article for The North American Review in 1885, argued that Leo's policy on the education of American Catholics echoed the reactionary fulminations of Pius IX and the Syllabus of Errors. In 1888, The Forum carried an article which charged that Leo's primary motive for ordering the buildup of parochial schools was to instill into the minds of little Catholic children the spirit of absolute obedience to Rome.[10]

In 1889, the influential anti-Catholic Protestant journal, Our Day, editorialized concerning what was deemed as Leo's destructive intentions upon the public school

system in America. In 1890, even the more moderate Christian Union editors argued that papal interference in American education clearly implied that American Catholics were expected to give their first loyalty to Leo XIII rather than to their country.[11]

Between 1891 and 1893, the school controversy reached its peak, and the series of events which helped to bring it to that stage also caused some of the previously critical periodicals to take a more favorable view of Pope Leo XIII's stand on parochial education. The intensification of the controversy began in 1891 when the liberal archbishop of St. Paul, Minnesota, John Ireland, arranged for state support of the parochial schools in the Faribault and Stillwater communities on the condition that religion be taught after school hours. Conservatives such as Archbishop Corrigan of New York accused Ireland of trying to undermine parochial education, and in 1892, Ireland felt forced to go to Rome to defend his idea. The pope's decision on the case was issued through the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith in April, 1892. As in the earlier decision on the Knights of Labor, so also in this case, the result was a tolerari potest (it can be tolerated).[12]

Editorials in both The Christian Union and The Independent viewed Archbishop Ireland's school plan favorably. More important, Leo's decision was praised

as

ind

for

at

ter

cor

dec

the

lib

an

and

hav

Nor

su

Le

th

ic

ta

to

fo

as being in accordance with American ideals and as an indication that the pope was slowly moving away from his formerly ultramontane stand on the school issue.[13]

While the secular periodicals were rather silent at this point in the controversy, the Catholic periodicals tended to reflect the disagreement between liberal and conservative bishops as to the meaning of the papal decision. The Western Watchman of St. Louis, edited by the outspoken Rev. David Phelan, frequently took both liberals and conservatives to task. In this case, Phelan, an admirer and friend of Ireland, sided with the liberals and argued that Archbishop Corrigan of New York should have been interdicted for protesting the papal decision.[14] None of the more consistently liberal journals, however, such as The Catholic World, made any direct response to Leo's decision.

The leading conservative Catholic journals, on the other hand, such as The Catholic Review and The American Catholic Quarterly Review, reflected the interpretation which most conservative bishops gave to Leo's tolerari. The Catholic Review, for example, saw the following implications in the papal decision:

> The duty of the hour, therefore, for all the Catholics in the United States, is to get together, and putting out of sight all past controversies, to build up the school system from which God is not banished. We must press on until every Catholic child receiving instruction, is in a Catholic school, bearing the double burden of public and private

t
c
t

Yet,

respo

refle

the h

was r

than

schoo

perio

(soon

annua

on No

ablega

fourte

contr

Althou

ing o

the s

schoo

favor

autho

where

both

> taxation for educational purposes until our fellow-citizens relieve us of the injustice. For us now, there is no room for doubt or controversy.[15]

Yet, the controversy did not end, and the periodical response to Leo's further intervention continued to reflect the split between liberals and conservatives in the hierarchy, except that the liberal response to Leo was reflected more clearly by Protestant periodicals than by journals of reputedly liberal Catholic opinion.

The next stage of Leo's intervention in the school controversy which drew a response from the periodical press was the address of the papal ablegate (soon to be appointed as Apostolic Delegate) to the annual meeting of the American Archbishops in New York on November 16, 1892. Speaking in Leo's name, the ablegate, Archbishop Francesco Satolli, presented fourteen propositions intended to settle the school controversy and to heal the breach in the hierarchy. Although the propositions strongly encouraged the building of parochial schools, clergy were forbidden to deny the sacraments to parents sending their children to public schools. Even more important, the propositions were favorable to arrangements between Church and civil authorities such as that made by Archbishop Ireland, wherein "due consideration was shown for the rights of both parties."[16]

propo

prese

out c

they

In th

The c

just

Liber

to cc

tant

The e

addre

stead

Ameri

state

schoo

An ar

conse

crush

was c

and t

its n

the S

Only one archbishop, John Ireland, accepted the propositions completely. The other archbishops who were present were prevented from rejecting the propositions out of respect for Cardinal Gibbons who suggested that they give further consideration to the ablegate's message. In the following weeks, appeals were sent to Leo XIII. The conservatives protested the ablegate's propositions just as they had earlier protested Ireland's school plan. Liberals, working through Cardinal Gibbons, asked Leo to confirm Satolli's propositions as soon as possible.[17]

While both sides awaited a reply, leading Protestant periodicals gave wide coverage to Satolli's address. The editors of The Christian Union interpreted the address as further evidence that Leo was slowly but steadily moving away from ultramontanism and toward Americanism. All liberal Protestants, the editors stated, applauded the kind of modus vivendi on the school question suggested by Leo through his ablegate. An article in The Independent agreed, and added that conservative opposition within the hierarchy must be crushed. By the beginning of 1893, The Christian Union was optimistic that the conservatives had been crushed and that the liberals were "in the saddle."[18]

Among secular periodicals, The Forum, true to its name, carried articles expressing opposite views of the Satolli address. While one of the articles, written

by a Congregational minister, was in essential agreement with the editors of The Christian Union and The Independent, the other article illustrated the alarmist technique of the American Protective Association and its sympathizers. The latter article, written by Methodist Episcopal Bishop John Vincent, called Ireland's school plan an example of the nation surrendering to the Church. Moreover, he said, the pope's temporary policy of allowing the Catholic parent to choose whether or not to send his child to a parochial school was nothing more than an attempt to reconcile liberal and conservative bishops so as to get on with the chief work of making Roman Catholicism dominant in the United States--primarily by dividing public school funds to support Catholic education. The editor of Our Day, a Protestant anti-Catholic journal, agreed with Bishop Vincent's view.[19]

The editor of The Nation, however (not renowned for his friendliness toward the Church), reacted with admiration and surprise at what he termed the "unexpected consequences" of the pope's intervention thus far in the school controversy:

> If the papal approval of Archbishop Ireland's Faribault plan was of itself a victory for liberal Catholicism, the subsequent decisions of the Pope, through his representative, and the humiliation of the leader of the reactionaries [Archbishop Corrigan of New York], have put that victory beyond question and made it secure. Infallible wisdom cannot reverse its judgements, and therefore it will no longer be

> possible for good Catholics in this country to maintain their attitude of uncompromising hostility to American public schools.[20]

The liberal Catholic World, in 1890, had published Archbishop Ireland's laudatory (and later controversial) introduction to a biography of its founder, Father Isaac Hecker, a liberal Catholic convert whom Ireland described as in full sympathy with American principles and institutions; but in 1893, as in the past, the World made no response to Leo's decision in the school controversy. Perhaps the journal was content to let Protestant periodicals such as The Christian Union and The Independent be its spokesman for the present.[21]

If the liberal Catholic World chose to be silent, another pro-Ireland journal, The Western Watchman of St. Louis, a maverick periodical of personal journalism edited by the outspoken Rev. David Phelan, supported the pope's decision. Moreover, the editor predicted that despite the continued protests of the conservative bishops, the pope would stand resolutely by Satolli, and in that case, said the editor, one vote was a majority.[22]

The conservative Catholic Review bypassed any direct comments about Satolli's address. It did editorialize, however, that the essence of the archbishop's conference was to encourage the parochial system, that there was no disagreement within the hierarchy over the deliberations of the conference, and that, reports to

the contrary notwithstanding, the conference was certainly not a victory for any alleged liberal Catholic party.[23]

Another conservative journal, The Church Progress of St. Louis, was more outspoken. The journal's editor, Rev. Conde Pallen, argued that Satolli's address carried no more authority than that of a private opinion, and that it certainly should not be taken as the voice of Pope Leo XIII. The editor then added that Satolli was a good friend of Archbishop Ireland, and that this fact had motivated the ablegate's address.[24]

In May, 1893, Leo provoked still further periodical response to his intervention in the school controversy. An apostolic letter, Clara Saepenumero (On the School Question), was sent to Cardinal Gibbons who in turn was instructed to distribute copies to all American bishops. Seeking a reconciliation within the ranks of the American hierarchy, the pope sustained both Ireland and Satolli, but also emphasized that the school legislation of the Baltimore council of 1884 was to remain intact. The key sentence of the letter read:

> The decrees which the Baltimore Councils, agreeably to the direction of the Holy See, have enacted concerning parochial schools, and whatever else has been prescribed by the Roman Pontiffs, whether directly or through the Sacred Congregations, concerning the same matter are to be steadfastly preserved.[25]

In November, 1893, following a relatively peaceful conference of archbishops two months earlier, Cardinal Gibbons wrote to Leo thanking him for the apostolic letter

and assuring the pontiff that all of the archbishops present at the conference had given their full consent to the letter's teachings.[26] Gibbons' optimism, however, belied a tension and divisiveness in the hierarchy which still lurked near the surface and which was to become visible again before the century ended.

The editor of The Independent recognized the tension within the American hierarchy when he said that Leo's letter would not succeed in quelling the controversy over the question of public versus parochial schools. He argued that since Leo had tried to appease both liberals and conservatives, the particular way in which his letter would be enforced would depend upon what party was strongest at any given time. In 1893, the liberal interpretation would prevail because Satolli and the pope seemed to be on the side of Ireland and his party.[27]

In the Fall of 1893, the editor of Our Day looked back in critical retrospect over the whole controversy. Both the tolerari potest of Ireland's school plan and the propositions of the ablegate at the archbishops conference in 1892 were interpreted as part of a papal attempt to Romanize America by attacking the public school system, "the very basis of our general intelligence, thrift, and progress."[28]

Secular periodicals such as The Nation and The North American Review carried articles and editorials

critical of Leo's letter on the school controversy. In both journals, the letter was interpreted as rigid and uncompromising in its promotion of parochial school education and its disparagement of public school education for Catholic children. The chief article in The Nation was authored by a Roman correspondent who was probably tuned in to the primarily conservative press of Rome, while the article in The North American Review was authored by William C. Doane, Episcopal Bishop of Albany, a consistent critic of the Catholic Church.[29]

The Catholic periodical response to Leo's letter was sparse. Only the New York Freeman's Journal, a pro-Ireland publication, explicitly stated that Leo's letter was essentially an expansion of his earlier tolerari potest. Yet, even here the editor added a word of caution. He emphasized that he did not wish to imply that Leo was favoring one or another faction within the Church, but rather that the pope was urging Catholic education wherever possible and practical, without the use of coercion.[30]

More consistently conservative periodicals such as The Catholic Review, The American Catholic Quarterly Review, and the American Ecclesiastical Review concentrated their editorial responses to the pope's letter on countering any assertions that Leo had sanctioned the public school system for Catholic children. The Catholic

Review, for example, found in the Baltimore decrees of 1884 a more than sufficient statement explaining the true meaning of the educational policy of the Holy See in September, 1893:

> There is no mistaking that language. There is no compromise--no loophole through which the nominal Catholic who prefers public and Protestant to parochial and Catholic school can creep out of the obligation of sending his children to the latter.
>
> Catholics are solemnly bound by the laws of the highest authorities of the Church to give their childres an education truly Christian and truly Catholic, and for this purpose to send them to parochial or other Catholic schools where practicible; and they are to take every pains to defend them against the dangers of a mere secular education.[31]

By the end of 1893, despite the persistance of conservative Catholic journals, despite the silence of the liberal Catholic World concerning Leo's intervention, and despite the continued criticism of anti-Catholic writers and editors, the nation's two leading non-denominational Protestant periodicals, The Independent and The Christian Union had come to view Leo's intervention in the American Catholic Church during the previous two years as indications of his growing sympathy with the liberal bishops. More specifically, the pope's interventions with respect to the Cahensly affair, the reinstatement of Father Edward McGlynn, and the school controversy were interpreted as apparent signs that the pope was moving to accommodate the Catholic Church with American democracy.

During the same years which witnessed the improvement of Leo's image as spiritual ruler of the American Church in the columns of The Independent and The Christian Union, much of the bitterness against the American Church that continued during the late 1880's and early 1890's was due to the alarmist fulminations of the American Protective Association and its sympathizers. However, as Donald Kinzer, author of the definitive work on the organization, has demonstrated, the Association, even at its peak in the middle 1890's, never gained the complete acceptance of the most influential portion of Protestant American opinion, and in several instances, was denounced by both the Protestant pulpit and press. The attitudes of The Independent and The Christian Union toward Leo's intervention in American Catholic affairs during the early 1890's give added credibility to Kinzer's argument.[32]

Indeed, the school controversy that raged during the late 1880's and early 1890's may have been intensified by those writers and editors who were sympathetic with the aims of the American Protective Association. Yet, even without that organization's help, the school issue would have been highly flammable.

The initial periodical response to Leo's intervention in the school controversy during the late 1880's reflected the hopes and fears of both Catholic and

Protestant leaders. Even the secular journals, for the most part, reflected the Protestant ethic. The rapid growth of the public school system after 1880 had been paralleled by an accelerated pace in the spread of parochial schools. Bishops and editors of conservative Catholic persuasion, in particular, saw the growth of the public school system as a threat to the faith of those children whose parents were, to a large extent, illiterate, immigrants, or both.

Denunciations of the public schools in the columns of conservative Catholic periodicals provoked and were provoked by similar denunciations against the parochial schools in the columns of Protestant and secular periodicals. Moreover, given the pope's influence over the education resolution passed at the Baltimore council in 1884, non-Catholic journals, as cited earlier, charged the pope several times with leading a conspiracy against public education.

Yet, when Leo's intervention in the school controversy became more direct between 1891 and 1893, The Christian Union and The Independent (and even The Nation on one occasion) interpreted the pope's decisions as sympathetic to the liberal bishops, despite the vociferousness of conservative Catholic journals and the relative silence of those journals in partial or complete sympathy with the liberal Catholic cause.

The relative highpoint which Pope Leo XIII had reached in the columns of the nation's two leading non-denominational Protestant journals between 1891 and 1893 (and the smattering of complements which the pope received on occasion from other leading non-Catholic journals during that same period) would not be sustained during the next seven years. The superficial calm that seemed to have come to the ranks of the Catholic hierarchy in the United States in 1893 would prove even more short-lived.

There were already disagreements in 1893 concerning the meaning and merit of Leo's appointment of a permanent Apostolic Delegate to the United States. Later, there would be disagreements over the meaning of the pope's encyclical, Longinqua Oceani, sent to American bishops in 1895. Then, during the remainder of the century, there would be signs of the pope's apparent turning away from the liberal element in the American Church, a phenomenon which would culminate with the encyclical on "Americanism" in 1899.

Both the Catholic and the non-Catholic periodical press would reflect those events as they responded to the last years of Pope Leo XIII's intervention in the affairs of the American Catholic Church. More important, during the last five years of Leo's intervention, his image would suffer in the eyes of the editors of The Independent

and The Christian Union, and would continue to be criticized, at times quite harshly, in the columns of other important Protestant as well as secular journals.

Postscript to Chapter IV-Rerum Novarum and Au Milieu des Sollicitudes

During the period between 1891 and 1893, Pope Leo XIII, in addition to intervening into the Cahensly affair and the school controversy, issued two of his most famous encyclicals, On the Rights and Duties of Capital and Labor, May 15, 1891, and On the Condition of Church and State Relations in France, February 16, 1892. In many peoples' minds, these two letters, but especially the first, project an image of Leo as the pope of the workingman and as a pope with a greater desire to reconcile the Church with modern democracy than did any of his immediate predecessors.

The first encyclical, Rerum Novarum, was addressed to the entire Catholic world, and was most famous for asserting the following points: Socialism is not the solution to industrial society's ills because it runs contrary to man's natural right to own property, and because it would provoke class warfare; inequalities in wealth are an inevitable result of natural human inequalities, but through the harmonious cooperation of Church, State, employers, and workers, such natural inequalities

may at least be minimized in the interest of the essential equality of every individual and in the interest of the public weal; poverty is no disgrace, but may be alleviated through Christian charity; the State has the right to intervene, whenever necessary, to promote the just treatment of workers by their employers, and it has the duty to intervene in order to prevent any association of workers which would be dangerous to the public weal and which would violate the rights of employers; employers must not exploit their workers, and must pay them a just wage, that is, one which would enable the worker to support himself and his family in a frugal manner; workers have a natural need to organize, but must respect the property and persons of their employers, and may use only just means to obtain their rights; finally, Christian charity must be the golden rule of all parties.[33]

Among Catholic periodicals, liberal writers and editors stressed that the pope's letter was a call for a more active Catholic apostolate on behalf of social reform. Conservative writers and editors tended to stress the letter's condemnation of socialism (including the theories of Henry George), and that the letter was an authoritative statement requiring the full assent of all Catholics.[34]

Protestant and secular journals, with few exceptions, were not nearly as enthusiastic over the

encyclical and, in their comments, reflected the continued confusion of many Americans concerning the right solution to the social and moral problems of their industrial age.

The two leading nondenominational Protestant journals, The Christian Union and The Independent, gave the encyclical its kindest reception, but even here The Independent's editor insisted that it offered only a partial solution to societal ills. On the other hand, The Christian Union's editor gave the pope's basic tenets his unqualified praise.[35]

Editors and writers for other non-Catholic periodicals were, to varying degrees, critical of the encyclical, and unable to agree as to its major points of emphasis. Our Day's editor criticized what he felt was the pope's stress on the rights of capital and the defense of private property. The Open Court, a journal committed to reconciling science with religion, was critical of what its editor felt was the pope's undue emphasis on charity rather than on justice as a means of alleviating social inequities.[36]

Terence Powderly's Journal of the Knights of Labor interpreted the letter as telling the workers to be content with their lot and to do nothing except what the Church approved. The same journal published, in three consecutive issues, what the editor called a keen, clear, apt, and controversial open letter from Henry George to

the pope in which George called the encyclical a personal attack on his single tax theory, and in which he accused the pope of giving "the gospel to the laborers and the earth to the landlords."[37]

The Nation's editor asserted that both employers and employees would resent the papal interference, and that the letter "would probably be received with laughter in every Trades Union in the world." A writer for The Arena criticized what he called the pope's implicit stress on compulsory arbitration as savoring of the very socialism which the pope was allegedly combating.[38]

Finally, William Traynor, president of the American Protective Association, expressed in the pages of The North American Review a classic illustration of his association's conspiracy theory about the pope and his Church in America:

> The evident object of the encyclical is to unify labor in the United States, in order that it may secure the same advantages in the labor market as in politics . . . and eventually, under the leadership of the priesthood, grasp the balance of power in the commercial and labor world.[39]

While writers and editors were still disputing the merit and meaning of Rerum Novarum, Leo issued another famous encyclical, Au Milieu . . . , a letter best remembered for the pope's exhortation to all French Catholics to give their support to the Third Republic (whereby he hoped to alleviate the rampant anti-clericalism in France by destroying the then prevalent

image of a Church alligned with the forces of royal absolutism and reactionism).[40]

The periodical response to Au Milieu . . . was quantitatively much smaller than the response to Rerum Novarum, but it was much more favorable. A few brief paragraphs will suffice, then, to give a general idea of the periodical response.

Articles and editorials in both The Independent and The Christian Union praised the pope's new policy toward France as a further indication of his democratic tendencies, and as further proof of his sympathy with the liberal forces in the American Church. The editor of The Nation agreed.[41]

The response among Catholic periodicals was minimal, but did provide some indication of conservative and liberal attitudes. A classic example of the liberal response was written by Archbishop John Ireland in The Western Watchman. Ireland took full advantage of the liberal bishops' apparent popularity with the pope when he suggested in general terms the inspiration behind the pope's new policy toward France:

> . . . the pope has derived from the United States, if not a good share of the democratic inspirations which he has been sending out over the world from the Vatican, at least a solid encouragement for them. In this we can well take honor to ourselves.[42]

A good example of the conservative Catholic periodical response to Au Milieu . . . was that made by

Jesu

Eccl

as i

acce

he a

so a

ever

the

and

one

Cath

cour

any

cern

post

had

Leo

illu

rece

Rerur

popu

ing r

Chris

Jesuit Father Thomas Hughes, writing for the American Ecclesiastical Review. In the article, Hughes said that as in France, so also in the United States must Catholics accept the legally existing political order. However, he added, as the pope has urged upon French Catholics, so also does he direct American Catholics to try by every legal means to rectify all discrimination against the faith.[43] The defensiveness evident in Hughes' remarks and lacking in Ireland's remarks was a good example of one of the differences between conservative and liberal Catholics.

Neither of the two encyclicals discussed, of course, constituted an act of papal intervention into any of the major episodes with which this study is concerned. Yet, as mentioned in the introduction to this postscript, both encyclicals have, to varying degrees, had the effect of projecting in many minds, the image of Leo XIII as the first modern pope.

However, as these last few pages have tried to illustrate, while Au Milieu . . . was generally well received by both Catholic and non-Catholic journals, Rerum Novarum, the encyclical for which Leo has been most popularly remembered, was not favorably received by leading non-Catholic journals (with the exception of The Christian Union and The Independent).

