"The Word" Library—No. 1.

SOCIALISM
AND
THE POPE

By

GUY A. ALDRED

Price - 4d.

1940.
GLASGOW:
The Strickland Press, 104 George St., C.1.
Bakunin Press, Bakunin Hall, 29 Castle St., C.3.



SOCIALISM AND THE POPE

First published by the author from 145 Queen Street, Glasgow, C.1., 1934. Chapter III. has been extended. Two appendices have been added, and also some author's notes.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

I.—The Papal Attitude Defined 3

II.—Big Business Agrees 11

III.—"Sacred Heart" Literature 17

IV.—The Status of Jesus 22

V.—The Primitive Church and Slavery 35

VI.—The Church and Poverty: Medieval to Protestant ... 40

VII.—Christian Socialism 44

VIII.—The Pope Does Not Understand 49

IX.—Parliamentary "Socialism" and the Poor Clergy! 51

APPENDICES.

I.—The Rise and Persecution of Quakerism 53

II.—The Pope and Spain 56

III.—Roman Reaction 59

AUTHOR'S NOTES.

x48785
/E—

I. The Papal Attitude Defined.

Pope Pius XI. solemnly commemorated the fortieth anniversary of the publication by Pope Leo XIII. of his famous Encyclical, "Rerum Novarum," by radioing a new pronouncement to the world. This new Encyclical, "Quadragesimo Anno," was summarised in the ordinary press and published at length in the Catholic press. There is no dispute concerning its tone or character. It is a definite challenge to Socialism in every shape and form. Henceforth, the Catholic working man, if he would be emancipated from wage slavery, must give up his Catholicism, not because some Socialist has declared that Socialism means Atheism, but because the Vatican has elected to take its stand by Capitalism. The Pope has made acceptance of wage-slavery a question of faith and morals. He has reduced the eternal verities to the servitude of capitalism and, in consequence, with much unwisdom, he has signed the social and economic death-warrant of the Church of Rome. For the workers must, and will be emancipated. If the Pope opposes the struggle towards that emancipation, like any other princeling of mammon, he must be thrust aside. There is neither holiness nor piety, neither genius, nor affection, in condemning the mass of mankind to want, servitude, disease, crime and murder. Whoso opposes Socialism and the working-class struggle is guilty of this conspiracy of crime against the mass of mankind. As such, he must be indicted and, in due course, condemned. Socialism is not on trial. Capitalism is.

Pope Pius XI. declares that the publication of the "Rerum Novarum"—otherwise called "The Workers' Charter"—on May 15, 1891, was both necessary and opportune. We confess that we fail to see that it was either necessary or opportune. It was marked throughout, with dullness and mediocrity: and the world has dullness and mediocrity in excess. Neither are ever necessary, since they represent but the pomp and vanity of the parade of power and authority. It is notorious, however, that the Pope, like every monarch, priest, judge and premier, speaks without the one thing that each of these persons, in the plentitude of the arrogance and economic circumstance, claim: authority. Those in power, in class or slave society, have everything— *except authority*. Hence their pompous dullness. This declaration of truth and fact is not merely sound Socialism and sound Atheism. It is also sound Christian teaching and sound human experience. The priest is too dull to be inspired and too mediocre to be a Christian.

Pope Pius XI. states that the "Rerum Novarum" has become the great charter of Catholic Social Action. This may be true. But it is also true that the great Charter of Catholic Social Action has achieved nothing. Otherwise, why is it necessary for Pope Pius

XI. to repeat the platitudes of Pope Leo XIII. to a world steeped in even deeper misery and destitution than that to which the Vatican addressed itself in 1891? Is not all this solemn pronouncement, where nothing is attempted and still less accomplished, just a solemn sham?

Pope Pius XI. speaks of the mutual products of Capital and Labour, and invokes, with approval, the formal words of Pope Leo XIII.:—

> "It is not possible to have capital without labour, nor labour without capital."

We hope this dictum is not supposed to be infallible. For it is very bad political economy. Capital is merely the stored-up product of human labour-power, and is, therefore, robbery. In any case why must capital be the appropriation of the few, and labour be the condition of the many? What bearing has this relationship of man to man upon the question of wealth-production?

We fail to see the necessary bearing of the actual circumstance of the human beings concerned upon the platitude enunciated by Pope Leo XIII., and repeated by Pope Pius XI., as an apology for a social and economic inequality which it neither explains, nor examines, nor excuses.