Moreover, even The Christian Union and The Independent (for whose editors the encyclicals represented some additional proof of Leo's democratic and liberal inclinations) did not hesitate to change to a less favorable image of Leo during the last stages of his intervention into particular American Church affairs between 1895 and 1899. Neither encyclical had caused The Independent's or The Christian Union's favorable image of Leo between 1891 and 1893. Both encyclicals had enhanced, to varying degrees, those journals' image of Leo which resulted in the course of the pontiff's intervention in the Cahensly affair, the reinstatement of Father McGlynn, and the school controversy.

So too, neither encyclical helped to sustain that favorable image in the columns of The Independent and The Christian Union; for, between 1895 and 1899, these two journals (along with other important non-Catholic journals) viewed Leo's interventions in the American Church as signs that the pope was moving toward the camp of the Church's conservative, indeed, reactionary forces.

Germa
1953)
are i
1891,
The C
413;
James

56-57
and "
XI (J
slyis
"The
20, 1
(June
XL (J
Envoy

footn

(Novem
ber 2,
Crusad
91; "T
Donald
Americ
Washin

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER IV

[1]Rev. C. J. Barry, The Catholic Church and the German Americans (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1953), is the definitive work on Cahensly. Briefer studies are in John Meng, "Cahenslyism: The First Stage, 1883-1891," and "Cahenslyism: The Second Stage, 1891-1910," The Catholic Historical Review, XXXI (January, 1946), 389-413; XXXII (October, 1946), 302-40; and Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 367-78.

[2]Ibid.

[3]"The Letter from Rome," CR, XL (July 19, 1891), 56-57; Editorial Note, TI, XLIV (November 17, 1892), 12; and "The Pope and the Cahensly Scheme," Public Opinion, XI (July 11, 1891), 323-24. See too, Editorial, "Cahenslyism Condemned," TI, XLV (February 9, 1893), 10-11; "The Cable in the Hands of the Enemy," CR, XXXV (January 20, 1889), 56; "The Lucerne Controversy," CR, XXXIX (June 20, 1891), 388; "Cahensly's Second Memorial," CR, XL (July 25, 1891), 50-51; and L. W. Bacon, "An American Envoy at the Vatican," TF, XV (May, 1893), 273.

[4]John Meng,"Cahenslyism," both articles cited in footnote 1, give good illustrations of this attitude.

[5]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 331.

[6]See, for example, "Correspondence," TN, LVII (November 9, 1893), 347; Editorial Note, TI, XLV (November 2, 1893), 14; Washington Gladden, "The Anti-Catholic Crusade," The Century Magazine, XLVII (March, 1894), 789-91; "The Week," TO, XLIX (March 10, 1894), 438. See too, Donald Kinzer, An Episode in Anti-Catholicism: The American Protective Association (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964), chapters 4-6.

45;
Joh
Chu.
(19
sch

130·
and

Poli
and
Edit
(Feb
(Sep

(Mar
flic
XLI

140-

Edit
too,
tori
Edit
(Feb

(Aug

321.
ACQR

144-

[7]Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, pp. 130-45; Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 653-707, and John J. Meng, "Growing Pains in the American Catholic Church, 1880-1908," Historical Records and Studies, XXVI (1947), 35-53, all contain excellent accounts of the school controversy.

[8]Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, pp. 130-39; Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 654-62; and Meng, "Growing Pains," pp. 35-39.

[9]Ibid.

[10]M. C. O'Byrne, "What is the Catholic School Policy?" NAR, CXL (June, 1885), 526; L. Boulard, "Romanism and the Republic," TF, V (July, 1888), 561-62. See also, Editorial, "The Pope and the American Schools," HW, XXXV (February 28, 1891), 147. See too, Editorial, HW, XXXI (September 24, 1887), 683.

[11]"Papal Domination in American Schools," OD, III (March, 1889), 257-59; "Papal and American Plans in Conflict," OD, III (June, 1889), 574-576; Editorial Note, CU, XLI (February 20, 1890), 257.

[12]Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, pp. 140-45.

[13]Editorial Note, TI, XLIV (May 26, 1892), 13; Editorial Note, CU, XLVI (November 26, 1892), 976. See too, Editorial Note, TI, XLIV (July 7, 1892), 16; Editorial Note, CU, XLVII (February 4, 1893), 210-211; and, Editorial, "The Pope and the American Schools," HW, XXXV (February 28, 1891), 147.

[14]Editorial, "Martial Law for New York," WW, XXV (August 4, 1892), 4.

[15]"Topics of the Hour," CR, XLI (May 21, 1892), 321. See too, James Conway, The State Last, reviewed in ACQR, XVII (April, 1892), 4.

[16]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 695.

[17]Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, pp. 144-45; Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 695-701.

1160-6
210-11
(Augus
McGlyn
1893),
1892),
103-04

Vatica
"The P
Papal
135-38
(Septe

LVI (J

Life o
See to
CW, LI

3, 189
10, 18
27, 18

1892),
I, 697

(July,

School
Note,

(Septer
Public
(Septem

[18]"The Outlook," CU, XLVI (December 17, 1892), 1160-61; "The Outlook," CU, XLVII (February 4, 1893), 210-11; An Onlooker, "The Catholic Outlook," TI, XLV (August 24, 1893), 2-3; "The Religious World," "Dr. McGlynn and Archbishop Corrigan," CU, XLVII (January 14, 1893), 78. See too, "The Outlook," CU, XLVI (November 26, 1892), 976; "The Outlook," CU, XLVII (January 21, 1893), 103-04.

[19]L. W. Bacon, "An American Viceroy from the Vatican," TF, XV (May, 1893), 273; Bishop John Vincent, "The Pope in Washington," TF, XV (May, 1893), 263; "New Papal Attack on American Schools," OD, XI (February, 1893), 135-38; and, "Satolli and the Public Schools," OD, XII (September, 1893), 228-41.

[20]Editorial, "The Catholic Controversy," TN, LVI (January 19, 1893), 44.

[21]Archbishop John Ireland, "Introduction to the Life of Father Isaac Hecker," CW, LI (June, 1890), 285-93. See too, Rev. A. F. Hewit, "Catholic and American Ethics," CW, LI (June, 1890), 348-58.

[22]Editorial Note, WW, XXV (December 29, 1892), 4.

[23]Editorial, "A Public Enemy," CR, XLII (December 3, 1892), 360; "Topics of the Hour," CR, XLII (December 10, 1892), 369; "Topics of the Hour," CR, XLII (November 27, 1892), 417.

[24]Editorial, The Church Progress (December 17, 1892), quoted in Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 697.

[25]Pope Leo XIII, Clara Saepaenumero, ACQR, XVIII (July, 1893), 649.

[26]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 702-07.

[27]Editorial, "The Pope on Satolii and the Parochial Schools," TI, XLV (June 29, 1893), 11. See too, Editorial Note, TI, XLV (July 6, 1893), 11.

[28]"Satolli and the Public Schools," OD, XII (September, 1893), 228-41. See too, "The Pope on the Public Schools," New York Observer, reprinted in OD, XII (September, 1893), 208-09.

[29]X, "The Pope and the American Schools," TN, LVII (August 24, 1893), 133-34; Rt. Rev. William C. Doane, "The Roman Catholic Church and the School Fund," NAR, CLVIII (January, 1894), 92-93. See too, Editorial, "Ambiguous Infallibility," TN, LVI (June 29, 1893), 467-68.

[30]Editorial, "The Pope's Letter," Freeman's Journal (June 24, 1893), 4.

[31]Editorial, "Shall We Support Our Schools and Colleges?" CR, XLIV (September 2, 1893), 136. See too, Editorial, "Eccesiastical Democracy," AER, IX (October, 1893), 271-78; "The Pope's Letter to the American Bishops on the School Question," ACQR, XVIII (July, 1893), 272; "Topics of the Hour," CR, XLIV (July 8, 1893), 1; and "Topics of the Hour," CR, XLIV (July 22, 1893), 33.

[32]See, "The Week," TO, XLIX (March 10, 1894), 438; Editorial Note, TI, XLV (November 2, 1893), 14; Washington Gladden, "Open Letter: A Reply," The Century Magazine, XXVI (March, 1894), 473-474; Correspondence," TN, LVII (November 9, 1893), 347. Kinzer, An Episode in Anti-Catholicism, the most definitive study of the American Protective Association, concluded that the association as such, scarcely rippled the surface of American society, even at its peak.

[33]Pope Leo XIII, Rerum Novarum, in E. Gilson, ed., The Church Speaks to the Modern World: The Social Teachings of Leo XIII (New York: Image Books, 1954), pp. 200-44.

[34]Rev. E. B. Brady, "The Pope and the Proletariat," CW, LIII (August, 1891), 633-44; Rev. Charles A. Ramm, "Henry George and the Late Encyclical," CW, LIV (January, 1892), 559-67; Rev. M. M. Sheedy, "The American Iron Workers and Coal Workers," CW, LIII (September, 1891), 851-61; Bishop John Spalding, "Socialism and Labor," CW, LIII (September, 1891), 791; W. Onahan, "Columbian Catholic Congress at Chicago," CW, LVII (August, 1893), 605-06; Archbishop John Ireland, "The Church and Charity," an address reprinted in WW, XXIV (September 13, 1891), 1; Bishop J. Keane, "The Encyclical Rerum Novarum," ACQR, XVI (July, 1891), 599; Archbishop M. Corrigan, "The Archbishop on the Encyclical," CR, XXXIX (June 20, 1891), 6; Editorial, "The Pope on the Land Question," CR, XXXIX (June 21, 1891), 386; "Topics of the Hour," CR, XXXIX (June 27, 1891), 401; Editorial, "Leo XIII on Just Wages,"

CR, XL
Encycl

(June
1891),
904-05
TI, XL
TI, XL

Editor
(July

the Kn
Reply
(Octob
5, 189

(Janua
Labor,

CLXI (

The Gr
John J

12: Md
1892),
87; Ed
XLV (F
(Septe
Letter
392.

(April
Type,"
(Decem
istics
XXVIII
Unifie

CR, XLI (May 28, 1892), 338; Rev. R. J. Hollaind, "The Encyclical Rerum Novarum," AER, V (August, 1891), 82-90.

[35]Editorial, "The Pope's Encyclical," CU, XLIII (June 18, 1891), 805; "The Outlook," CU, XLIV (July 18, 1891), 122; "The Outlook," CU, XLVII (May 13, 1893), 904-05; Editorial, "Pope Leo on the Condition of Labor," TI, XLIII (June 18, 1891), 13. See too, Editorial Note, TI, XLIV (January 28, 1892), 12.

[36]Editorial Note, OD, VIII (August, 1891), 147-48; Editorial, "The Pope's Encyclical," The Open Court, V (July 9, 1891), 2877-80.

[37]Editorial, "The Pope's Encyclical," Journal of the Knights of Labor, XI (June 18, 1891), 2; "George's Reply to Leo XIII," Journal of the Knights of Labor, XII (October 22, 1891), 1-2; (October 29, 1891), 4; (November 5, 1891), 2.

[38]Editorial, "The Pope and the Poor," TN, LIV (January 7, 1892), 7-8; Thomas B. Preston, "Pope Leo on Labor," The Arena, IV (August, 1891), 459-67.

[39]William Traynor, "The Menace of Romanism," NAR, CLXI (August, 1895), 135.

[40]Pope Leo XIII, Au Milieu des Sollicitudes, in The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII, ed. by John J. Wynne (New York: 1903), 249-63.

[41]Editorial Note, TI, XLIII (February 26, 1891), 12: Mdme. H. Loyson, "Papal Evolution," TI, XLIV (June 11, 1892), 1-2; "The Outlook," CU, XLV (March 12, 1892), 486-87; Editorial, "The Pope and the French Cardinals," CU, XLV (February 27, 1892), 393-94; "The Outlook," CU, XLVI (September 17, 1892), 482; and, Editorial, "The Pope's Letter to the French Cardinals," TN, LIV (May 26, 1892), 392.

[42]Archbishop John Ireland, "Pope Leo," WW, XXV (April 14, 1892), 5. See too, Editorial, "A Rejuvenated Type," WW, XXV (July 1, 1892), 4; Editorial Note, CW, LX (December, 1894), 428; and, A. S. Marshall, "Characteristics of the Teachings of Leo XIII," Donahoe's Magazine, XXVIII (July, 1892), 45-49; Editorial, "Religion, the Unifier," WW, XXV (May 26, 1892), 4.

[43]Rev. Thomas Hughes, S. J., "Leo XIII and the Safeguards of Republics," AER, VIII (January, 1893), 1-4. See too, Editorial, "The New York Press and the Vatican," CR, XLI (February 21, 1892), 137; "Topics of the Hour," CR, XLI (May 28, 1892), 337; and, "Topics of the Hour," CR, XLI (June 11, 1892), 369.

CHAPTER V

THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: THE THIRD STAGE, 1893-1897

The periodical response to the intervention of Pope Leo XIII into the affairs of the American Catholic Church between 1893 and 1899 revolved around the following events: the pope's appointment of Archbishop Francesco Satolli in 1893 as the first permanent Apostolic Delegate to the United States; the papal encyclical, Longinqua Oceani, sent in 1895 to the American Catholic hierarchy; and a series of papal decisions which culminated with the promulgation of the encyclical, Testem Benevolentiae, sent in 1899 to James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore.[1] This chapter will examine the periodical response to Leo's interventions between 1893 and 1897, that is, from his appointment of the Apostolic Delegate to the eve of the most intense period of the "Americanist" controversy.

On January 24, 1893, Pope Leo XIII formally appointed Italian Archbishop Francesco Satolli as the first permanent Apostolic Delegate to the United States. Publically, the American Catholic hierarchy accepted the appointment very courteously, but privately, a majority of the bishops, liberals as well as conservatives, expressed varying degrees of reluctance toward what many of them viewed as an unnecessary act of papal intervention into American Church affairs.[2]

Liberal and conservative bishops believed that they were better equipped than any foreign prelate to deal with the problems of the Church in America. Conservative bishops, in particular, however, were to remain ill-disposed to Satolli's appointment during most of the Delegate's three and one-half years residency. German bishops resented Satolli's anti-Cahensly stand. Other conservative bishops were disturbed by the Delegate's participation in the school controversy in 1892, by his reinstatement of Edward McGlynn, and by what seemed to be his generally liberal bias until 1895.[3]

The periodical response to Leo's appointment of Satolli, occurring as it did in an America marked by depression, Populism, "APAism," and an increasing resentment of the influx of southern and eastern European immigrants, was quantitatively substantial and, to varying degrees, a reflection of contemporary conditions.

Among Protestant periodicals, the editorial columns of The Independent and The Christian Union (changed to The Outlook [TO] later in 1893) proclaimed the pope's appointment of Satolli, in view of the Archbishop's stands on the school controversy, Cahenslyism, and McGlynn, as a victory for the liberals in the American hierarchy. Neither periodical indicated any awareness of the reluctance with which most of the bishops had accepted the pope's decision. The Independent's editor believed that only the conservatives strongly opposed the appointment, and that the pope had proved his liberal tendencies by not allowing himself to be intimidated by Archbishop Corrigan and his supporters. The Christian Union's editors agreed and said that the pope had utilized the school controversy and the archbishops' conference in 1892 as a means of introducing Satolli on behalf of the liberals.[4]

While the nation's leading Protestant journals defended Satolli as a personification of Leo's liberal inclinations, a smaller portion of the Protestant periodical press illustrated the "no-popery" attitude of the American Protective Association and charged that the pope's appointment of Satolli was part of a papal plot to undermine American institutions.[5]

The anti-Catholic Our Day of Boston, reprinted the pope's letter to Satolli granting him the special powers

of his new office. Following is the portion of the letter which the editor argued was a prime example of the papal claim to supremacy over the civil power and, hence, an incitation to treason:

> Whatever sentence or penalty you shall declare or inflict duly against those who oppose your authority We will ratify, and, with the authority given Us by the Lord, will cause to be observed inviolably until condign satisfaction be made. Notwithstanding constitutions and apostolic ordinances, or any other to the contrary [last five words italicized by Our Day].[6]

The editor and writers for Our Day argued that the Delegate was Leo's echo in America and that he therefore must be viewed as a strong supporter of the reactionary Syllabus of Errors issued by Pope Pius IX in 1864 and supported by Leo XIII. Likewise, the Delegate's apparently moderate stands with regard to Cahenslyism, the school controversy, and the McGlynn case must not detract from the more basic fact that his actions have clearly reflected Leo's belief in his absolute infallibility in matters of state, education, politics, and morals. Indeed, Satolli's propositions on the school question in 1892, for example, was nothing less than a papal ultimatum and an attempt to divide public monies in order to advance papal pretensions to power in America.[7]

Among leading secular periodicals, only the popular reform-minded Forum of New York provided any significant coverage of the Delegate's appointment--two articles

by Protestants and two by Catholics. Hence, The Forum's response was essentially an extension of the Protestant-Catholic debate.

The first article, written by Methodist Episcopal Bishop John Vincent, a rather consistent critic of papal policy in America, followed the hostile line of periodicals such as Our Day and others sympathetic with the aims of the American Protective Association. Vincent argued that Leo had appointed Satolli in order to reinforce the primary allegiance of American Catholics to the papacy, and to stop the dissensions within the American hierarchy. Once this was accomplished, the pope could more effectively redirect the energies of both liberals and conservatives to the one goal they both agreed upon, Roman domination of the United States.[8]

In the second article, L. W. Bacon, a prominent Congregational minister from Connecticut, called Vincent's fear of papal domination over the United States an example of alarmism. Bacon replied (and without any indication of a tongue-in-cheek intent) that the Catholic Church controlled only Boston and New York, and would continue to be a large and influential sect, but little more. Moreover, the Delegate's actions with regard to the school controversy, Cahenslyism, and McGlynn revealed, if anything, that Leo was more liberal than most American Catholic prelates. In fact, concluded Bacon, one of the

chief purposes of sending an Apostolic Delegate was to help rid the American Church of the stigma--Church of the foreigners.[9]

Given the nature of The Forum's response, it may be well to comment briefly on the general Protestant periodical attitude before examining the two Forum articles authored by Catholics. Leo's appointment of Satolli occasioned a rather substantial response by The Independent and The Christian Union. The editors of both journals (as related earlier) interpreted the pope's action as an expression of his preference for the methods and attitudes of the liberals in the American hierarchy. More important, the early decisions of the Delegate were interpreted as signs of the pope's desire for a more thorough Americanization of the Catholic Church in the United States.

If Satolli's appointment and early decisions offered the basis for an improved image of Pope Leo XIII in the columns of the nation's two leading Protestant periodicals, a smaller segment of Protestant periodical opinion utilized the appointment and decisions as a means of furthering its "pope-as-bogeyman" bias. Anti-Catholic journals such as Our Day, for example, clearly reflected the "conspiracy theory" of the alarmist American Protective Association.

Although widely circulated journals such as The Independent and The Christian Union were a more accurate general index of Protestant-American opinion, anti-Catholic periodicals were nevertheless beginning to ride a crest of popularity by 1893. Nativists tended to interrelate the pope's appointment of Satolli, the heavy Catholic immigration from southern and eastern Europe, and the general economic depression of 1893 in the United States.[10] This tendency may have accounted, at least in part, for periodical charges that Satolli's apparent liberalism was only a subtle disguise for furthering papal pretensions in the United States.

The absurd extent to which some periodical editors went to discredit the papacy at this time was particularly well illustrated by the publication of a bogus papal encyclical in the columns of Detroit's Patriotic American, an official organ of the American Protective Association. The alleged encyclical was quoted as stating that on September 5, 1893, the birthday of St. Ignatius Loyola, founder of the then ultramontane Jesuit order, American Catholics (presumably under the coordinating leadership of Satolli) were to kill all Protestant heretics in the nation. However, as with most of the alarmist accusations printed in the pages of A.P.A. journals, periodicals such as The Independent

and even the usually unfriendly Nation exposed the encyclical as forged and therefore of no concern to intelligent Americans.[11]

Catholic periodicals provided additional rebuttals to anti-Catholic editors and writers, but, for the most part, were rather reserved in their response to the pope's appointment. The conservative Catholic Review, for instance, implied its general sympathy with those bishops who were privately disgruntled over Satolli's appointment. Still, the editor did state that unless those bishops could prove beyond question that the pope's decision had been a mistake, they should and would accept the will of the pope. The editor concluded by reaffirming his journal's loyalty to the Holy See.[12]

Three years later, on the eve of Satolli's departure for Rome in 1896, the editor of The Catholic Review praised Leo for having appointed Satolli in 1893.[13] At the time that this editorial was being written, as a later section of this chapter will show in more detail, Satolli had turned from the liberal to the conservative camp in the American hierarchy, and so, presumably, had the pope. Hence, it was easier for the editor to give unqualified praise to the pope's decision in 1896 than in 1893, when both the pope and Satolli seemed to be in sympathy with the liberal bishops.

Other generally conservative Catholic comments came from the Rt. Rev. J. Loughlin, associate editor of the conservative American Catholic Quarterly Review, writing for The Forum in 1893, and from an editorial and article in the pro-Ireland but otherwise conservative Western Watchman, edited by Rev. David Phelan. The comments from both journals emphasized that Leo had appointed Satolli out of social and religious, and not out of political motives as some non-Catholic writers had contended. The Delegate, they said, was in the United States purely as an ecclesiastic, and would help the hierarchy to guide the Americanization of the Church and its vast immigrant membership. The Western Watchman's editor, in particular, insisted that Satolli was not here to strengthen the pope's alleged hold over the political views of American Catholics.[14]

Neither Loughlin's article in The Forum nor the article and editorial in The Western Watchman made any reference to the rift within the American hierarchy which had influenced the pope's decision to appoint Satolli, or to the general reluctance of the American bishops to accept that decision. Also, none of the comments in either journal made any mention of the intensified hierarchical conflict that had resulted, in part, because of the Delegate's (and presumably Leo's) initial sympathy with the liberal bishops.

The liberal Catholic World published no opinion on Leo's decision until 1896, at the occasion of Satolli's elevation to the cardinalate. Then, the journal's editor stated that the Delegate's residency had been an expression of Leo's love and concern for the Church in the United States.[15] This was a safe statement and, perhaps all that was necessary at the time; for by 1896, Satolli, as mentioned earlier, had turned his ear to the conservatives in the American hierarchy. More important, however, with respect to The Catholic World's comment, Satolli's elevation to the cardinalate was an indication that he would soon be recalled to Rome. The fact that The Catholic World had not commented earlier on the pope's appointment was perhaps because the Delegate had initially been so favorable to the liberals. The Catholic World's editor may have felt, either out of timidity or conviction, that any comment about the motives behind the pope's decision would have hurt the liberal cause.

Liberal Catholic opinion was more candidly expressed in the columns of secular and, surprisingly, the more moderately conservative Catholic journals. Father Edward McGlynn, for example, writing for The Forum in 1893, gave a frank, though admittedly biased opinion of the pope's decision to appoint Satolli. Speaking from personal experience, McGlynn welcomed Satolli's presence as a sign of Leo's desire to curb the

arbitrary power of bishops in their dealings with allegedly refractory priests. It was natural, he said, that most bishops felt reluctant to accept Leo's decision, for they feared that the pope was unjustly depriving them of their power.[16]

In January, 1895, when the liberal bishops and their followers were still popular with the pope and Satolli, the liberal priest, Thomas Bouquillon, a theologian at The Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C., wrote an article for the moderately conservative American Catholic Quarterly Review. Bouquillon stated that Leo's decision to appoint Satolli was motivated by a desire to strengthen the ties between the American Church and Rome. Hinting at the myriad of problems confronting the American Church, he said that Leo's decision would ultimately have the effect of promoting greater unity within the American hierarchy, and would strengthen, not weaken episcopal authority. These results would in turn promote a spirit of justice, respect, and obedience among the clergy, would increase the zeal for good works, and would promote peace and harmony between the Church and the civil power. Finally, with an implied reference to the criticisms leveled privately against the pope and his Delegate by the conservatives in the hierarchy, Bouquillon said:

> It is felony, it is high treason against the Papal sovereignty to create opposition to an apostolic

> delegate, falsify or travesty his acts and intentions, provoke against him suspicion and diffidence.[17]

Since the reference to the conservatives was implied and not explicit, and because no Catholic periodical, liberal or conservative, openly condoned any criticism of the papal decision, this particular article, though written by a liberal, was not necessarily out of place in a moderately conservative periodical.

The same month in which Bouquillon's article appeared in The American Catholic Quarterly Review, Leo addressed the encyclical Longinqua Oceani (On the American Church, January 6, 1895) to the American hierarchy. The encyclical tried to lay to rest any doubts or disappointments that the pope knew had followed his decision to appoint a permanent Apostolic Delegate. In the encyclical, he referred to that appointment as a fitting crown to the work of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore of 1884, and as a traditional way of linking the Holy See to its numerous branches throughout the world.[18]

In the first section of the encyclical, the pope dwelled at length on the background of the American Church, and on its tremendous progress since the establishment of a hierarchy in 1789. Quantitatively, the facts justified the pontiff's praise. The Church organization which served more than 9,000,000 Catholics in 1895, included more than 10,000 priests, over 9,000 churches,

more than 100 seminaries, nearly 900 secondary schools, more than 3,700 parochial schools with over 750,000 students, more than 1,000 charitable institutions, and a hierarchy that numbered 75 bishops, 17 archbishops, and 1 cardinal.[19]

After Leo praised the progress of the American Church and the equity of those civil laws which had helped to make such progress possible, he counseled against concluding that the prosperous condition of the Church in the United States proved the desirability of Church and state separation:

> . . . it would be very erroneous to draw the conclusion that in America is to be sought the type of the most desirable status of the Church, or that it would be universally lawful or expedient for State and Church to be, as in America, dissevered and divorced. [Indeed, the Church in America] . . . would bring forth more abundant fruits if, in addition to liberty, she enjoyed the favor of the laws and the patronage of the public authority.[20]

The remainder of the encyclical made it clear that Leo was proclaiming an official, non-negotiable statement of his conclusions about the American Catholic Church since the Baltimore council of 1884. He cited his ratification of the Baltimore decrees and his establishment of a permanent apostolic delegation as signs of his love for the American Church. On the last point, the pope said specifically that the Apostolic Delegate had been sent to restore harmony within the ranks of the American hierarchy.[21]

In the last few pages of the letter, principles of doctrine and discipline were reiterated. These included advice concerning the indissoluble nature of marriage, the duties of citizens to observe just laws, the virtue of temperance, the importance of receiving the sacraments frequently, the avoidance of secret societies that had been condemned by the pope or deemed dangerous by local bishops, the rights of workers to organize peacefully, the association of Catholics with other Catholics unless forced by necessity to associate with non-Catholics, the duties of Catholic journalists to act with unanimity and to respect the bishops, and the need for apostolic zeal on behalf of American Indians and Negroes.[22]

The Independent and The Outlook (formerly The Christian Union) editorialized their disappointment in the pope for issuing what they deemed was an essentially conservative document. During the previous three years, Leo's decisions involving the American Church had helped to convince the editors of these journals that the pope's basic sympathies were with the liberals in the hierarchy. Longinqua Oceani tended to nullify that belief.

The Independent said that Leo's warning against the desirability of Church and state separation was ill-advised. The editorial declared that the first amendment to the Constitution which provided for religious liberty and which prohibited the establishment of any religion

was the ideal. On the other hand, in characteristically moderate fashion, the editor said that the warning, however ill-advised, was not really intended explicitly for American Catholics, but rather " . . . for Italy and other countries in Europe."[23]

Aside from Leo's remarks on Church and state relations, both The Independent and The Outlook editorialized their disappointment in the pope's advice to Catholic journalists not to criticize, but to be docile to the decisions and to respect the authority of the bishops. Such advice, in addition to the pope's exhortation that Catholics should prefer the company of other Catholics, was viewed by these journals as un-American in principle and in spirit.[24]

New York's Christian Advocate, a nationally circulated journal of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and an important source of anti-Catholic opinion, was essentially in agreement with the editors of The Independent and The Outlook. While not explicitly editorializing, the journal printed an article by an anonymous Catholic layman who was highly critical of Longinqua. The author stated that the encyclical was very embarrassing to American liberal Catholics because of its emphatic condemnation of the progressive views of men like Archbishops Ireland, Keane, and Gibbons. Particularly disturbing, the author continued, was the pope's advice that American Catholics

should not be convinced of the value of Church and state separation, and that the Church would be better off if she were established and enjoyed public patronage. Such a union, he said, would be bitterly resented not only by Protestants but by American Catholics as well. Moreover, he concluded, the pope's advice would play very nicely into the hands of the American Protective Association.[25] Perhaps by publishing such an article, the Advocate was trying to show that liberal Catholic opinion of the encyclical was basically the same as that of most Protestants.

Among secular periodicals, the editor of The Nation dismissed the encyclical as platitudinous and commonplace. Harper's Weekly editorialized its basic agreement with the comments of The Independent and The Outlook concerning the encyclical's excessively authoritarian tone. In its appraisal of Leo's statement about Church and state relations, however, the periodical's editor was convinced that the pope's candid desire for a union of his Church with the American state implied the suppression or, at best, the "grudging toleration of all forms of Christian faith deemed by Catholics heretical."[26]

The North American Review printed the most blatantly anti-Catholic article, a critical essay by William Traynor, the president of the American Protective Association. Traynor read conspiracy into every phrase of the

encyclical, from the pope's remarks on the indissolubility of marriage to his suggestions on behalf of the Indians and Negroes. It was clear to Traynor that the pope was pursuing a policy of papal imperialism in the United States.[27]

As the anonymous Catholic layman writing for The Christian Advocate had predicted, Traynor capitalized on the pope's remarks concerning Church and state relations. Leo's words, Traynor said, showed that he regarded the United States as nothing more than a province of the Catholic or Papal Church. The principles of the papacy and of American democracy were utterly diverse, but the pope and his priests were subtly maneuvering to unite the two by playing on the "generosity and ignorance upon the part of the American people, and [by] apparent concessions which yield nothing but empty words. . . . "[28] This last phrase was probably referring to earlier papal decisions regarding Cahenslyism, McGlynn, the school controversy, decisions which met a favorable response from journals such as The Independent and The Outlook whose editors were not in sympathy with the American Protective Association.

The anti-Catholic response by a portion of the non-Catholic periodicals was less significant than the critical attitudes expressed in the columns of The Independent and The Outlook. Longinqua Oceani struck these

leading journals of Protestant opinion as a discordant note, and marked a turning point in their response to the remainder of Leo's intervention in the affairs of the American Catholic Church.

Catholic periodicals that responded to the pope's encyclical, such as the conservative Catholic News, The American Catholic Quarterly Review, and the American Ecclesiastical Review gave some implicit indication that the liberal Catholicism of men like Gibbons, Ireland, and their small contingent in the hierarchy were being given a mild papal reprimand. An editorial in The Catholic News insisted that those who followed Leo's advice to the letter could not help being good citizens. Msgr. Schroeder, the conservative theologian of Catholic University, wrote in The American Catholic Quarterly Review that while separation of Church and state in America was a social necessity, no true Catholic must disobey the pope's advice and hold that such a condition was ideal.[29]

While Schroeder followed the conservative party line, his adversary, the liberal Archbishop John Ireland cancelled his contract to write an explanatory article on the encyclical for The North American Review. He believed that Americans would never accept Leo's statement about Church and state and about public patronage for the Church.[30]

Even the reputedly liberal Catholic World, the moderately liberal Catholic University Bulletin, and the pro-Ireland Western Watchman, while less doctrinaire than the conservative Catholic journals, agreed that Leo's encyclical was entirely compatible with American ideals, and that it was the duty of every Catholic to obey him.

For instance, Rev. A. F. Hewit, editor of The Catholic World, said that while the pope was right in asserting that a Catholic State was a desirable ideal, since the United States was not a Catholic country, the union of Church and state at the present time was neither desirable nor practicable, and would not be supported by American Catholics. He added, however, that it

> . . . is not aid given to any form of religion, as such, when patronage and favor are extended to works done for the general good of the community and the service of the State, by schools, orphanages, foundling asylums, hospitals, and industrial institutes for training boys and girls in useful occupations.[31]

An editorial in The Catholic University Bulletin made the point that the encyclical was not ex cathedra (that is, not an infallible pronouncement). The editor added, however, that American Catholics must nevertheless follow the encyclical's teachings as general rules of conduct. Only the outspoken editor of The Western Watchman dared to say that the pope may have been wrong in such things as his criticism of secret societies. Yet, even the Western Watchman's editor said that right or wrong, the pope's letter must be obeyed.[32]

The encyclical Longinqua Oceani marked a turning point in the relationship between the liberals and the pope, but if liberal journals such as The Catholic World and The Catholic University Bulletin were aware of that fact, they did not make it clear in their columns.[33] Admittedly, the liberal periodical interpretation of the encyclical tended to be less narrow than that of the conservative journals. Yet, ultimately, both liberal and conservative Catholic journals accepted the pope's teachings.

Meanwhile, the liberal bishops and their followers were privately distressed by the authoritarian and conservative tone of the encyclical. More important, within one year the liberal bishops were able to perceive what either timidity or a policy of watchful waiting may have prevented the liberal journals from printing, that is, that Longinqua Oceani was an ill-omen for the future of liberal Catholicism in the United States.[34]

During the interval between the promulgations of the encyclical Longinqua Oceani (January, 1895), and the encyclical on the alleged heresy of "Americanism," Testem Benevolentiae (January, 1899), Leo XIII made a series of decisions affecting the American Church which left little doubt that the liberals in the American hierarchy had lost much of their former status in the

eyes of the pope and his Apostolic Delegate. At the same time, it became apparent that the conservatives had regained a substantial measure of influence with both Satolli and the pope.

In April, 1895, Satolli, in the company of arch-conservative Msgr. Joseph Schroeder of The Catholic University, addressed a congregation of German American Catholics during the consecration of their new church in Pottsville, Pennsylvania. Speaking as the pope's representative, Satolli seemed to be modifying his earlier stance against Cahenslyism when he encouraged his congregation to retain their language and customs, and said nothing about the importance of Americanization.[35]

Two months later, in June, 1895, Msgr. Denis O'Connell, the liberal rector of the North American College in Rome, was dismissed from his post by the pope under the guise of a voluntary resignation for reasons of ill-health. In reality, conservatives had convinced Leo that O'Connell, a strong partisan of Archbishop Ireland, had exhibited tendencies toward liberalism and religious minimism in matters of doctrine and discipline, and was therefore ill-suited to train future American priests.[36]

Then, in September, 1895, the pope sent a letter to the Apostolic Delegate (at Satolli's personal request) advising him against allowing Catholics to hold religious

congresses with representatives of other faiths. There were to be no future interfaith congresses such as that held in Chicago during the World's Fair in 1893, in which liberals such as Gibbons, Ireland, and Archbishop John Keane, rector of The Catholic University, had played leading roles.[37]

The periodical response to these indications of a changing papal attitude toward the liberals in the American hierarchy was generally confined to comments about the pope's letter to Satolli on religious congresses. Liberal Catholic journals were silent, while conservative Catholic journals either followed the same course or, like The Western Watchman, praised the wisdom of the pope's decision as a hindrance to the advance of religious minimism.[38]

Protestant periodicals such as The Independent and The Outlook were silent, while some of the smaller denominational journals were split in their opinion of the pope's decision. The Churchman, for example, the successful Episcopal journal of New York, editorialized that the letter to Satolli was one more example of the pope's determination to maintain a Church policy of "arrogant exclusiveness," and thereby to perpetuate a "spirit of alienation from American sentiment," an "aggressive policy of domination," and an "implacable attitude" toward religious reconciliation. Another

journal, the United Presbyterian of Pittsburg, disagreed. Instead, the journal's editor praised the pope's ban on future interfaith congresses as a wise decision. Recalling that the World's Parliament of Religions held in 1893 had included delegates from non-Christian sects, the editor contended (with apparent conviction) that Leo's decision was motivated by a desire not to place the Christian religions on the same level with the false non-Christian religions of the world.[39]

In 1896, the periodicals responded more substantially to what was clearly the most significant omen to date of the pope's apparent disillusionment with the liberals in the American hierarchy--the dismissal of Archbishop John J. Keane, a close friend of Archbishop Ireland and Msgr. O'Connell, from his post as rector of Catholic University. Leo sent a letter to Cardinal Gibbons in September, to inform him of his decision to remove Keane on the grounds that the position had been intended only as a temporary appointment. Conservatives were elated, but the liberals, including the more moderate Gibbons, were stunned, and rumors quickly spread that Satolli (and possibly Msgr. Schroeder) had influenced the pope's decision.[40]

Leading Protestant periodicals interpreted the pope's action as a rebuke to the liberal party in the hierarchy. The Independent was especially outspoken on

the matter. Its editor conceded the wisdom of the policy of disallowing an indefinite term of office for anyone in Keane's position. However, the editor was equally certain that Keane had been removed because of his alleged pelagianism (that is, his assertions that any form of Christianity was better than no Christianity at all). Also, the editor was convinced that Leo's decision had not been reached independently, but had been influenced by Archbishops Corrigan, Satolli, and Msgr. Schroeder.[41]

When, during the following year, Msgr. Schroeder was on the verge of being dismissed from his position at The Catholic University for neglecting classes, for personal hostility toward other faculty, and for frequenting too many taverns, The Independent's editor interpreted the action as papal reprieve for the liberals. However, other Protestant journals were holding to the earlier opinion, that is, that Leo was moving toward the conservative camp in the American hierarchy. That view was to become increasingly apparent during the next few years.[42]

Among Catholic periodicals, the liberal Catholic World was silent on the matter of Keane's removal. The conservative Catholic Review, however, tried to quell rumors that Leo had ever been in sympathy with any party or clique in the hierarchy. Its editor, therefore, reported the dismissal of Keane as if it were a routine

administrative change, and nothing more. In fact, the Review continued to give favorable coverage to Keane's later fund-raising campaign for the financially distressed Catholic University.[43]

The only outspoken remark by a Catholic periodical was made in the editorial column of The Western Watchman. A year before Keane's dismissal, the editor, Rev. David Phelan, had written that conservative rumors charging Keane and Ireland with religious minimism were false. Both men, he argued, were well within the spirit of religion advocated by Pope Leo XIII. Phelan did say, however, that while Keane had never compromised his faith by any corporate action with Protestants, he had at times acted imprudently by saying that Protestantism was better than no Christianity at all.[44]

When Leo's decision to remove Keane was made public in 1896, The Western Watchman editorialized that while the decision seemed uncalled for, it was the duty of every Catholic to accept and to understand, but not to criticize the pope's action. The conservatives had convinced Leo that some of Keane's views had become a stumbling block to the growth of the university, and, after all, his remark about Protestantism being preferable to no religion was hard to defend. Indeed, the editor concluded, Keane had thrown away a great opportunity to serve the Church because of his imprudent overtures to Protestantism.[45]

By 1897, when the last important stage of Leo's intervention in the affairs of the American Church began, leading Protestant journals had already modified whatever favorable image of the pope they may have previously held. The Independent had told its readers in earlier editorials that the dismissal of Keane had been the result of the pope being misled and misinformed by the conservatives, but even this normally moderate journal could not conceal its disappointment in the pope.

Outspoken Catholic editors such as Phelan of The Western Watchman had agreed with The Independent in seeking for other than a personal motive behind Leo's action, but Phelan's disappointment over Keane's removal was not completely sincere. Phelan revealed some personal animosity toward Keane, but because Keane was such a close friend of Ireland, and because Phelan deeply admired Ireland, the editor probably felt obliged to raise some mild objection to Keane's dismissal, if only to help Ireland save face.

The silence of the liberal Catholic World and the nonchalance of the conservative Catholic Review concerning Keane's dismissal, and the silence of both on the matter of Leo's letter on religious congresses did not accurately reflect the true opinion of either journal. Throughout the 1890's, both had carried articles or editorials reflecting their respective sympathies and

differences. However, between 1895 and 1897, neither of the journals were outspoken in their estimate of the pope's intervention in the affairs of the American Church. This was particularly true of The Catholic World which, much more than The Catholic Review, seemed hesitant to engage in any direct estimate of the pope's actions toward the American Church. Again, as in earlier years, either timidity or conviction seemed to compel the journal to voice its views and its approach to an Americanized Catholicism more indirectly by way of general feature articles about Church doctrine and discipline.[46]

During the final important stage of Pope Leo XIII's intervention in the affairs of the American Church, a stage popularly known as the "Americanist" controversy, there would be greater balance, quantitatively, between the response of Catholic and non-Catholic periodicals. Catholic editors and writers, liberals as well as conservatives, would speak out with greater candor on the meaning of the pope's intervention and on the implications of that intervention for the future of American Catholicism.

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER V

[1]In terms of background information, the best available source of official Catholic documents for the period under consideration was, Rev. John Tracy Ellis, ed., Documents of American Catholic History (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956). The most helpful secondary works related to the material covered in this chapter were, James H. Moynihan, The Life of Archbishop John Ireland (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953); Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I; Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism; McAvoy, History of the Catholic Church; and, Meng, "Growing Pains," pp. 35-53.

[2]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 595-652, contains an excellent account of the Delegate's appointment and residency. See too, Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, 179-80.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Editorial, "Roma Locuta Est," TI, XLV (January 19, 1893), 10; Editorial, "The Roman Catholic Issue," CU, XLVII (January 21, 1893), 109-10; "The Outlook," CU, XLVII (March 18, 1893), 503. See too, "The Outlook," CU, XLVII (January 21, 1893), 103-04; "The Outlook," CU, XLVII (January 14, 1893), 57; Editorial Note, TI, XLV (January 12, 1893), 13; Editorial Note, TI, XLV (March 2, 1893), 12; and, Editorial Note, TI, XLV (March 16, 1893), 12.

[5]The following include reactions to conservative Catholic charges that Satolli was misrepresenting the pope, as well as reactions to anti-Catholic comments: Editorial Note, TI, XLV (July 13, 1893), 15; "The Religious World," TO, XLVIII (September 2, 1893), 441. See too, Editorial Note, TI, XLV (May 11, 1893), 12; "Catholicism and Satollicism," TI, XLV (August 10, 1893), 14-15; "The Outlook," CU, XLVII (May 6, 1893), 852-53; and, "An Onlooker," TI, XLV (August 24, 1893), 2-3.

[6]Editorial Note, OD, XI (April, 1893), 322-23.

[7]J. Cook, OD, XI (March, 1893), 224; "Satolli and the Public Schools," OD, XII (September, 1893), 234-41. See too, "Bishop Coxe to Msgr. Satolli," [An Open Letter] OD, XII (December, 1893), 528-31.

[8]Bishop J. H. Vincent, "The Pope in Washington," TF, XV (May, 1893), 266-67.

[9]Rev. L. W. Bacon, "An American Viceroy from the Vatican," TF, XV (May, 1893), 269-71, 273.

[10]John Higham, Strangers in the Land, Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925 (New York: Atheneum, 1963), 78-82.

[11]"Correspondence," TN, LVII (November 9, 1893), 347; Editorial Note, TI, XLV (November 2, 1893), 14; Donald Kinzer, An Episode in Anti-Catholicism, The American Protective Association (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964), 97-99.

[12]Editorial Note, CR, XLIII (January 28, 1893), 49.

[13]Editorial, "The New Cardinal," CR, XLIX (January 12, 1896), 40.

[14]Rev. J. F. Loughlin, "Rome a True Ally of the Republic," TF, XV (May, 1893), 279-80; Rev. P. J. McManus, "The APA," WW, XXVI (January 18, 1894), 2; Editorial, "Demanding Msgr. Satolli's Recall," WW, XXVII (January 31, 1895), 4. See too, Editorial, "Cardinal Satolli," WW, XXVII (November 7, 1895), 4.

[15]Editorial Note, CW, LXII (January, 1896), 570.

[16]Rev. Edward McGlynn, "The Vatican and the United States," TF, XVI (September, 1893), 14, 16-17.

[17]Rev. Thomas Bouquillon, "The Apostolic Delegation," ACQR, XX (January, 1895), 128-30.

[18]Pope Leo XIII, Longinqua Oceani, in Documents, ed. by Ellis, pp. 514-26.

[19]Ellis, Documents, pp. 515-18; Editorial, "The Catholic Church in America," The Catholic News, IX (February 10, 1895), 4.

[20]Ellis, Documents, pp. 517-18.

[21]Ibid., p. 522.

[22]Ibid., pp. 522-27.

[23]Editorial, "The Pope's American Encyclical," TI, XLVII (February 7, 1895), 10.

[24]"The Religious World," TO, LI (February 9, 1895), 234.

[25]A Catholic Layman, "Leo XIII to the Church in the United States," CA, LXX (February 14, 1895), 99-100.

[26]Editorial Note, TN, LX (January 31, 1895), 83; Editorial, "The Recent Encyclical of Leo XIII," HW, XXXIX (March 9, 1895), 218.

[27]William Traynor, "The Menace of Romanism," NAR, CLXI (August, 1895), 134.

[28]Ibid., pp. 129-33.

[29]Editorial, "Our Holy Father's Encyclical," The Catholic News, IX (February 3, 1895), 5; Msgr. Joseph Schroeder, "Leo XIII and the Encyclical Longinqua," ACQR, XX (April, 1895), 381-82; "Catholic Journalists and the Recent Encyclical," AER, XII (March, 1895), 212-15. See too, "The Mind of the Apostolic Delegate," AER, XIII (July, 1895), 101-07; and, M. J. H., "Church and State," ACQR, XXI (January, 1896), 98-124.

[30]Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, p. 196.

[31]Rev. A. F. Hewit, "Encyclical of Leo XIII to the Bishops of the United States," CW, LX (March, 1895), 721-22, 723-24, 725-26.

[32]"The Public Writings of Leo XIII," TCUB, I (April, 1895), 305; Editorial Note, WW, XXVII (February 28, 1895), 4; Editorial, "The Pope's Encyclical to the American Bishops," WW, XXVII (January 31, 1895), 4.

[33]Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, pp. 195-96; McAvoy, Great Crisis, pp. 123-24.

[34]Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, pp. 196-97; McAvoy, Great Crisis, pp. 124-53.

[35]McAvoy, History of the Catholic Church, p. 318.

[36]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, I, 31-34; McAvoy, Great Crisis, pp. 125, 144; Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, p. 196.

[37]Moynihan, Life of Archbishop Ireland, p. 43.

[38]Editorial Note, WW, XXVII (October 24, 1895), 4.

[39]"Pope Leo XIII on Religious Congresses," The Literary Digest, XII (November 9, 1895), 50.

[40]McAvoy, History of the Catholic Church, pp. 321-22.

[41]Editorial Note, TI, XLVIII (October 8, 1896), 13; Editorial Note, TI, XLVIII (October 15, 1896), 11-12; Editorial Note, TI, XLVIII (October 22, 1896), 14; and, Editorial Note, TI, XLVIII (December 10, 1896), 16. See too, "The Resignation of Bishop Keane," The Literary Digest, XIII (October 24, 1896), 821; "The Religious World," TO, LIV (December 12, 1896), 1100; and Rev. D. S. Phelan, "The Roman Catholic Church," TI, XLIX (January 7, 1897), 12.

[42]Editorial, "The Conflict in the Catholic University," TI, XLIX (October 28, 1897), 10-11. See too, Editorial, "Archbishop Keane for New Orleans," TI, XLIX (August 26, 1897), 12; and, "Meaning of Bishop Keane's Removal," The Literary Digest, XIII (October 31, 1896), 851-52.

[43]"Bishop Keane," CR, L (October 17, 1896), 247; "Archbishop Keane to the University Alumnae," CR, LI (June 5, 1897), 354. See too, R. Mayne, "Bishop Keane," CR, XLI (March 12, 1892), 162; and, "The Resignation of Bishop Keane," The Literary Digest, XIII (October 24, 1896), 821.

[44]Editorial Note, WW, XXVII (December 9, 1895), 4.

[45]Editorial, "The Retirement of Bishop Keane," WW, XXVIII (October 8, 1896), 4. See too, Rev. D. Phelan, "The Roman Catholic Church," TI, XLIX (January 7, 1897), 12.

[46]Some examples of The Catholic World's liberal approach to Catholicism in the American environment are: Rev. I. T. Hecker, "The Mission of Leo XIII," CW, XLVIII (October, 1888), 1-12; Rev. William Barry, "Catholic and Democratic Ideals," CW, LI (May, 1890), 143-52; Rev. A. F. Hewit, "Catholic and American Ethics," CW, LI (June, 1890), 348-58; S. B. Hedges, "Father Hecker," CW, LXI (June, 1895), 381-82; and P. J. O'Callaghan, "The Puritan Catholicized," CW, LXV (April, 1897), 113-14.

CHAPTER VI

THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: THE LAST STAGE, 1897-1903

The climax to Pope Leo XIII's intervention into the affairs of the American Catholic Church occurred in January, 1899, when he issued his encyclical, Testem Benevolentiae (On Americanism), to James Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore. The contents of the letter set forth boundaries beyond which the liberal bishops were not permitted to go in advancing the Americanization of the Catholic Church in the United States.[1]

Conservatives in the hierarchy interpreted the letter as a papal vindication of their orthodoxy and as a stinging rebuke to what they called the religious minimism and indifference of their liberal counterparts. Liberal bishops were privately disappointed by the encyclical, but publically, they reiterated their orthodoxy, and refused to concede that the pope was in any way rebuking or admonishing them. Research has

since shown that there were elements of truth in both interpretations of the encyclical.[2]

This chapter is not intended to be a study of the "Americanist" controversy, but rather of the periodical response to Leo's attempts to settle that controversy in the ranks of the American Catholic hierarchy. Therefore, the following background information is intended to make the subsequent discussion of that periodical response more meaningful.

Conservative and liberal bishops in the American hierarchy wanted the Protestant majority in the United States to know that Catholicism was completely compatible with American constitutional ideals. However, the conservatives, who composed a majority within the hierarchy, and the liberals, who often enjoyed greater popularity with the press and the people, differed rather considerably in their approach to that problem, and sometimes in their perception of American constitutional ideals.

Liberals were generally friendlier and less defensive than the conservatives in their relations with Protestants. For example, without compromising Church doctrine, some liberals often preached in Protestant churches and were willing participants in interdenominational congresses. Conservatives felt that such actions went beyond the bounds of Christian charity.[3]

Liberals were more willing to accept the findings of science without feeling that such findings would undermine their religious beliefs; more generally, liberals sought to eradicate the separation between secular and spiritual, and to make every action religiously meaningful. In order to advance that goal, they tended to interpret Leo's teachings as authoritative, but more as general guidelines than as demands for unconditional assent. Conservatives, on the other hand, resisted liberal efforts to commit the Church to an encounter with the era. Most conservatives felt that such an encounter would of necessity imperil the faith of their immigrant flocks. They tended to believe that the Church in America was prospering not because of the era but in spite of it. Moreover, they interpreted Leo's teachings more narrowly than did the liberals, gave a more encompassing interpretation to the pope's power of infallibility, and desired a greater degree of Romanization in the structure and operation of the American Church.[4]

No liberal ever taught the sufficiency of personal religious inspiration, but most of them did frown upon excessive reliance on external spiritual direction. They believed that the clergy would profit more by promoting interior union with God than by increasing the rules and regulations governing the lives of the people.

Conservatives tended to feel that men, weak and sinful creatures that they were, needed as much external religious guidance as possible.[5]

Moreover, while the liberals never slighted prayer, the sacraments, or religious devotions as effective methods of perfecting one's religious life, they strongly advocated an active apostolate, that is, a greater application of the principles of the faith to the problems and needs of both Church and society. Conservatives, however, tended to encourage a spirit of passive acquiescence among laity and clergy, and sanctioned only hierarchically organized and dominated action.[6]

Finally, the liberals often spoke critically about the religious orders. They never questioned the essential value of the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience commonly taken by members of such orders. However, they believed that the nature of most religious orders made them rather limited in the amount and kind of missionary work they could perform. Moreover, many religious orders in America were directly controlled by superiors who lived in Rome, and who knew little or nothing of the need for a more active religious life and zeal on this side of the Atlantic. On the other hand, most liberals admired such religious orders as the Paulist Fathers, founded in America by the Rev. Isaac

Hecker. This order required no vows of its members, and was intended for active missionary work among Catholics and non-Catholics in the United States. Liberals viewed the order as more in touch with the practical, active spirit of the times than were the older religious orders.[7]

Father Hecker, who also founded and edited The Catholic World until his death in 1888, had converted to Catholicism in 1844, was ordained a priest in 1849, and established the Paulist Fathers in 1858. In his earlier days, he had associated with the Transcendentalists, was a friend of Thoreau, Bronson Alcott, and Emerson, and had spent a brief time at Brook Farm. These early experiences and acquaintances may have influenced his later liberal Catholic emphasis on the importance of an interiorized spiritual life, and his deemphasis on excessive external religious guidance.[8]

In 1891, three years after his death, Hecker's biography, written by Paulist Father Walter Elliot and including a laudatory preface by Archbishop Ireland, was published with the imprimatur of the conservative Archbishop Corrigan of New York. The text was very sympathetic to Hecker, and Ireland's preface, in particular, portrayed the priest as an exemplary embodiment of the liberal but orthodox Catholic who personified the harmonious and mutually beneficial way in which the

principles of Roman Catholicism could coexist with American democracy. In addition, Ireland praised Hecker's emphasis on the development of active social virtues and on the development of a interiorized religious faith not dependent on excessive external controls. The publication of the biography provoked no outburst from either liberal or conservative bishops and editors.[9]

In 1897, the biography appeared in French. The editor, Abbe Felix Klein, a liberal who taught at the Institut Catholique of Paris, added a preface in which he glowingly described Hecker's life as proof of the compatibility between Catholicism and republicanism. More important, Klein edited the translation so as to emphasize those differences which distinguished Hecker and other liberal Catholics from their conservative counterparts. Favorable reviews of the translation by liberal French, German, and Italian Catholics provoked a highly critical response by both European and American conservative Catholic writers and clergymen.[10]

European conservatives, in particular, argued that Hecker's religious views were heretical, and therefore, that republicanism was harmful, not beneficial to the Catholic faith. European and American conservatives referred to Hecker and those who admired his views as "Americanists," and accused them of expecting the Church to modify its doctrines and disciplines so as to make

converts more easily. The "Americanists" were also accused of promoting the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit upon the individual, giving the natural virtues greater importance than the supernatural virtues, placing greater emphasis on active rather than on passive virtues, and deemphasizing the importance of religious vows. As the stream of criticism mounted against the American liberals, they, in turn, defended Hecker and his ideas, and charged that the conservatives had misinterpreted both the biography and the liberal approach to an Americanized Catholicism.[11]

The crisis reached its peak when the conservatives urged the pope to condemn the Americanism which they had accused Hecker and his admirers of preaching. Leo appointed a commission of cardinals to investigate the charges, and on January 22, 1899, the pope embodied the results of the commission's findings in his encyclical, Testem Benevolentiae.

Leo condemned the ideas which the conservatives had ascribed to Hecker and the American liberals. However, the pope never said that either Hecker or his admirers in the American hierarchy ever held the condemned doctrines. Those doctrines, he said, were garnered from the French translation of The Life of Father Hecker. After describing and refuting the condemned

doctrines (essentially the same as those mentioned earlier by the conservatives), the pope added:

> . . . We cannot approve the opinions which some comprise under the head of Americanism. If, indeed, by that name be designated the characteristic qualities which reflect honor on the people of America, just as other nations have what is special to them; or if it implies the condition of your commonwealths, or the laws and customs which prevail in them, there is surely no reason why We should deem that it ought to be discarded. But if it is to be used not only to signify, but even to commend the above doctrines, there can be no doubt but that our Venerable Brethern the bishops of America would be the first to repudiate and condemn it, as being especially unjust to them and to their entire nation as well. For it raises the suspicion that there are some among you who conceive of and desire a church in America different from that which is in the rest of the world.[12]

As indicated above, conservative bishops interpreted the encyclical as a rebuke to their liberal colleagues, and thanked the pope for stifling a very real threat to the life of the American Church. Liberals also thanked Leo for condemning admittedly false doctrines, but emphasized that they had never held the false doctrines in the first place and interpreted the encyclical as a clear recognition of that fact. Privately, however, the liberals regretted the promulgation of the encyclical and in fact had tried to prevent its publication, not because they felt that they were guilty of the errors condemned, but because by its publication, the encyclical implied that " . . . the American Church is not understood abroad, and that its enemies are listened to, and that they can lie with impunity."[13]

Protestant journals, responding in an era of "manifest destiny," American expansion, and a heightened national feeling, interpreted the encyclical as a rebuke to the theological "Americanism" of the liberals in the American hierarchy. More important, these journals argued that the pope should not have condemned that "Americanism" which, in their eyes, did not pose a threat to the existence of the Church. Indeed, the condemned "Americanism," they said, was nothing more than a truly Christian attempt by an enlightened few to bring the Catholic Church into greater harmony with the age and with the American way of life. The pope's letter, they concluded, had stifled that attempt. The following examples will document the Protestant periodical response.

The Independent's reaction to the encyclical was a prime example of how the editor of a leading Protestant journal had, apparently unknown to the liberals, interpreted those differences which distinguished the liberals from the conservative bishops as inclinations toward the Protestantization of American Catholicism.[14]

In March, 1899, The Independent's editor expressed disappointment that the encyclical had been printed by the conservative press before Archbishop Ireland could reach Rome and convince the pope of the absurdity of the anti-Americanists' claim that American Catholicism was being undermined from within.[15] At its face value, this

response seemed to indicate that the editor was simply supporting the liberal bishops' assertions of orthodoxy. However, in another editorial that same month, the editor strongly implied that the liberals had in fact held the condemned doctrines. His complaint was that the pope had condemned doctrines which he felt were perfectly Christian and should never have been condemned.[16]

Other Protestant journals responding to the pope's encyclical conveyed the same notion of liberal American Catholicism as did The Independent. The Outlook's editors criticized Leo's apparent unwillingness to recognize the possibility of variation in doctrine or discipline in order to more successfully adapt the Church to the age. The Philadelphia Reformed Church Review, another non-denominational journal, accused the pope of widening the chasm between Catholics and Protestants, a chasm which its editor implied had been narrowed because of the attitudes of the liberals in the American hierarchy. The Methodist Christian Advocate of New York agreed and editorialized that Leo's letter did nothing less than resurrect the Syllabus of Errors issued by Pope Pius IX in 1864.[17]

The Open Court, a popular philosophical journal published in Chicago and committed to reforming religion under the auspices of science, added a note of hope to its criticism of the encyclical. The editor argued that

the pope had doomed the Church to stagnancy by condemning liberal efforts to bring the Church into the spirit of the times. At the same time, the editor expressed his journal's hope that the condemned "Americanism" would continue to flourish, despite the encyclical. Only in that way, he concluded, could true freedom and spirituality be attained by the millions of Catholics who followed the pope's teachings so blindly.[18]

The Protestant periodicals that responded to Leo's last major encyclical to the American Church showed varying degrees of disappointment, disillusionment, and disgust. The Independent's editor reflected the disappointment of its readers (no letters to the editor refuted the journal's position). On the other hand, the editorial policy of The Independent, as in previous years, still gave some benefit of the doubt to Leo XIII. The journal's editorials argued that had Leo been given the chance to hear a formal presentation of the liberal American Catholic position (as was the case in the episodes involving Leo with the Knights of Labor, Cahenslyism, the school controversy, and eventually, McGlynn), the pope would have probably chosen the liberal side. This attitude, with respect to Testem Benevolentiae, was consistent with the journal's earlier appraisals of papal decisions involving the American Church.

The Outlook, however, reflected a more unqualified sense of disillusionment with the pope, an attitude which had begun with the promulgation of Longinqua Oceani in 1895. The journal's previously favorable policy toward Leo had resulted from papal decisions made between 1891 and 1893. The editors had interpreted those decisions, discussed earlier, as indications of papal willingness to follow the liberals' desire to modify the Church's theretofore intransigent positions on such issues as education, secret societies, Americanization of immigrants, the relation between the Church and the civil power, and Protestant-Catholic cooperation. Testem Benevolentiae, in 1899, was interpreted as the culmination of a series of conservatively oriented papal decisions involving the American Church since 1895.

Anti-Catholic journals such as The Christian Advocate responded to the pope's encyclical in a manner similar to its earlier response to papal decisions involving the American Church--with suspicion and disgust. Any faint hope such journals may have silently harbored concerning the Americanization (hence, Protestantization) of the Catholic Church in the United States by the efforts of its liberal bishops were, of course, dimmed by the pope's encyclical.

Finally, and equally important, the response of the influential Independent and Outlook indicated that a

significant portion of articulate Protestants felt that the pope's condemnation of theological "Americanism" was a condemnation of the favorable image of the doctrinal and disciplinary attitudes of the American Church which liberals such as Gibbons, Keane, and Ireland had conveyed to a large number of Protestant Americans. That Protestant view of liberal American Catholicism must not have offered much solace to liberal Catholic prelates who were insisting upon their orthodoxy in the face of attacks from their conservative counterparts.

Among secular periodicals, the editor of The Nation, in agreement with the leading Protestant journals, stated that Leo had condemned those doctrinal and disciplinary views held by the most intelligent American bishops and priests. The Atlantic Monthly carried an article which predicted the continued growth and importance of American Catholicism in the life of the nation, but added that the late encyclical of the pope seemed to be a partial victory for conservative American Catholic leadership.[19]

The most significant secular periodical coverage of Leo's encyclical was provided by The North American Review. Although the journal did not explicitly editorialize, it offered its readers examples of the different interpretations which conservative and liberal Catholics

were giving to Testem Benevolentiae. Two of the three articles published were authored by liberal Catholics.

In July, 1899, the first article, written by a Catholic church historian, the liberal Rev. William Barry, expressed with candor what liberal Catholic journals such as The Catholic World were expressing more moderately about the meaning of the encyclical. Barry argued that Leo's encyclical had upheld the political "Americanism" of the liberal bishops, and that it had separated that true form of "Americanism" from its false theological counterpart which conservatives had so unjustly attributed to the liberals.[20]

Neither Hecker nor any of the liberal bishops, Barry said, had ever espoused those tenets of theological "Americanism" (described on pp. 155-56) condemned by Leo XIII. French conservatives, in particular, had become distraught with the pope's favorable view of American democracy and of the prosperous condition of the Catholic Church in America. They therefore sought to discredit American democracy's favorable influence upon the pope, and saw in the imprecise translation of the biography of Father Hecker an opportunity to create a false notion of "Americanism" which they (and American conservatives in the hierarchy) then attributed to Hecker and the liberal bishops in the United States. Their conspiracy, however, backfired. Leo recognized the source of this

phantom heresy, and while he justifiably condemned its tenets, he clearly upheld the brand of "Americanism" preached by such men as Gibbons, Ireland, and Keane.[21]

A second article, published by The North American Review in March, 1900, was written by Msgr. P. L. Pechenard, conservative rector of the Catholic University of Paris. Pechenard tried to refute Barry's contention that Leo had condemned a phantom heresy (that is, one which existed only in the minds of European and American conservative Catholic clergy and writers, but which had no essential basis in the opinions or attitudes of the liberal American bishops). Pechenard argued that the heresy did in fact exist in America among the liberal bishops and their followers. After all, he said, the bishops of both New York and Milwaukee had explicitly thanked the pope for ending the heresy of those in America seeking to undermine the doctrinal and disciplinary unity of the Church.[22]

Two months later, in May, 1900, a third article appeared in The North American Review written by J. St. Clair Etheridge (possibly a pseudonym of Archbishop Ireland) to refute Pechenard's claims.[23] The author declared that the "Americanism" condemned by the pope had been born and buried in Europe, and had been unknown in America until the promulgation of Testem Benevolentiae. The only "Americanism" preached by men like Hecker,

Ireland, and Keane was the political "Americanism" approved by the pope. Moreover, he said, Leo never imputed the errors of the condemned "Americanism" to the liberal bishops.[24]

More specifically, Etheridge denounced Pechenard's reference to those letters written by the bishops of New York and Milwaukee thanking the pope for condemning a very real threat to the American Church. Etheridge pointed out that New York and Milwaukee were the only two out of fourteen arch-dioceses to write such letters. The reasons for that fact, Etheridge said, were very clear. In New York, the conservative Archbishop Corrigan (who, Etheridge mentioned, had given his imprimatur to the Hecker biography in 1891) was simply exercising a personal vendetta against Ireland and Gibbons. The bishops of Milwaukee, on the other hand, (who were Germans) were similarly motivated. They were still embittered over the defeat of Cahenslyism, an episode in which Ireland, Gibbons, and Keane had played important parts.[25]

The articles in The North American Review reflected, to some extent, the range of views that were forthcoming from the columns of the Catholic periodical press. Equally important, however, the Review gave twice as much space to the liberal than to the conservative interpretation of the encyclical. Likewise, the

quality of the liberal interpretations clearly outweighed the quality of the particular conservative argument. Thus, without explicitly editorializing, and without indicating whether he actually agreed with the liberal interpretation, the Review's editor did imply his opposition to the conservative viewpoint.

Among Catholic periodicals responding to the pope's encyclical, The Western Watchman, and two heretofore unmentioned journals, the popular Donahoe's Magazine of Boston, and William H. Thorne's The Globe of New York offered good indications of the range of conservative viewpoints.

Donahoe's Magazine, a general Catholic family journal, published an article in June, 1899, which praised Leo for having spoken in time to save the Church from any harm that might have been caused by her well meaning but misdirected friends in America. The article's author, a clergyman, stated that the pope's letter had acted as a calming force upon the mistaken zeal of those individuals who had, at times, placed the American Church in an awkward and unorthodox position.[26]

While the Donahoe article interpreted the encyclical as a rather mild indictment of the liberal bishops and their followers, the personal journalism of Rev. David Phelan's Western Watchman offered a more outspoken analysis of Testem Benevolentiae. Phelan said that while

Archbishop Corrigan had been essentially right to thank Leo for preventing the errors of Hecker and his admirers from finding permanent lodging in the American Church, the archbishop was being rather alarmist when he said that the pope's letter had saved the American Church from being devoured by a wolf. Indeed, Phelan continued, Hecker was an essentially good man whose brain had softened during the last years of his illness-ridden life, and the upshot was his rather slipshod theology. Ireland (who prefaced the English edition of Hecker's life) saw much that was good in Hecker, but never publically went as far as Keane did in his admiration for some of Hecker's tenets. Leo recognized the good intentions of the "Americanists," and therefore aimed his encyclical not at condemning them, but at gratifying the alarmists without sacrificing his friendship with the liberals.[27]

By far, the most outspoken Catholic periodical response to the encyclical came from the pages of convert editor William H. Thorne's The Globe, one of the most vituperative Catholic periodicals of the period. Thorne, like Phelan, felt free to criticize both conservatives and liberals, depending on the issue at stake. Until 1899, however, The Globe's response to the pontificate of Leo XIII had been confined chiefly to a debate over the desirability of restoring the temporal power over

Rome to the pope, an issue with which Thorne took the side of the opposition.[28]

In June, 1899, six months after the pope had issued his encyclical on "Americanism," Thorne wrote a feature article for his journal entitled, "Was the Pope Fooled on Americanism?" His answer was a mixture of conservative Catholicism and intensely personal journalism. He began by asking God to bless the pope for having issued the letter, but to curse those bishops who had tried to prevent its promulgation, and to pity those editors who supported the liberals by insisting that the condemned "Americanism" never existed in the American Church. Thorne included in the latter group the editors of The Catholic World and the New York Freeman's Journal.[29]

Thorne then dismissed some alleged liberal charges that Leo had been persuaded to issue the encyclical by a group of reactionaries determined to discredit the Catholic University, among other things, in America. Indeed, Thorne insisted, Hecker was a half converted lunatic (Hecker had converted to Catholicism earlier in life), and the Paulists, Ireland, and Keane were ambitious schismatics who had utilized the Hecker biography to advance their own errors. Fortunately, Leo was alerted to the plan and, by his encyclical, stopped it cold.[30]

After he refuted the sincerity of the liberals' assertions of orthodoxy, Thorne then indicted the conservative Archbishop Corrigan as an "Americanist" by virtue of his having allowed Hecker and the Paulists to prosper and go unchecked in the New York diocese. The Paulists, he said, had been Corrigan's pets, and the archbishop either did not have the intelligence to recognize their errors, or was too cowardly to do anything about correcting them.[31]

Finally, Thorne criticized the Protestant periodical claim that the encyclical was a partial victory for the conservatives. Thorne's reply was too indicative of the man's character to be paraphrased:

> A partial victory. My God! It is not a question of partial victory or a question of reactionaries or liberalism. It is God's old eternal truth as uttered and practiced by the apostles and interpreted by His Church in all ages of the world versus a parcel of Yankee and Western upstarts who thought they were out on a prairie chicken hunt of their own.[32]

Thorne's charge of Corrigan's collusion-by-silence may have been derived, in part, from the fact that Corrigan's imprimatur had appeared on the English edition of the Hecker biography in 1891. His charge may also have been derived partly from the responses of two of the nation's leading conservative Catholic periodicals, The Catholic Review and The Catholic News, to the Americanist controversy and to the pope's encyclical. Both journals were published in New York, and both (especially The

Catholic Review) often reflected official diocesan (Corrigan's) opinion in their responses to Leo's intervention in the affairs of the American Church. That fact has already been documented by previous references to the Review's editorials.

The Catholic Review, which merged into the Milwaukee Catholic Citizen in 1898, had always spoken admiringly of Hecker and the Paulists. On more than one occasion, the Review's editor, J. Talbot Smith, a Church historian, wrote about the perfect harmony between the ideas of Hecker and those of Pope Leo XIII. He even went so far as to attribute to Hecker's inspiration many of Leo's most basic ideas about the spiritual life; and in 1898, Smith reported the favorable way in which Pope Leo had received a copy of the English edition of the Hecker biography from Archbishop Keane. A year earlier, the editor had favorably commented on Klein's preface to the French edition of the biography as a clear indication of Klein's and the translator's perfect orthodoxy and of their harmony with the teachings of Pope Leo XIII.[33]

Although The Catholic Review ended publication in New York in 1898, The Catholic News continued to prosper. In 1897 and 1898, when the Americanist crisis was reaching its peak, the News expressed no editorial dissent from the remarks of the Review concerning Hecker and the

Paulists, and in fact regularly published a column by the Paulists about the perfection of the spiritual life.[34]

When, in 1899, the pope issued his encyclical on "Americanism," The Catholic News did little more than report the event. Although the News did reprint the full text of the pope's letter, the only editorial comment made was that the letter was an expression of the pope's love for America and for the American Catholic Church. In the introduction to the reprint, the editor mentioned that " . . . so called Americanism is discussed," but then made no further comments about the letter either in that or later issues.[35]

Given the earlier implied editorial kinship between the Review and the News with regard to the Paulists and to other issues involving the pope and the American Church (both journals were critical of McGlynn in 1886 and 1887), the rather non-committal response of The Catholic News to Testem Benevolentiae seemed logical. The nature of the News' response was probably out of deference to The Catholic Review's earlier editorials about Hecker and out of deference to its own favorable opinion of the Paulists. Moreover, the News' minimal response to the encyclical may also have been out of deference to Archbishop Corrigan who, despite his face-saving letter thanking Leo for condemning a very real heresy, had earlier supported

Hecker and the Paulists (if only by his implicit consent to the editorials of The Catholic Review).

The official Paulist publication, the liberal Catholic World, edited by the Rev. A. F. Hewit since Hecker's death in 1888, responded explicitly to the pope's encyclical--an infrequent event in view of the journal's previously silent "responses" to episodes involving Leo's intervention into the American Church. After presenting the text of the pope's encyclical, the World's editor said that the pope's words represented a complete and unqualified vindication of Hecker's teachings. The pope had condemned certain erroneous interpretations of Hecker's teachings, but not the teachings themselves. The implication of the editor's remarks, then, was that the English edition of Hecker's life was in perfect harmony with Catholic orthodoxy; heresy had resulted from the interpretations gleaned from the French translation. Liberal Catholicism in America had been upheld by Rome.[36]

The New York Freeman's Journal, edited by the Rev. Louis Lambert, and before him by other pro-Ireland supporters, was more outspoken than The Catholic World in its explanation of the origins of the heresies condemned by the pope. Leo, the editor said,

> . . . lays the responsibility on all those who have given countenance and publicity to those views by promoting the publication of "The Life of Father Hecker" in French and by commenting on it in various ways.[37]

While the editor of The Catholic World was satisfied to say that the heresies of theological "Americanism" had arisen from erroneous interpretations of the French translation, the editor of the Freeman's Journal made it a point to stress that Hecker's teachings had been plundered and distorted not only by European and American conservatives, but by liberals such as the Abbe Felix Klein as well. Leo's letter, then, was not only a condemnation of errors falsely attributed to American Catholic liberals; it was also a condemnation of those French and other European liberals who had inadvertantly impugned the reputations of certain prelates in the United States by falsely identifying their theological "Americanism" with the perfectly orthodox political "Americanism" of men like Hecker, Ireland, and Keane.[38]

Personal loyalty and personal animosity motivated much of the Catholic periodical response to the pope's encyclical. The Catholic World had to defend its founder and former editor. The response of the New York Freeman's Journal and of The Western Watchman, despite the divergencies between their interpretations, were both, in part, motivated by the editors' admiration for Archbishop Ireland. The Catholic News seemed to be motivated, in part, by a desire to help Archbishop Corrigan save face, just as William Thorne's Globe was intent on

implicating the archbishop in what the editor viewed as a papal indictment of the liberal bishops in America. The silence of such leading conservative journals as The American Catholic Quarterly Review and the American Ecclesiastical Review may have been partly motivated by their satisfaction that adequate (if inadvertant) harm had been done to the liberal bishops by the Protestant periodical response to Testem Benevolentiae.

Moreover, the general tenor of the Catholic periodical response tended to reflect the continuing disagreements within the American hierarchy as to the meaning of the pope's encyclical as well as to the proper way of Americanizing the Catholic Church in the United States. Although the liberals persistently and publically proclaimed their orthodoxy, it was apparent by 1900 that those theological tendencies which distinguished the liberals methodologically but not doctrinally from the conservatives, and which the liberals had utilized in the hope of bringing about an open dialogue between their Church and the age, had been discredited by the controversy that preceded and followed the promulgation of Testem Benevolentiae.

The interest of the periodical press in the last three years of Leo's reign, 1901 to 1903, was considerably less than it had been during the previous fifteen years. During these last years, Leo did not intervene in

American Church affairs, and after 1900, the periodical press did not resurrect the Americanist controversy or Leo's part in its final stages.

By 1900, the conservative bishops in the American hierarchy were more strongly entrenched than at any other time during the previous ten years. Moreover, the conservative approach to Americanization, characterized as it was by a defensiveness, a suspiciousness, an authoritarianism, and the narrowness of a ghetto mentality, was to be generally unsuccessful during the next two decades in furthering the acceptance of Catholicism in the United States. The Rev. Thomas McAvoy, author of the definitive study of the "Americanist" controversy and crisis, stated that none of the liberals changed sides as a result of Testem Benevolentiae, but rather maintained an "armed silence" between their conservative counterparts and themselves. Equally important,

> The story of the Catholic Church in the United States during the next two decades was the story of the rejected Americanists hoping for changes that did not come and their opponents trying to solve the problem of getting Catholicism accepted in American circumstances without adopting the policies they had condemned in their opponents.[39]

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER VI

[1]Pope Leo XIII, Testem Benevlentiae, in Documents, ed. by Ellis, pp. 553-62.

[2]The most helpful secondary sources of information on the "Americanist" controversy were: McAvoy, Great Crisis, chapters 4-7; Rev. Thomas T. McAvoy, "Americanism and Frontier Catholicism," The Review of Politics (July, 1947), 275-301; Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism; Moynihan, Life of Archbishop Ireland; Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, II, chapter I; and Meng, "Growing Pains," pp. 17-67; and Ellis, Documents.

[3]McAvoy, Great Crisis, chapter III; Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, II, chapter I; and Cross, Emergence of Liberal Catholicism, chapters IX-X, spend much time discussing liberal and conservative differences. See also, McAvoy, "Americanism and Frontier," pp. 295-301; and Meng, "Growing Pains," pp. 17-67.

[4]Ibid.

[5]Ibid., especially Cross, pp. 171-72.

[6]Ibid.

[7]Ibid., especially Cross, pp. 176-77.

[8]R. W. A., "Hecker, Isaac Thomas," Dictionary of American Biography (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), VIII, 494.

[9]McAvoy, "Americanism and Frontier," p. 286; Archbishop John Ireland, "Introduction to the Life of Father Hecker," CW, LI (June, 1890), 348-58.

[10]McAvoy, "Americanism and Frontier," pp. 292-93; Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, II, 51; and McAvoy, Great Crisis, pp. 164-68.

[11]McAvoy, "Americanism and Frontier," pp. 288, 292-93.

[12]Ellis, Documents, pp. 561-62.

[13]Gibbons to O'Connell, Baltimore, March 2, 1899, quoted in Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, II, 70; and Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, II, 70-75.

[14]This Protestant image of liberal American Catholicism was in evidence at least as far back as 1891. See, Editorial Note, TI, XLIII (May 7, 1891), 2; Editorial Note, TI, XLIV (November 10, 1892), 12; and "The Religious World," TO, LI (March 2, 1895), 358.

[15]Editorial Note, TI, LI (March 9, 1899), 717-18.

[16]"The Pope on Americanism," The Literary Digest, XVIII (March 11, 1899), 287.

[17]Editorial, "The Pope on Americanism," TO, LXI (March 4, 1899), 492-93; Editorial, "The Pope's Letter on 'Americanism,'" The Reformed Church Review, III (June, 1899), 395, 401; Editorial, "Pope Leo and Americanism," CA, LXXIV (March 2, 1899), 327.

[18]"Americanism in the Roman Church," The Open Court, XIII (April, 1899), 253-55.

[19]Richard Norton, "Americanism," or the Catholic Church in America" [Editorial], TN, LVIII (March 30, 1899), 238; Henry Sedgewick, "The United States and Rome," Atlantic Monthly, LXXXIV (October, 1899), 457-59.

[20]Rev. William Barry, "Americanism, True and False," NAR, CLXIX (July, 1899), 34, 38; and Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, II, 75.

[21]Barry, "Americanism, True and False," NAR, CLXIX (July, 1899), 35, 36, 43.

[22]Msgr. P. L. Pechenard, "The End of Americanism in France," NAR, CLXX (March, 1900), 421-32. See too, McAvoy, Great Crisis, p. 333, for a reference to Pechenard's position.

[23]Ellis, Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, II, 75 disagrees with McAvoy, Great Crisis, pp. 335-36, and with Moynihan, Life of Archbishop Ireland, p. 111, both of whom believed the article was written by Ireland.

[24]J. St. Clair Etheridge, "The Genesis of Americanism," NAR, CLXX (May, 1900), 679-89.

[25]Ibid., pp. 690-93.

[26]Rev. M. E. Twomey, "Leo XIII and the United States," Donahoe's Magazine, XLI (June, 1899), 543-46.

[27]Editorial, "Remember Haman," WW, XXIX (March 2, 1899), 4; and, Editorial, "The Pope's Letter on Americanism," WW, XXIX (February 23, 1899), 4. See too, Editorial, "The Meaning of the Pope's Letter," WW, XXIX (March 2, 1899), 4; Editorial Note, WW, XXIX (March 30, 1899), 4; and, Editorial, "Archbishop Corrigan's Letter of Adhesion," WW, XXIX (May 11, 1899), 4.

[28]William H. Thorne, "Abandon the Pope's Temporal Sovereignty," The Globe, XV (January-June, 1894), 756-76; and, William H. Thorne, "Abandon the Pope's Temporal Power," The Globe, XLI (March, 1901), 1-11.

[29]William H. Thorne, "Was the Pope Fooled on Americanism?" The Globe, XXXIV (June, 1899), 125.

[30]Ibid., pp. 127-28, 142.

[31]Ibid., pp. 131, 134, 135.

[32]Ibid., p. 139.

[33]Editorial, "Father Hecker," CR, XXXV (December 30, 1888), 8; Editorial, "Father Hecker," CR, LII (July 31, 1897), 67; Editorial Note, CR, LII (January 1, 1898), 417. See too, Archbishop Ireland, "Pope Leo," CR, LI (April 10, 1897), 231.

[34]See The Catholic News, XII, XIII (1897-1898), for weekly columns by the Paulists; and Mott, History of American Magazines, IV, 298.

[35]"Letter of the Pope," The Catholic News, XIII (February 25, 1899), 18.

[36]"The Papal Letter and The Outlook," CW, LXIX (April, 1899), 1-8; and, "Leo XIII on Americanism," CW, LXIX (April, 1899), 133-39.

[37]Editorial, "Why Was the Letter Written?" Freeman's Journal (March 18, 1899), 1; and, Mott, History of American Magazines, IV, 298.

[38]Editorial, "Last Words on Americanism," Freeman's Journal (March 25, 1899), 1; and, "More on Americanism," The Literary Digest, XVIII (March 18, 1899), 314.

[39]McAvoy, History of the Catholic Church, p. 338; McAvoy, Great Crisis, p. 338; Rev. Thomas McAvoy, "The Catholic Minority After the Americanist Controversy, 1899-1917: A Survey," The Review of Politics, XXI (January, 1959), 53-81; and Callahan, Mind of the Catholic Layman for an excellent discussion of the domination by the hierarchy over the issues and controversies which led to the intervention of Pope Leo XIII during the 1880's and 1890's, and for a good discussion of Catholicism in the years after the Americanist controversy.

CHAPTER VII

THE PERIODICAL PRESS AND PAPAL INTERVENTION: CONCLUSIONS

In 1903, the institutional Catholic Church in the United States was in its one hundred fourteenth year. During the previous quarter of a century, the American Church had experienced its most rapid period of growth and had encountered some of its most serious problems. That quarter century had coincided with the pontificate of Pope Leo XIII, and had proved to be an era in which the pope intervened in American Catholic affairs more frequently than had any of his predecessors since the establishment of an American hierarchy in 1789.

It was also an era which witnessed a substantial American public response to papal intervention into major episodes of American Catholic Church history. One important index of that public response, as this study has tried to show, was the American periodical press. This important public media summed up its attitudes toward Leo's intervention during the months just preceding and following the pope's death on July 20, 1903.

An anonymous Catholic prelate writing for The Independent spoke in general terms of Leo's ruling policy of conciliation, patience, and a belief in man's essential goodness. Leo, he said, had reasserted the same doctrines as his predecessor, but " . . . with so much reasonableness and light that they awakened little adverse comment."[1]

In the same issue of The Independent, the editor agreed with the anonymous prelate, but was more specific in terms of evaluating Leo's impact upon Protestant Americans:

> . . . Protestants have softened; they no longer show the old hatred for the Papacy. Presbyterians have deliberately taken out of their Confession of Faith the reference to the Pope as "Anti-Christ." We are not any more willing than before to admit the claims of Rome; we admit the overwhelming claims of a good and wise man to rule our hearts.[2]

The editors of The Outlook praised Leo in general terms for having the wisdom to deal with modern conditions, including the growing force of democracy and the social problems accompanying the development of an industrialized society. Leo's distinguishing trait, the editors said, was his ability and willingness to accomodate the doctrine of infallibility to changing circumstances. He has inspired the Church with a humanistic spirit, and has inspired democracy with respect for law and order based on and motivated by the principles of the Christian religion.[3]

More specifically, The Outlook's editors, apparently having second thoughts about Leo's intervention in the "Americanist" controversy, spoke of that episode as a

prime example of Leo's uncompromising adherence to principles. On the other hand, the editors recalled the pope's intervention in the school controversy, his reinstatement of Father Edward McGlynn, and his intervention in Knights of Labor episode as examples of Leo's willingness to accomodate the Church to the age. The reinstatement of McGlynn, in particular, seemed to have left a favorable impression with the editors:

> That single act of restoration interpreted and emphasized the liberty of speech and opinion sacredly secured by the Pope to the priesthood so long as the priest remains loyal to the supreme authority of the Church and its essential tenets.[4]

A much more critical Protestant estimate was exemplified in the editorial comments of the interdenominational Missionary Review of the World and the Lutheran Reformed Church Review. The editors of both journals spoke in general terms of Leo's personal piety and intellectual power, but insisted that, all things considered, the pope was an ardent champion of medieval papal ideals. Moreover, The Missionary Review editorialized that the system within which Leo had been forced to work fettered him and compelled him to defend and propagate Romanism at the cost of intolerance to all forms of Protestantism. The Reformed Church Review agreed and added that the friendlier attitude of Protestants toward Catholicism and the papacy had not been the result of Leo's influence,

but rather was an expression of the spirit of toleration characteristic of a scientific age.[5]

Among secular journals, the editor of The Nation had both words of praise and criticism for the pope. Leo, he said, had tried to distinguish between the good and the bad elements of modern civilization, especially in the interest he showed toward America and toward the affairs of the American Catholic Church.[6]

In another editorial, however, the editor of The Nation referred to Leo's intervention in the school controversy as an excellent example of how the doctrine of Papal Infallibility "tends irresistably to triteness or to an Hegelian union of contradictories." The thesis, said the editor, was the decree of the Baltimore council of 1884 ordering the expansion of parochial schools under Church control; the antithesis came in 1892 when Leo issued his tolerari potest of Archbishop Ireland's school plan, an act which "seemed to acknowledge frankly the right of State control over parochial schools." The antithesis was given further papal support when Satolli issued his propositions on the school controversy at the archbishop's conference in 1892. The synthesis, concluded the editor, came with the promulgation of the encyclical on the school question in 1893. In the encyclical, the pope:

> . . . had a good word for the Baltimore decisions, and he approved the resolutions of the Archbishops which allowed the right of Roman Catholic parents to educate their children in secular schools, and the right of State control of the parochial. Here was a Barmecide feast for the high-church party and a substantial meal for Archbishop Ireland and his friends.[7]

While editorial control of The Nation had remained in the hands of one man, W. P. Garrison, during all except the first three years of Leo's reign, the editorial control of another leading secular journal, Harper's Weekly, had changed hands several times during the course of Leo's reign. However, until 1901, all of the editors had been relatively unfriendly toward the Church and the papacy. In 1901, George Harvey, editor of The North American Review since 1899, became editor of Harper's Weekly as well. Although the lack of Leo's intervention into American Catholic affairs between 1901 and 1903 did not afford Harvey an opportunity to respond to that aspect of Leo's pontificate, the occasion of Leo's death did not prevent him from looking in favorable retrospect at the pope's relations to his Church in America.[8]

Harvey recalled in general terms the great progress which the American Church had made under Leo's guidance, and likewise, the improved relations between Catholics and Protestants in the United States as a result of Leo's interest in and affection for America and the American Church. The pope's numerous assurances of his

special interest in the welfare of the American Church and of the United States in general, said Harvey, caused much of the former bitterness toward Catholicism to subside. Moreover, during the reign of Leo XIII, said Harvey,

> Unofficial relations, without violence to American traditions, were established with the government. This was due largely to the tact and liberal views of such men as Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, and through them and their colaborers the feeling gained strength throughout the land that the Church was in no degree a menace to the country, but a bulwark, especially in its support of law and order.[9]

Any resurrection of a Know Nothing Party, Harvey continued, would be regarded with derision by most Protestant Americans. The Church of Leo XIII has become a bulwark against skepticism and socialism, and "no-popery" cries would no longer be supported in America now that the Church has come to be regarded as a coadjutor in upholding the existing order.[10]

Harvey's North American Review afforded an opportunity for seven clergyman, one Catholic and six Protestant, to express their views on Leo XIII. In the first article, Archbishop John Ireland wrote in general terms of the pope's ability to grasp quickly the essence of a problem, and his ability to distinguish the good from the evil in the age, and the incidental from the essential in the Church. This ability, this willingness to try and understand the Church in light of the age was lacking, said Ireland, in Leo's predecessor.[11] Ireland was no doubt reflecting, in part, upon Leo's initial support of the

liberals during the late 1880's and early 1890's when their attempts to accomodate the Church with the age were most successful.

The second article, written by the Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, Episcopalian Bishop of Delaware, took issue with Ireland's statement that Leo had tried to reconcile the Church with the age. Leo, he said, may very well have had a sincere desire to better mankind, but he did not completely understand the age or the problems with which he was dealing.[12]

Rev. Robert F. Coyle, Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly, commended Leo for his condemnation of radical and revolutionary economic and political theories (possibly an implicit reference to Leo's initial handling of the McGlynn-Henry George affair, and to Rerum Novarum). Coyle also spoke in general of Leo's generous heart and conciliating spirit. On the other hand, Coyle ended his article with an implicit reference to Longinqua Oceani and to Clara Saepaenumero, when he insisted that Leo had refused to admit freedom of conscience or worship, liberty of speech or teaching, and civil control over the education of Catholic children. In any conflict between Church and State, Coyle concluded, Leo taught that the former must always be obeyed.[13]

Rev. J. B. Thomas, Baptist professor of church history at Newton Theological Institute, portrayed the

pope as more flexible than his predecessor, less given to shouting anathemas, and more interested in the practical application of principles than in their theorization. On the other hand, said Thomas (with an implied reference to McGlynn's excommunication and to Longinqua Oceani), Leo was an exponent of an obsolete theory which prohibited free speech and worship, a policy more suitable to the middle ages than to the modern era.[14]

The next article was written by the Rev. Washington Gladden, the most famous social gospeler of the period. Speaking, he said, on behalf of all liberal minded Protestants, the genuinely Christian character of Leo XIII was, to a large extent, the reason why the traditional stereotype of the pope as "the man of sin" and the "son of perdition" has been shattered in the minds of most Protestants.[15]

The last two articles were written by the Rev. John Wesley Johnston, a Methodist minister, and by Rabbi H. Periea Mendes. Johnston praised Leo for combining a spirit of conciliation without compromising those doctrines and disciplines in which he believed. While the pope was not a reformer, said Johnston, he was liberal in mind, broad in outlook, and a man whose ambitions were never personal.[16]

Rabbi Mendes, without going into detail, sand that despite the many mistakes committed by Leo during the long years of his pontificate,

> The glory of Leo XIII is that he recognized new times and new conditions, and possibly would have done so to a yet greater extent but for his environment--the Curia.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> He tried to harmonize the Roman Catholic Church with the new social, industrial, scientific, and even political conditions, while holding to its historic and traditional duties and dogmas.[17]

Although none of the Protestant and secular journals or writers exalted Leo XIII as a liberal and a democrat, most of them, at least, could agree that he was an improvement over his predecessor, Pius IX, if only by the more tactful way in which he ruled the Church; and that, at least in part, Leo XIII's pontificate and particularly his frequent interactions with the American Church had helped to alleviate some of the bitterness between Protestant and Catholic Americans.

Before drawing any detailed conclusions, it is necessary to mention the comments of some of the leading Catholic journals in 1903.

The Catholic World, edited by the Rev. A. P. Doyle, the third liberal Catholic to control the World after the deaths of its founder, Rev. Isaac Hecker and his successor, Rev. A. F. Hewit, made comments about Leo which, while perfectly orthodox, savored of the liberal Catholicism so well exemplified by men like Ireland and Keane in the years before 1899. Leo, said Doyle, deserves praise for reviving faith in the sacraments and in the devotion to

the Rosary and the Sacred Heart. He also deserves praise, however, for "inculcating a closer union in the interior life with the Holy Spirit."[18] The latter statement was strikingly close to the liberals' conviction that more emphasis should be placed on helping people to interiorize their faith rather than on emphasizing rules, regulations, and external spiritual guidance by the clergy.

In another editorial, Doyle praised Leo's leadership in a field of education for Catholic children. While Doyle was obviously referring to Leo's emphasis on the building of parochial schools, the editor added that Leo's encyclicals to the American Church proved beyond any doubt that the pope approved the principles of American constitutional life.[19] Doyle's statements did not indicate any attempt to renew the "Americanist" controversy of the 1890's, but in a rather tactful way, they do give added credibility to McAvoy's remark (mentioned at the end of chapter VI) that the liberals did not change their essential way of thinking after the promulgation of Testem Benevolentiae, but simply engaged, for the most part, in an armed silence with their conservative counterparts.

The editors of the Western Watchman and the New York Freeman's Journal spoke of Leo in general terms as one who had improved the mutual understanding of Protestants and Catholics, and as one who had tremendously raised the stature of the papacy as a moral force in the

modern world. The American Catholic Quarterly Review printed an article which emphasized Leo's tactfulness as the key to the successes of his pontificate. Leo, said the author, was

> Careful, thoughtful, devoid of that momentary enthusiasm which people sought in a Pope, cautious in the use of words, gentle in persuasion. . . .[20]

The author's description of Leo may very well have been true, especially in contrast to the rather tactless manner of his predecessor. However, when one reflects upon the differences between the conservative and liberal Catholic interpretation of Leo's encyclicals to the American Church, and upon the fact that those encyclicals tended, ultimately, to silence but not to settle the divisions within the American hierarchy over the problem of Americanization, one questions whether Leo's trait of being "cautious in the use of words" was always advantageous, particularly for the American Church.

The relatively non-controversial comments of The Western Watchman, Freeman's Journal, and American Catholic Quarterly Review were not found in the pages of the conservative and outspoken Globe. Among the important conservative Catholic journals, The Globe, edited by convert William Thorne, came the closest to recollecting the conservative side of the "Americanist" controversy. In what seemed to be an implicit but clear reference to the pope's encyclical on "Americanism," Thorne compared Leo XIII to

Abraham Lincoln. Both men, he said, had redeemed, unified, and saved.[21] A recollection of Thorne's vehement denunciation of the liberals and his equally strong support of the position that Leo's encyclical, Testem Benevolentiae, had saved the Church in America from an imminent tragedy, seemed to make his analogy between Lincoln and Leo sound like an echo of his earlier stand. It likewise, gives further (if only inferential) support to the contention that neither liberals nor conservatives changed sides after the promulgation of the encyclical on "Americanism."

The purpose of the first portion of this chapter has been to let the periodicals speak for themselves in terms of their general conclusions about Leo XIII and, particularly, about Leo's interventions into the affairs of the American Catholic Church. The purpose of the second portion of this chapter will be to briefly summarize the study and then to state its general conclusions.

When Vincent Cardinal Pecci was elected pope on February 20, 1878, the initial general response by leading Protestant and secular journals was that Leo XIII's temperament as well as his educational and administrative background would influence him to quietly abandon what these journals referred to as the medieval character of Pius IX's policies. Leo, it was generally believed, would accomodate the Catholic Church to modern civilization.

The most explicit and vocal Catholic periodical response to Leo's election was, in general, a rebuttal of Protestant and secular periodical predictions. The predominantly conservative character of Catholic periodical writing was indicated by the counter-prediction that Leo would adhere uncompromisingly to the guidelines established by Pius IX.

Only the quiet and, for the most part, implicit hope of the liberal Catholic World gave any indication that at least a portion of articulate Catholic Americans awaited a new style of papal leadership which would alter in a more favorable direction the Protestant-secular image of the papacy and especially of its relationship with the American Catholic Church.

The periodical response to Pope Leo's intervention into major episodes of American Catholic Church history indicated that the initial predictions of Protestant and secular journals, the counter-predictions of conservative Catholic journals, and the quiet hope of the leading liberal Catholic journal were all partially, but never completely satisfied.

Between 1884 and 1888, Pope Leo XIII imposed canonical organization upon the American Catholic Church at the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, decided that Catholic workers could belong to the Knights of Labor, and excommunicated Father Edward McGlynn for openly supporting

the theories of Henry George and for not obeying the order to come to Rome to defend himself.

The non-Catholic periodical response to Leo XIII during this first stage of papal intervention was neither quantitatively great nor particularly flattering to the pope's image. The Catholic periodical response was also minimal and, for the most part, was confined to conservative journals.

The Protestant periodical response to Leo's intervention by means of calling a plenary council in 1884 revealed an awareness that the council would result in more direct papal control over the American Church. The Protestant response also revealed an awareness that there was some reluctance in the American hierarchy to any additional controls by Rome.

On the other hand, the Catholic periodical response was primarily defensive, that is, it tried to quell any rumors concerning the reluctance of the American bishops to the furthering of papal control over the American Church. An atmosphere of unity among the bishops and docility to the pope's wishes was conveyed in the pages of the Catholic periodical press.

The non-Catholic periodical response to Leo's intervention in the Knights of Labor episode was quantitatively greater and more significant than it had been to the pope's call for a plenary council. The favorable

responses of the nation's two leading non-denominational Protestant journals, The Independent and The Christian Union, were particularly important inasmuch as it was at least an indication that a substantial portion of articulate Protestant opinion had agreed with the pope that Christian workers needed more than charitable aid and encouragement to better their condition.

Among Catholic journals, leading conservative periodicals gave their cautious approval to the pope's action, but at the same time warned the Knights to live up to the pope's expectations. In general, however, after 1888, Catholic journals were more tolerant of unionism.

In the case of Edward McGlynn's excommunication, non-Catholic periodicals, including The Independent and The Christian Union, criticized Leo for interfering with what they deemed was the right of every American to hold a personal view in any economic or political matter. The Nation's editor, who had been one of the few influential editors to criticize Leo's decision in the Knights of Labor case, was, in the McGlynn episode, the outstanding example among secular editors to defend the pope's decision to excommunicate the priest. In the Knights of Labor and the McGlynn cases, The Nation revealed its anti-union and laissez faire bias.

The Independent and The Christian Union, both of whose editors were critical of Leo for interfering with the

rights of an American citizen, also revealed an underlying respect for the pope. The Union's editor criticized McGlynn for his personal attacks on Leo; The Independent's editor went so far as to say that had McGlynn gone to Rome as ordered, Leo would have vindicated him.

Among Catholic journals, the conservative editors were again the chief spokesmen as they upheld Leo's decision, especially in view of the priest's refusal to go to Rome. They criticized his economic theories too, but only after criticizing the priest's disobedience, hence reflecting the conservative Catholic's concern over the question of the pope's authority, and the threat to it which was exemplified by the McGlynn case.

During the second stage of papal intervention, 1889-1893, Pope Leo XIII rejected the plan of Peter Cahensly whereby the American Church would have been fragmented according to nationality, and second, the pope offered a compromise solution to the school controversy whereby plans such as those of Archbishop Ireland were deemed tolerable, as long as the buildup of parochial schools continued.

In an era of heightened national feeling and of increasing agitation for immigration restriction, the favorable periodical response by Catholic, Protestant and secular journals to Leo's rejection of the Cahensly plan prevented a potentially dangerous episode from becoming

a source of ammunition for anti-Catholic journals seeking to prove the incompatibility between Americanism and Catholicism.

The periodical response to Leo's intervention in the school controversy led to two significant findings. First, despite the continued criticism of the pope's intervention by anti-Catholic journals, the two leading non-denominational journals, The Independent and The Christian Union, viewed Leo's intervention, in conjunction with his intervention in the Cahensly affair and in the reinstatement of Father McGlynn in 1892, as signs of papal desire to accomodate the Church with the age and, in particular, to accomodate the American Church with American democracy.

Second, the pope's intervention in the school controversy, in particular, provoked a Catholic periodical response which, more than in any previous case of Leo's intervention, reflected the increasingly serious rift between conservatives and liberals in the American hierarchy over the question of educating and Americanizing the vast numbers of Catholic immigrants coming to American shores during the 1880's and 1890's.

It was also during the period of the early 1890's that two of the pope's most popularly remembered encyclicals, Rerum Novarum and Au Milieu . . ., were promulgated, the first to the entire Catholic world, the second to the

French Cardinals. Au Milieu . . . was generally well received by Catholic and non-Catholic periodicals. Rerum Novarum, on the other hand, found a kind reception in the Catholic journals, in the columns of The Christian Union and, to a lesser extent, in the editorial columns of The Independent. Several other important non-Catholic journals were critical of the encyclical.

During the third stage of papal intervention, 1893-1897, the response of the periodical press focused on Leo's appointment of the first Apostolic Delegate to the United States, the papal encyclical Longinqua Oceani, and a series of papal decisions which led to the eve of the most intense period of what has become popularly known as the "Americanist" controversy.

Among non-Catholic journals, anti-Catholic writers viewed the pope's appointment of Satolli as part of a plot to further papal control over American Catholics and to further papal pretensions to power in America. The Independent and The Outlook, on the other hand, interpreted the pope's appointment, in light of Satolli's apparent sympathy with the liberals in the American hierarchy during the school controversy and the reinstatement of Father McGlynn, as a victory for the forces of progress and democracy.

Catholic journals concentrated on refuting nativist charges that Leo had appointed Satolli out of political

motives. Conservative Catholic publications included a subtle comment implying some sympathy with the conservative bishops who were particularly resentful of the pope's appointment because of Satolli's initial sympathy with their liberal counterparts.

Between 1895 and 1897, a series of papal pronouncements and decisions concerning the American Church not only served to strengthen the criticisms of anti-Catholic journals, but, more important, had the effect of convincing the Protestant Independent and Christian Union that Leo was moving toward the camp of the conservatives and away from the camp of the liberals in the American hierarchy. Those decisions and pronouncements included the encyclical Longinqua Oceani, which was deemed excessively authoritarian and un-American in spirit; Satolli's address to German community wherein he encouraged them to hold on to their language and customs; the pope's letter to Satolli forbidding any future interfaith congresses such as had occurred in 1893 in Chicago; the pope's removal of Msgr. Denis O'Connell, a liberal and friend of archbishop Ireland, from his post as rector of the North American College in Rome; and the removal of the liberal Archbishop John Keane from his post as rector of the Catholic University of America. The pope's removal of Keane, his prohibition of future Catholic participation

in interfaith congresses, and the encyclical Longinqua, in particular, aroused the ire of non-Catholic journals.

Among Catholic journals, the response to Leo's ban on Catholic participation in interfaith congresses, his removal of Keane, and his encyclical Longinqua gave some indication of the increasingly serious rift in the American hierarchy between liberals and conservatives, but, for the most part, even the reputedly liberal periodicals or those whose sympathies were with certain liberal bishops accepted Leo's teachings dutifully.

During the last stage of papal intervention, Leo's attempted settlement of the "Americanist" controversy, the nature of the periodical response was qualitatively the most significant, not only in terms of what it revealed about the periodical image of the pope as ruler of the American Church, but also in terms of what that response revealed about the Protestant image of liberal American Catholicism.

Non-Catholic journals responding to Leo's encyclical, Testem Benevolentiae, were critical of what they deemed to be a papal condemnation of liberal American Catholicism, a brand of Catholicism which such journals as The Independent and The Outlook believed was a truly Christian attempt by an enlightened few to bring the Catholic Church into greater harmony with the age and with the American way of life.

Inasmuch as conservative Catholic editors and writers, with few exceptions, likewise interpreted the pope's encyclical as a condemnation of certain tenets held by the liberal bishops, the Protestant periodical response revealed that an articulate portion of Protestant American opinion had been viewing the methodological differences which separated the conservatives from the liberals in the hierarchy as more than just methodological, but rather as essential and as inclinations toward Protestantism, indeed, as inclinations toward the Protestantization of American Catholicism.

Liberal Catholic editors and writers refused to concede that the pope had condemned their approach to Americanizing the Catholic Church. Moreover, they refused to concede that the pope was accusing them of holding the condemned tenets, all of which they rejected. They insisted that the condemned tenets had been fabricated in Europe as a result of the imprecise translation of the life of Father Hecker, a leading liberal Catholic American. They further argued that European conservatives used the translation to discredit the influence of democracy on the Catholic Church. American conservatives, they argued, jumped on the bandwagon in order to revenge their humiliation at the hands of the liberals in the Cahensly affair, the reinstatement of McGlynn, and the school controversy.

At any rate, the response of the non-Catholic periodicals indicated, if nothing else about the future of American Catholicism, that the conservatives were once again in a very secure position, a status they were to retain for decades afterward in directing the policies of the American Church.

This study has indicated the following general conclusions. First, the periodical response to Pope Leo XIII's intervention into American Church affairs was greater during the 1890's than during the 1880's, for it was during the later period that the American Church encountered some of its most difficult and climactic problems in areas related to its disciplinary organization, its pattern of growth, and the nature of its hierarchical leadership.

Second, many of the opinions and attitudes expressed or implied by the journals as they responded to Leo's acts of intervention were derived from what the journals perceived as the actual or most desirable ideals of American life. In a word, the periodical press showed a tendency to Americanize Pope Leo XIII's acts of intervention, both in the interest with which it responded to and in the judgments it made of them.

For example, on the eve of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1884, the Protestant Independent

warned that further papal control over the American Church would be resented by Catholic citizens, and implied that Catholics shared with their Protestant compatriots a deep love of the freedom concomitant to a democratic nation. The Catholic Review, on the other hand, saw no incompatibility between a Catholic's constitutional freedom as an American citizen and his obligation to accept rules of belief and conduct from the pope in matters pertaining to the religious life, however much those rules might affect his conduct as a citizen.

In the case of the Knights of Labor, those non-Catholic journals which praised the pope for not condemning the organization were revealing their sympathy for the worker and their belief that American democracy must serve all of the people. Those Catholic journals which reported Leo's action strongly implied that an American Catholic's rights as a citizen depended on whether or not those rights interfered with his duties as a Catholic.

When Father McGlynn was excommunicated by the pope, non-Catholic journals criticized Leo not for his implicit condemnation of the theories of Henry George, but for interfering with what they deemed was an American's right to hold a personal view in any political or economic matter. Catholic journals praising the pope's decision again asserted that a priest's rights as a citizen were null and void if they went contrary to Church discipline, in this

case, the order to come to Rome and to cease the questionable activities until the matter was decided one way or another by the Holy See.

During the school controversy, those Protestant and secular journals which praised or criticized the pope's intervention did so in accordance with whether or not it was perceived that the pope was supporting or undermining the nation's commitment to public education and its constitutional rule prohibiting public support of sectarian education. Among Catholic journals, those in sympathy with the conservatives interpreted the pope's actions as essentially supportive of parochial rather than public school education for Catholic children, a fact which they felt was in keeping with the constitutional rule insuring freedom of worship. Those Catholic journals in sympathy with the liberals interpreted the pope's intervention as a sign of his support of parochial education, but also as a sign of his support of compromise arrangements whereby parochial education could be enhanced by the state without minimizing the constitutional guarantee of separation between Church and state.

In 1893, when Leo appointed an Apostolic Delegate to the United States, non-Catholic journals praised or criticized the pope's action in accordance with whether or not they perceived in the appointment a papal attempt

to undermine American Catholics' rights as citizens, thereby threatening American constitutional guarantees.

The encyclical, Longinqua Oceani, promulgated in 1895, was criticized by non-Catholic periodicals for asserting, among other things, that the American constitutional guarantee of church and state separation was not to be considered by true Catholics as the ideal. The non-Catholic perception of church and state separation as a most desirable American ideal was shared more closely by liberal than by conservative Catholic editors and writers. Catholic journals in sympathy with the liberals' efforts to Americanize the Church accepted the pope's teaching as an ideal, but not one to be asserted as strongly as some of their conservative counterparts were doing in the milieu of the late nineteenth century.

A third conclusion of this study was that the periodical response to Leo XIII's acts of intervention reflected, on several occasions and to varying degrees, not only ideas, problems, and conditions prevalent in the American Church, but also in the nation generally during the last years of the nineteenth century.

For example, the response to Leo's intervention in the Knights of Labor episode reflected, on one hand, a generally more tolerant attitude toward unionism by American Catholics and Protestants. On the other hand, it reflected a growing recognition among American Catholic

spokesmen that the vast numbers of Catholic laborers in the United States would not be content with exhortations to be patient or with the platitude that poverty could be spiritually beneficial.

The Protestant periodical response to the McGlynn affair reflected, in part, a feeling among many Protestants that the pope controlled his clergy in matters that went beyond the realm of faith and morals. Catholic periodicals responding to the affair reflected the conservative Catholic's adherence to the Church's hierarchical and authoritarian structure, and the belief that the pope had the right to intervene in any matter even remotely related to the realm of faith and morals. On the other hand, the total response reflected, in part, the essential opposition of most Catholic and Protestant Americans to the theories of Henry George, despite the non-Catholic periodical's strong objection to the pope's interference into what they deemed an American's right to hold a personal view in any political or economic matter.

The periodical response to Leo's intervention in the Cahensly episode reflected the native Protestant's concern over the mounting waves of non-English speaking immigrants coming to America, and the belief of many Protestant and Catholic leaders that language assimilation was of utmost importance to the process of Americanization. The Catholic periodical response, in particular, reflected

the Irish domination of the American hierarchy, and the rift between most German and Irish bishops over the proper method and pace of Americanization.

Later, the pope's intervention in the school controversy provoked a periodical response which reflected, from the non-Catholic side, a sacred cow image of public education, and a fear of compromising constitutional guarantees of total church and state separation. The Catholic response reflected, on one hand, the conservative Catholic belief that the public schools were centers of Godlessness and, thus, a threat to the faith, and on the other hand, the liberal Catholic belief that public and parochial school education could work in harmony for the benefit of Catholic students.

The fourth conclusion of this study was that on several occasions and with certain exceptions, important secular and Protestant journals perceived in Leo's acts of intervention and indication of a different and more modern style of papal leadership than that which they had perceived during the reign of his predecessor, Pius IX.

This was true in the case of the Knights of Labor, and was especially indicated in the editorial columns of the nation's two leading non-denomination Protestant journals in the response to Leo's intervention in the

Cahensly affair, the reinstatement of Father McGlynn, and the school controversy.

Fifth, with regard to two of Leo's most famous encyclicals, Rerum Novarum and Au Milieu des Sollicitudes, the latter was given a generally favorable though minimal reception by the periodical press. The former was, with the exception of The Christian Union and, to a lesser degree, The Independent, given a rather unfavorable reception by several important secular and Protestant journals.

Sixth, during the last five years of the nineteenth century, leading secular and Protestant journals, including The Outlook and The Independent, viewed Leo's acts of intervention as signs that he was moving away from the liberal and toward the camp of the American hierarchy's conservative, indeed, reactionary forces. The pope's encyclical, Longinqua Oceani, his removal of Archbishop Keane as rector of Catholic University, his letter forbidding future Catholic participation in interfaith congresses, and especially his encyclical on "Americanism" were interpreted as unfavorable omens for the future of liberal Catholicism in America.

Finally, and despite the rather critical response of the Protestant and secular periodicals to the last five years of Leo's intervention, these periodicals eulogized Pope Leo XIII as an improvement over his predecessor, if

only by the more tactful and, at times, the more flexible way in which he ruled the Church, a fact which some of the journals believed had accounted for the improved relations between Protestant and Catholic Americans in the year of Leo's death, 1903.

FOOTNOTES--CHAPTER VII

[1]Anonymous Catholic Prelate, "Leo XIII," TI, LV (July 23, 1903), 1715-16.

[2]Editorial, "Leo XIII," TI, LV (July 23, 1903), 1755. See too, TI, LV (July 16, 1903), 1657; (July 23, 1903), 1713; (July 30, 1903), 1777; and, (August 6, 1903), 1843.

[3]Editorial Note, "Leo XIII," TO, LXXIV (July 1, 1903), 642; Editorial, "Pope Leo XIII, A Protestant Estimate," TO, LXXIV (July 25, 1903), 729-30.

[4]Ibid., p. 730; and, Editorial Note, "Leo's Reign and Policy," TO, LXXIV (July 21, 1903), 721-22.

[5]Editorial, "The Death of the Pope," The Missionary Review of the World, XXVI (September, 1903), 697; Editorial, "Leo XIII and the Papacy," The Reformed Church Review, VII (October, 1903), 569, 570, 583.

[6]Editorial, "The Work of Leo XIII," TN, LXXVII (July 9, 1903), 26-27.

[7]Editorial, "Leo XIII," TN, LXXVII (July 23, 1903), 69.

[8]Mott, History of American Magazines, II, 469.

[9]Editorial Note, HW, XLVII (July 18, 1903), 1178; Editorial, "Leo XIII," HW, XLVII (July 25, 1903), 1218.

[10]Editorial, "Why All Eyes are Fixed Upon the Vatican," HW, XLVII (August, 1903), 1251; Editorial, "The Future of the Catholic Church," HW, XLVII (August 8, 1903), 1288. See too, Sydney Brooks, "The Pope as a Politician," HW, XLVII (August 1, 1903), 1258.

[11]Archbishop John Ireland, "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence," NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 325, 327, 331.

[12]Rt. Rev. Leighton Coleman, "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence," NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 338, 340.

[13]Rev. Robert F. Coyle, "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence," NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 343, 344-45.

[14]Rev. J. B. Thomas, "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence," NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 347, 351, 352.

[15]Rev. Washington Gladden, "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence," NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 354-55.

[16]Rev. John Wesley Johnston, "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence," NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 358-59.

[17]Rabbi H. Pereia Mendes, "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence," NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 361, 363.

[18]"Great White Shepherd of Christendom," CW, LXXVI (March, 1903), 723. See too, "Comments on Current Topics," CW, LXXVII (April, 1903), 135-36.

[19]Rev. A. P. Doyle, "Leo XIII, The Great Leader," CW, LXXVII (August, 1903), 576, 578; "Comments on Current Topics," CW, LXXVII (August, 1903), 707-08. See too, Rev. J. J. Burke, "Leo XIII: A Critic's Mistakes," CW, LXXVIII (November, 1903), 148-49; and, Rev. T. J. Shahan, "Leo XIII," TCUB, IX (October, 1903), 453.

[20]The New York Freeman's Journal for July 18-August 1, 1903 carried tributes to Leo from Catholics and Protestants. See too, Dr. H. G. Menderhall, "We Were All One Years Ago," Freeman's Journal (July 25, 1903), 2; Editorial, "Leo is No More," WW, XXXVIII (July 23, 1903), 8; Rev. P. L. Connellan, "Leo XIII," ACQR, XXVIII (October, 1903), 648.

[21]William H. Thorne, "Saint Leo XIII," TG, XIII (September, 1903), 240-41, 231.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

In order to afford the interested reader the easiest access to the primary sources utilized in this study, the periodicals have been arranged alphabetically, and the articles and editorials for each periodical have been arranged chronologically. General information for each periodical is provided in: Mott, Franklin Luther. A History of American Magazines. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967. 4 Vols.

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW:

Corcoran, Very Rev. James A. "Pius The Ninth and His Pontificate." ACQR, III (April, 1878), 342-63.

Shea, John Gilmary. "The Pastoral Letter of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore." ACQR, X (January, 1885), 1-18.

Jannet, C. Land and Labor in France and the United States. Reviewed in ACQR, XIV (January, 1889), 1-22.

Keane, Rt. Rev. John J. "The Encyclical Rerum Novarum." ACQR, XVI (July, 1891), 595-611.

Conway, James. The State Last. Reviewed in ACQR, XVII (April, 1892), 432.

Editorial Note. "The Pope's Letter to the American Bishops on the School Question." ACQR, XVIII (July, 1893), 642-43.

Bouquillon, Thomas. "The Apostolic Delegation," ACQR, XX (January, 1895), 112-31.

Schroeder, Joseph. "Leo XIII and the Encyclical Longinqua." ACQR, XX (April, 1895), 369-88.

H. M., J. "Church and State." ACQR, XXI (January, 1896), 98-124.

Connellan, P. L. "Leo XIII." ACQR, XXVIII (October, 1903), 627-48.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW:

Hollaind, R. J., S. J. "The Encyclical Rerum Novarum." AER, V (August, 1891), 81-93.

Hughes, Thomas, S. J. "Leo XIII and the Safeguards of Republics." AER, VIII (January, 1893), 1-14.

"Ecclesiastical Diplomacy." AER, IX (October, 1893), 271-78.

"Catholic Journalists and the Recent Encyclical." AER, XII (March, 1895), 212-18.

"The Mind of the Apostolic Delegate." AER, XIII (July, 1895), 101-07.

THE ARENA:

Preston, Thomas B. "Pope Leo on Labor." The Arena, IV (August, 1891), 459-67.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY:

Langdon, William Chauncy. "The Old Pope and the New." Atlantic Monthly, XLI (May, 1878), 649-56.

Sedgewick, Henry. "The United States and Rome." Atlantic Monthly, LXXXIV (October, 1899), 457-59.

THE CATHOLIC NEWS:

Editorial. "McGlynn's Mistake." The Catholic News, I (April 17, 1887), 4.

Editorial. "McGlynnism." The Catholic News, I (May 1, 1887), 4.

Editorial. "Our Holy Father's Encyclical." The Catholic News, IX (February 3, 1895), 5.

Editorial. "The Catholic Church in America." The Catholic News, IX (February 10, 1895), 4.

"Letter of the Pope." The Catholic News, XIII (February 25, 1899), 18.

THE CATHOLIC REVIEW:

Editorial. "Leo XIII." CR, XIII (February 26, 1878), 144.

Editorial. "The Church at This Crisis." CR, XIII (February 26, 1878), 144.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XIII (March 2, 1878), 137.

Catholic, An Irish. "Pope Leo's Policy." Reprinted from The Spectator in CR, XIII (April 13, 1878), 242.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XIII (April 27, 1878), 269.

Editorial Note. CR, XXIV (December 15, 1883), 369.

"The Plenary Council." CR, XXIX (April 17, 1886), 256-57.

"The Knights of Labor." CR, XXIX (May 8, 1886), 318.

"Cardinal Gibbons and the Knights." CR, XXIX (May 30, 1886), 386.

Editorial Note. CR, XXXI (April 30, 1887), 273.

Editorial. "Rome and the Knights of Labor." CR, XXXI (May 1, 1887), 296.

Editorial Note. CR, XXXII (July 16, 1887), 33.

Editorial. "The Pope and Politics." CR, XXXIII (January 22, 1888), 56.

Editorial. "Father Hecker." CR, XXXV (December 30, 1888), 8.

Editorial. "The Cable in the Hands of the Enemy." CR, XXXV (January 20, 1889), 56.

Editorial. "State Socialism and Social Reform." CR, XXXV (February 3, 1889), 88.

Editorial Notes. "Archbishop Ireland and Katzer Condemn Cahensly"; "Cahensly Comes to New York"; "How the Lucerne Conspiracy Originated"; "The Herald on the Lucerne Conspiracy." CR, XXXIX (June 13, 1891), 318-19.

Corrigan, Archbishop. "The Archbishop on the Encyclical." CR, XXXIX (June 20, 1891), 386.

"The Lucerne Controversy." CR, XXXIX (June 20, 1891), 388.

Editorial. "The Pope on the Land Question." CR, XXXIX (June 21, 1891), 408.

Editorial Note. CR, XXXIX (June 27, 1891), 401.

Editorial. "The Letter From Rome." CR, XL (July 19, 1891), 56-57.

"Cahensly's Second Memorial." CR, XL (July 25, 1891), 50-51.

Editorial. "The New York Press and the Vatican." CR, XLI (February 21, 1892), 137.

Mayne, R. "Bishop Keane." CR, XLI (March 12, 1892), 162.

"Catholic Europe." CR, XLI (March 26, 1892), 206.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XLI (May 21, 1892), 321.

"Leo XIII on Just Wages." CR, XLI (May 28, 1892), 338.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XLI (May 28, 1892), 337.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XLI (June 11, 1892), 369.

Editorial. "A Public Enemy." CR, XLII (December 3, 1892), 360.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XLII (December 10, 1892), 369.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XLII (November 27, 1892), 417.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XLIII (January 7, 1893), 1.

Editorial Note. CR, XLIII (January 28, 1893), 49.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XLIV (July 8, 1893), 1.

"Topics of the Hour." CR, XLIV (July 22, 1893), 33.

Editorial. "Shall We Support Our Schools? CR, XLIV (September 2, 1893), 136.

Editorial. "The New Cardinal." CR, XLIX (January 12, 1896), 40.

"Bishop Keane." CR, L (October 17, 1896), 247.

Ireland, Archbishop John. "Pope Leo." CR, LI (April 10, 1897), 231.

"Archbishop Keane and the University." CR, LI (June 5, 1897), 354.

Editorial. "Father Hecker." CR, LII (July 31, 1897), 67.

Editorial Note. CR, LII (January 1, 1898), 417.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN:

"The Public Writings of Leo XIII." TCUB, I (April, 1895), 301-06.

Pace, E. A. "Francis Cardinal Satolli." TCUB, II (January, 1896), 1-10.

Shanahan, Edmund T. "The Leadership of Leo XIII." TCUB, VIII (July, 1902), 263-75.

Shahan, Thomas J. "Leo XIII." TCUB, IX (October, 1903), 447-54.

THE CATHOLIC WORLD:

"The Death of Pius IX: The Conclave and The Election." CW, XXVII (April, 1878), 129-36.

O'Reilly, Bernard. Leo XIII and His Probable Policy. Reviewed in CW, XXVII (April, 1878), 143.

Foreign Correspondent. "The Coronation of Pope Leo XIII." CW, XXVII (May, 1878), 280-85.

_____. "The Letter of Pope Leo XIII to Cardinal Nina on Church and State in Italy." CW, XXVIII (December, 1878), 419-23.

Smith, Rev. John Talbot. "Workman Should Not Only Act But Think." CW, XLVII (September, 1888), 838-43.

Hecker, Rev. Isaac T. "The Mission of Leo XIII." CW, XLVIII (October, 1888), 1-12.

O'Keefe, Henry. "The Church and the Toilers." CW, L (January, 1890), 539-42.

Barry, Rev. William. "Catholic and Democratic Ideals." CW, LI (May, 1890), 143-52.

Ireland, Archbishop Joun. "Introduction to the Life of Father Hecker." CW, LI (June, 1890), 285-93.

Hewit, Rev. A. F. "Catholic and American Ethics." CW, LI (June, 1890), 348-58.

Brady, Rev. E. B. "The Pope and the Proletariat." CW, LIII (August, 1891), 633-44.

Spalding, Most Rev. John L. "Socialism and Labor." CW, LIII (September, 1891), 791-807.

Sheedy, Rev. Morgan M. "The Encyclical and American Iron and Coal Workers." CW, LIII (September, 1891), 850-61.

Ramm, Rev. Charles A. "Henry George and the Late Encyclical." CW, LIV (January, 1892), 555-67.

Onahan, William J. "Columbian Catholic Congress at Chicago." CW, LVII (August, 1893), 605-06.

Editorial Notes. CW, LX (December, 1894), 428.

Hewit, Rev. A. F. "Encyclical of Leo XIII To the Bishops of the United States." CW, LX (March, 1895), 721-26.

Hedges, S. B. "Father Hecker." CW, LXI (June, 1895), 381-82.

"The Papal Policy Toward America." CW, LXI (July, 1895), 528-37.

Editorial Notes. CW, LXII (January, 1896), 570.

O'Callaghan, P. J. "The Puritan Catholicized." CW, LXV (April, 1897), 113-14.

"The Papal Letter and The Outlook." CW, LXIX (April, 1899), 1-8.

"Leo XIII on 'Americanism.'" The Messenger. Reprinted in CW, LXIX (April, 1899), 133-39.

Editorial Notes. CW, LXIX (June, 1899), 424.

"The Great White Shepherd of Christiandom." CW, LXXVI (March, 1903), 731-23.

"Comment on Current Topics." CW, LXXVII (April, 1903), 133-36.

Doyle, Rev. A. P. "Leo XIII, The Great Leader." CW, LXXVII (August, 1903), 580.

"Comment on Current Topics." CW, LXXVII (August, 1903), 707-08.

Burke, Rev. John J. "Leo XIII: A Critic's Mistakes." CW, LXXVIII (November, 1903), 143-52.

THE CENTURY MAGAZINE:

Gladden, Rev. Washington. "The Anti-Catholic Crusade." The Century Magazine, XLVII (March, 1894), 789-95.

THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE:

Layman, An Anonymous Catholic. "Leo XIII to the Church in the United States." CA, LXX (February 14, 1895), 99-100.

Editorial. "Pope Leo and Americanism." CA, LXXIV (March 2, 1899), 326-27.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION (THE OUTLOOK after June 30, 1893):

Editorial. "Pope Pius IX." XVII (February 13, 1878), 136-37.

"The Outlook." CU, XVII (February 27, 1878), 178.

"The Outlook." CU, XVII (March 13, 1878), 217-18.

S., J. A. "Letter from Rome." CU, XVII (March 20, 1878), 249.

"The Outlook." CU, XVII (April 3, 1878), 279.

Editorial. "The New Romanism." CU, XVII (April 10, 1878), 300.

"The Outlook." CU, XXXVII (January 5, 1888), 3.

"The Outlook." CU, XXXVII (January 12, 1888), 34.

"The Outlook." CU, XXXVII (May 24, 1888), 642.

"The Outlook." CU, XLI (February 20, 1890), 256.

Editorial. "The Pope's Encyclical." CU, XLIII (June 18, 1891), 805.

"The Outlook." CU, XLIV (July 18, 1891), 122.

Editorial. "The Pope and the French Cardinals." CU, XLV (February 27, 1892), 393-94.

"The Outlook." CU, XLV (March 12, 1892), 486-87.

"The Outlook." CU, XLV (April 30, 1892), 828.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVI (September 17, 1892), 481-82.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVI (November 26, 1892), 976.

Editorial. "The School Question." CU, XLVI (November 26, 1892), 1000.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVI (December 17, 1892), 1160-61.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVI (December 31, 1892), 1274.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVII (January 14, 1893), 57.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVII (January 14, 1893), 57-58.

"The Religious World." "Dr. McGlynn and Archbishop Corrigan." CU, XLVII (January 14, 1893), 78.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVII (January 21, 1893), 103-04.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVII (February 4, 1893), 210-11.

Editorial. "The Roman Catholic Issue." CU, XLVII (February 4, 1893), 211.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVII (March 18, 1893), 503.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVII (May 6, 1893), 852-53.

"The Outlook." CU, XLVII (May 13, 1893), 904-05.

"The Religious World." TO, XLVIII (September 2, 1893), 441.

"The Week." TO, XLIX (March 10, 1894), 438.

"The Religious World." TO, LI (February 9, 1895), 234.

"The Religious World." TO, LI (March 2, 1895), 358.

"The Religious World." TO, LIV (December 12, 1896), 1100.

Editorial. "The Pope on Americanism." TO, LXI (March 4, 1899), 491-93.

Editorial Note. "Leo XIII." TO, LXXIV (July 1, 1903), 642.

Editorial Note. "The Pope's Fight for Life." TO, LXXIV (July 18, 1903), 678-79.

Editorial. "Pope Leo XIII, A Protestant Estimate." TO, LXXIV (July 25, 1903), 728-31.

DONAHOE'S MAGAZINE

Marshall, A. J. "Characteristics of the Teachings of Leo XIII." Donahoe's Magazine, XXVIII (July, 1892), 45-49.

Twomey, Rev. E. M. "Leo XIII and the United States." Donahoe's Magazine, XLI (June, 1899), 543-46.

ECLECTIC MAGAZINE:

"Leo XIII." The Spectator. Reprinted in Eclectic Magazine, XC (May, 1878), 626-28.

THE FORUM:

Bouland, Leon. "Romanism and the Republic." TF, V (July, 1888), 555-63.

Vincent, John H. "The Pope in Washington." TF, XV (May, 1893), 261-67.

Bacon, Leonard Woolsey. "An American Viceroy from the Vatican." TF, XV (May, 1893), 268-74.

Loughlin. Rev. James F. "Rome A True Ally of the Republic." TF, XV (May, 1893), 275-82.

McGlynn, Rev. Edward. "The Vatican and the United States." TF, XVI (September, 1893), 11-21.

FREEMAN'S JOURNAL:

Editorial. "Pope Leo and America." Freeman's Journal (March 23, 1889), 4.

Editorial. "The Pope's Letter." Freeman's Journal (June 24, 1893), 4.

Editorial. "Last Words on Americanism." Freeman's Journal (March 25, 1899), 1.

Editorial. "Why Was the Letter Written?" Freeman's Journal (March 18, 1899), 1.

Menderhall, Dr. H. G. "We Were All One Years Ago." Freeman's Journal (July 25, 1903), 2.

THE GLOBE:

Editorial. The Globe, VI (February, 1896), 97.

Thorne, William H. "Was the Pope Fooled on Americanism?" The Globe, XXXIV (June, 1899), 125-43.

_____. "Saint Leo XIII." The Globe, XIII (September, 1903), 229-49.

HARPER'S WEEKLY:

Editorial, HW, XXII (February 23, 1878), 146.

Crooks, George R. "The Late Pope." HW, XXII (February 23, 1878), 152-54.

"Pope Leo XIII." HW, XXII (March 9, 1878), 189-90.

Woodberry, George E. "To Leo XIII." HW, XXXI (June 25, 1887), 458.

Editorial. "The Vatican and Dr. McGlynn." HW, XXXI (July 9, 1887), 482.

Editorial. "Rome and Dr. McGlynn." HW, XXXI (July 23, 1887), 518-19.

Editorial. "Ecclesiastical Politics." HW, XXXI (August 13, 1887), 574.

Editorial. "The Pope and American Schools." HW, XXXV (February 28, 1891), 147.

Editorial. "The Recent Encyclical of Leo XIII." HW, XXIX (March 9, 1895), 218.

Editorial Note. HW, XLVII (July 18, 1903), 1178.

Editorial. "Leo XIII." HW, XLVII (July 25, 1903), 1218.

Brooks, Sydney. "The Pope as a Politician." HW, XLVII (August 1, 1903), 1258.

Editorial. "Why All Eyes are Fixed Upon the Vatican." HW, XLVII (August 3, 1903), 1251.

Editorial. "The Future of the Catholic Church." HW, XLVII (August 8, 1903), 1288.

THE INDEPENDENT:

Editorial. "Cardinals vs. Independence." TI, XXXIV (August 3, 1882), 16.

Editorial. "The American Catholic Church." TI, XXXV (June 28, 1883), 16.

"Roman Catholic Statistics in the United States." TI, XXXVI (February 28, 1884), 14.

Editorial. "Flexibility of American Catholicism." TI, XXXVI (July 31, 1884), 17.

Editorial. "Dr. McGlynn and Cardinal Gibbons." TI, XXXIX (April 7, 1887), 17.

Editorial. "The Archbishop on His Knees." TI, XXXIX (April 28, 1887), 17-18.

Editorial. "The Roman Machine." TI, XXXIX (June 30, 1887), 17.

Editorial Note. TI, XL (January 12, 1888), 44.

Editorial Note. TI, XLIII (February 26, 1891), 12.

Editorial Note. TI, XLIII (May 7, 1891), 2.

Editorial. "Pope Leo on the Condition of Labor." TI, XLIII (June 18, 1891), 12.

Editorial Note. TI, XLIV (January 28, 1892), 1.

Editorial Note. TI, XLIV (May 26, 1892), 13.

Loyson, Madame Hyacinthe. "Papal Evolution." TI, XLIV (June 16, 1892), 1-2.

Editorial Note. TI, XLIV (July 7, 1892), 16.

Editorial Note. TI, XLIV (November 10, 1892), 12.

Editorial Note. TI, XLIV (November 17, 1892), 12.

Editorial. TI, XLIV (December 29, 1892), 11.

Editorial Note. TI, XLV (January 12, 1893), 13.

Editorial. "Roma Locuta Est." TI, XLV (January 19, 1893), 11.

Editorial. "Cahenslyism Condemned." TI, XLV (February 9, 1893), 10-11.

Editorial Note. TI, XLV (March 16, 1893), 12.

Editorial Note. TI, XLV (May 11, 1893), 12.

Editorial. "The Pope on Satolli and the Parochial Schools." TI, XLV (June 29, 1893), 10.

Editorial Note. TI, XLV (July 6, 1893), 11.

Editorial Note. TI, XLV (July 13, 1893), 15.

"Religious Intelligence." "Catholicism and Satollicism." TI, XLV (August 10, 1893), 14-15.

Editorial Note. TI, XLV (August 17, 1893), 12.

Onlooker, An. "The Catholic Outlook." TI, XLV (August 24, 1893), 2-3.

Editorial Note. TI, XLV (November 2, 1893), 14.

Editorial. "The Pope's American Encyclical." TI, XLVI (February 7, 1895), 10.

Editorial Note. TI, XLVI (February 21, 1895), 12.

Editorial Note. TI, XLVIII (October 8, 1896), 13.

Editorial Note, TI, XLVIII (October 15, 1896), 11-12.

Editorial Note, TI, XLVIII (October 22, 1896), 14.

Editorial Note, TI, XLVIII (December 10, 1896). 16.

Phelan, Rev. David S. "The Roman Catholic Church." TI, XLIX (January 7, 1897), 12.

Editorial. "Archbishop Keane for New Orleans." TI, XLIX (August 20, 1897), 13.

Editorial. "Conflict in the Catholic University." TI, XLIX (October 28, 1897), 10-11.

Editorial Note. TI, LI (March 9, 1899), 717-18.

Prelate, Anonymous Catholic. "Leo XIII." TI, LV (July 23, 1903), 1713-16.

Editorial. "Leo XIII." TI, LV (July 23, 1903), 1755-56.

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW:

de Gubernatis, Angelo. "The New King of Italy and the New Pope." International Review, V (May, 1878), 303-11.

JOURNAL OF UNITED LABOR (JOURNAL OF THE KNIGHTS OF LABOR):

"The Church and the Knights." Journal of United Labor, VII (April 16, 1887), 2356.

Manning, Cardinal. "The Liberty of Association." Journal of United Labor, VII (May 7, 1887), 2377-78.

"The Pope's Encyclical." Journal of the Knights of Labor, XI (May 28, 1891), 2.

"The Pope's Encyclical." Journal of the Knights of Labor, XI (June 18, 1891), 2.

"George's Reply to Leo XIII." Journal of the Knights of Labor, XII (October 22, 1891), 1-2; (October 29, 1891), 4; and (November 5, 1891), 2.

THE LITERARY DIGEST:

"Pope Leo XIII on Religious Congresses." The Literary Digest, XII (November 9, 1895), 50.

"The Resignation of Bishop Keane." The Literary Digest, XIII (October 24, 1896), 821.

"Meaning of Bishop Keane's Removal." The Literary Digest, XIII (October 31, 1896), 851-52.

"The Pope on Americanism." The Literary Digest, XVIII (March 11, 1899), 287-88.

"More on Americanism." The Literary Digest, XVIII (March 18, 1899), 314-15.

LITTELL'S LIVING AGE:

"What's Going On At The Vatican: A Voice from Rome." The Contemporary Review. Reprinted in Littell's Living Age, CXXXIX (December 14, 1878), 644-45.

THE MISSIONARY REVIEW OF THE WORLD:

Editorial. "The Death of the Pope." The Missionary Review of the World, XXVI (September, 1903), 697.

THE NATION:

Godkin, E. L. "Pius IX." TN, XXVI (February 14, 1878), 107-08.

"The Week." TN, XXVI (February 28, 1878), 143.

"The Week." TN, XXVI (April 18, 1878), 255.

Godkin, E. L. "The Position of Leo XIII." TN, XXVII (October 24, 1878), 251-52.

"The Week." TN, XLIV (March 17, 1887), 218.

"The Week." TN, XLIV (March 24, 1887), 247.

"The Week." TN, XLIV (March 31, 1887), 261.

"The Week." TN, XLV (July 7, 1887), 3.

"The Week." TN, XLV (July 14, 1887), 21-22.

"The Week." TN, XLV (November 10, 1887), 362.

Editorial. "The Pope and the Poor." TN, LIV (January 7, 1892), 7-8.

Means, D. M. [Editorial] "The Pope's Letter to the French Cardinals." TN, LIV (May 26, 1892), 392.

Editorial. "The Catholic Controversy." TN, LVI (January 19, 1893), 44-45.

Rolls, Ogden. [Editorial] "Ambiguous Infallibility." TN, LVI (June 29, 1893), 467-68.

Stillman, W. J. [Editorial] "The Pope and the American Schools." TN, LVII (August 24, 1893), 133-34.

"Correspondence." TN, LVII (November 9, 1893), 347.

"The Week." TN, LX (January 31, 1895), 83.

Norton, Richard. [Editorial] "'Americanism,' or The Catholic Church in America." TN, LVIII (March 30, 1899), 236-38.

Rolls, Ogden. [Editorial] "The Work of Leo XIII." TN, LXXVII (July 9, 1903), 26-27.

"The Week." TN, LXXVII (July 23, 1903), 63.

Editorial. "Leo XIII." TN, LXXVII (July 23, 1903), 68-69.

THE NATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW:

"The Papacy of Puis IX." The National Quarterly Review, XXXVII (July, 1878), 104-26.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW:

Froude, J. Anthony. "Romanism and the Irish Race." NAR, CXXIX (December, 1879), 519-36.

Spalding, Bishop John L. "Mr. Froude's Historical Method." NAR, CXXX (March, 1880), 280-99.

O'Byrne, M. C. "What is the Catholic School Policy?" NAR, CXL (June, 1885), 521-28.

Doane, Rt. Rev. William C. "The Roman Catholic Church and the School Fund." NAR, CLVIII (January, 1894), 30-40.

Traynor, W. J. H. "The Menace of Romanism." NAR, CLXI (August, 1895), 129-40.

Zahm, Rev. J. A. "Leo XIII and the School Question." NAR, CLXI (August, 1895), 200-14.

Barry, Rev. William. "'Americanism,' True and False," NAR, CLXIX (July, 1899), 33-49.

Pechenard, P. L. "The End of 'Americanism' in France." NAR, CLXX (March, 1900), 420-32.

Etheridge, J. St. Clair. "The Genesis of Americanism." NAR, CLXX (May, 1900), 679-93.

Ireland, Archbishop John. "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence." NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 321-37.

Coleman, Rt. Rev. Leighton. "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence." NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 337-41.

Coyle, Rev. Robert F. "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence." NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 341-46.

Thomas, Rev. J. B. "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence." NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 346-52.

Gladden, Rev. Washington. "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence." NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 352-56.

Johnston, Rev. John Wesley. "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence." NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 356-60.

Mendes, Rabbi Pereira. "Leo XIII, His Work and Influence." NAR, CLXXVII (September, 1903), 360-64.

THE OPEN COURT:

Editorial. "The Pope's Encyclical." The Open Court, V (July 9, 1891), 2877-80.

Editorial. "Americanism in the Roman Church." The Open Court, XIII (April, 1899), 253-54.

OUR DAY:

Editorial. "Papal Domination in American Schools." OD, III (March, 1889), 257-65.

Editorial. "Papal and American Plans in Conflict." OD, III (June, 1889), 570-81.

Editorial Notes. OD, VIII (August, 1891), 146-48.

Editorial. "New Papal Attack on American Schools." OD, XI (February, 1893), 135-38.

Cook, J. OD, XI (March, 1893), 224.

Editorial Notes. OD, XI (April, 1893), 321-23.

Editorial. "Satolli and the Public Schools." OD, XII (September, 1893), 228-43.

"The Pope on the Public Schools." New York Observer. Reprinted in OD, XII (September, 1893), 207-09.

"Bishop Coxe to Msgr. Satolli." OD, XII (December, 1893), 229-31.

THE PRINCETON REVIEW:

Coxe, Bishop A. Cleveland. "The Pontificate of Pius IX." The Princeton Review, I (March, 1878), 505-34.

PUBLIC OPINION:

"Henry George and the Catholic Church." Public Opinion, II (January 15, 1887), 288-90.

"Henry George and the Papacy." Public Opinion, II (January 22, 1887), 313-14.

"The Pope and the Cahensly Scheme." Public Opinion, XI (July 11, 1891), 323-24.

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW:

Editorial. "The Pope's Letter on Americanism." RCR, III (June, 1899), 389-402.

Editorial. "Leo XIII and the Papacy." RCR, VII (October, 1903), 568-85.

THE UNITARIAN REVIEW:

Editorial. "Pius IX." The Unitarian Review, IX (March, 1878), 333-38.

THE WESTERN WATCHMAN:

Editorial Note. WW, XVIII (February 12, 1887), 4.

Ireland, Archbishop John. "The Church and Charity." WW, XXIV (September 13, 1891), 1.

_____. "Pope Leo." WW, XXV (April 14, 1892), 5.

Editorial. "Religion, the Unifier." WW, XXV (May 26, 1892), 4.

Editorial. "A Rejuvenated Type." New York Sun. Reprinted in WW, XXV (July 21, 1892), 4.

Editorial. "Martial Law for New York." WW, XXV (August 4, 1892), 4.

Editorial Note. WW, XXV (December 29, 1892), 4.

McManus, Rev. P. J. "The A. P. A." WW, XXVI (January 18, 1894), 2.

Editorial. "Demanding Msgr. Satolli's Recall." WW, XXVII (January 31, 1895), 4.

Editorial. "The Pope's Letter to the American Bishops." WW, XXVII (January 31, 1895), 4.

Editorial Note. WW, XXVII (February 28, 1895), 4.

Editorial Note. WW, XXVII (October 24, 1895), 4.

Editorial. "Cardinal Satolli." WW, XXVII (November 7, 1895), 4.

Editorial Note. WW, XXVII (December 9, 1895), 4.

Editorial. "The Retirement of Bishop Keane." WW, XXVIII (October 8, 1896), 4.

Editorial. "The Pope's Letter on Americanism." WW, XXIX (February 23, 1899), 4.

Editorial. "Remember Haman." WW, XXIX (March 2, 1899), 4.

Editorial. "The Meaning of the Pope's Encyclical." WW, XXIX (March 2, 1899), 4.

Editorial Note. WW, XXIX (March 30, 1899), 4.

Editorial. "Archbishop Corrigan's Letter of Adhesion." WW, XXIX (May 11, 1899), 4.

Editorial. "Leo is No More." WW, XXXVIII (July 23, 1903), 8.

Secondary Sources

BOOKS

Abell, Aaron I. American Catholicism and Social Action: A Search for Social Justice, 1865-1950. New York: Hanover, 1960.

_____, ed. American Catholic Thought on Social Questions. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merril Company, Inc., 1968.

Barry, Colman J., O.S.B. The Catholic Church and the German Americans. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1953.

Billington, Ray A. The Protestant Crusade, 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of Nativism. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1963.

Browne, Henry J. The Catholic Church and the Knights of Labor. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, Inc., 1949.

Burton, Katherine. Leo the Thirteenth: The First Modern Pope. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1967.

Bury, J. B. History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century: Liberty and Authority in the Roman Catholic Church. New York: Schocken Books, Inc., 1964.

Callahan, Daniel. The Mind of the Catholic Layman. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1963.

Carlen, Sister M., I.H.M. Dictionary of Papal Pronouncements: Leo XIII to Pius XII, 1878-1957. New York: P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1958.

Cross, Robert D. The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958.

Ellis, John Tracy. American Catholicism. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.

_____, ed. Documents of American Catholic History. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1956.

_____. The Life of James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, 1834-1921 (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1952. 2 Volumes.

Freemantle, Anne, ed. The Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context. New York: G. P. Putnams' Sons, 1956.

Gargan, Edward T., ed. Leo XIII and the Modern World. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961.

Gilson, Etienne, ed. The Church Speaks to the Modern World: The Social Teachings of Leo XIII. New York: Image Books, 1954.

Goldman, Eric F. Rendevous With Destiny: A History of Modern American Reform. 2nd ed. rev. New York: Vantage Books, 1956.

Hales, E. E. Y. The Catholic Church in the Modern World: A Survey From the French Revolution to the Present. New York: Image Books, 1958.

Hayes, Carlton, J. H. A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1941.

Hays, Samuel P. The Response to Industrialism, 1885-1914. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Higham, John. Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism, 1860-1925. 2nd ed. New York: Atheneum, 1963.

Kinzer, Donald L. An Episode in Anti-Catholicism: The American Protective Association. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1964.

Latourette, Kenneth Scott. The Nineteenth Century Outside Europe: The Americas, The Pacific, Asia, and Africa. Volume III of Christianity in a Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1961.

_____. The Twentieth Century in Europe: The Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Eastern Churches. Volume IV of Christianity in a Revolutionary Age: A History of Christianity in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1961.

McAvoy, Thomas T., C.S.C. A History of the Catholic Church in the United States. Notre Dame: The University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

_____. The Great Crisis in American Catholic History, 1895-1900. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1957.

McCarthy, Justin. Pope Leo XIII. New York: Frederick Warne & Company, 1896.

Moody, Joseph N., ed. Church and Society: Catholic Social and Political Thought and Movement, 1789-1950. New York: Arts, Inc., 1953.

Mott, Franklin Luther. A History of American Magazines. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967. 4 Vols.

Putz, Louis J., C.S.C., ed. The Catholic Church, U. S. A. Chicago: Fides Publishers Association, 1956.

Shaughnessy, Gerald. Has The Immigrant Kept the Faith? New York: 1925.

Smith, James Ward and Jamison, A. Leland, eds. Religion in American Life. Vol. I.: The Shaping of American Religion. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.

Sweet, William Warren. The Story of Religion in America. 2nd ed. rev. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1950.

Tyler, Alice Felt. Freedom's Ferment: Phases of American Social History from the Colonial Period to the Outbreak of the Civil War. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1944.

Wynne, John J., ed. The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903.

Zwierlein, F. The Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid. Rochester: 1925-1927, Volume III.

ARTICLES:

Abell, Aaron, I. "American Catholic Reaction to Industrial Conflict: The Arbital Process, 1885-1900." The Catholic Historical Review, XLI (January, 1956), 385-407.

Cassidy, Francis P. "Catholic Education in the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore." The Catholic Historical Review, XXXIV (October, 1948), 257-305; (January, 1949), 414-36.

"Leo XIII." The Catholic Encyclopedia, IX (1910-1913), 169-72.

McAvoy, Thomas. "Americanism and Frontier Catholicism." Review of Politics, V (July, 1943), 275-301.

_____. "The Catholic Minority after the Americanist Controversy, 1899-1917: A Survey." The Review of Politics, XXI (January, 1959), 53-82.

Meng, John. "Cahenslyism: The First Stage, 1883-1891," and "Cahenslyism: The Second Chapter, 1891-1910. The Catholic Historical Review, XXXI (January, 1946), 389-413; XXXII (October, 1946), 302-40.

_____. "Growing Pains in the American Church, 1880-1908." Historical Records and Studies, XXVI (1947), 17-67.

Roohan, James. "American Catholics and the Social Question, 1865-1900." Historical Records and Studies (1954), 3-18.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES
31293103127456