Speaking in London, at the Albert Hall, in 1908, Archbishop Maguire, of Glasgow, made short work of this nonsense of Pope Leo XIII. as to the relationship of Capital to Labour. The Archbishop declared that the working-men would come to rule the world.

The following year, in another lecture, the Archbishop summed up the position in these trenchant terms:—

> "It seems almost incredible that in wealthy England so much destitution should exist, and still more that vagrancy and mendacity should so prevail. It may well be asked—Is this the grand total result of the wisdom of our legislators, the efforts of our philanthropists, the Christianity of our Churches, that our streets are infested with miserable creatures from whose faces almost everything purely human has been erased, whose very presence would put us to shame but for familiarity with the sight? Poor wretches! filthy in body, foul in speech, vile in spirit. Human vermin! Yes, but of our own manufacture, for every individual of this mass was once an innocent child. Society has made them what they are, not only by a selfish indulgence in indiscriminate almsgiving, but by permitting bad laws to exist and others to be so administered as to crush the weak and wreck the lives of the unfortunate."

In 1909, the Catholic Truth Society issued a revised pamphlet on Socialism by the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J. The Jesuit father condemned a Socialism that

> "Involves a transfer, sudden and probably violent, of all capital to the State, and apparently without compensation to the sufferers by the change."

Why should there be compensation? How can there be compensation if the wealth is socialised?

Father Rickaby added:—

> "There is nothing to prevent a good Catholic, or any reasonable man if he sees his way to it, advocating that the State should pacifically, and with due consideration of vested rights, take up now this form of capital, now that, and make it a Government or communal monopoly; and it is difficult to see where the absorption should stop; only let it be done gradually and justly."

As though injustice can be remedied gradually and justly! Of course, Father Rickaby has no understanding of Socialism. If his theology is as poor as his economics, it is hard to understand his right to a place in the pulpit. Perhaps that is why he finds himself there. Pulpit material is usually very poor.

Not less so is literary material when it is saturated with superstition. The same year Hilaire Belloc issued his pamphlet, "The Church and Socialism." This was revised and reissued by the Catholic Truth Society in 1921. Belloc opens with the following sentence:—

> "The Catholic Church is, throughout the world, opposed to that modern theory of society which is called *Socialist*, the full and most logical form of which is Communism."

This Society, among other pamphlets against Communism, issue: "Communism," by the Rev. Lewis Watt, S.J., B.Sc. (Econ.); and "The Theory and Objective of Bolshevism," by Walter Legge, T.O.D.

Father Watt, on page 32 of this pamphlet warns the faithful:—

> "That no loyal Catholic may join the Communist Party or sympathise with its programme has been made perfectly clear by Pope Pius XI. After the quotations from his encyclicals given on an earlier page it is hardly necessary to say that the papal condemnation of Communism in no way involves approval of the existing capitalist regime."

In case it should be supposed this *non*-approval of "the existing Capitalist regime" implies some faint idea of Socialism, Father Watt adds:—

> "He (Pope Pius XI.) has demanded for the workers their fair share of the world's wealth, a wage at least enough to provide an ample sufficiency of a family basis, and the opportunity to become property-owners instead of proletarians."

We see the workers lining up to obtain their property-rights, with the assistance of the Mother Church! What cant!

But the most interesting pronouncement of all, since it brings us to an analysis of the Pope's attitude, is that of Father Vincent McNabb, the Dominican, in "the Tablet," for March, 1909.

He defines Capital as the three economic functions of the State: (a) Productive; (b) Distributive; (c) Consumptive. Property may mean either or all three of these forms of Capital. The Socialists, when they declared that property was theft, made no distinction as to what was meant by property. Which was why Pope Leo XIII. issued his "Rerum Novarum," to challenge the

idea that a man had no right to any kind of property. Since then Socialists have distinguished between the different kinds of property, and many Socialists now admit *the right to Consumptive Property*. Therefore they do not deny the right to property and the Encyclical "Rerum Novarum" cannot be urged against them.

If Father McNabb's arguments were sound, the "Rerum Novarum" would have no meaning. Actually the definition is all wrong and is based on a misunderstanding of the meaning of wealth and of property.

How can consumptive wealth be termed property? If one is going to talk about "consumptive property," every Socialist believes in such "property"! But the "Rerum Novarum" opposed Socialism—opposed the Socialisation of the means of production and distribution, and not the Socialisation of personal "consumptive wealth," which must and can only be wealth used for each individual's well-being.

Pope Leo XIII., whilst Cardinal Archbishop of Perugia, devoted many essays to attacks on Socialism. After his elevation to the Papacy he expatiated on the evils of Socialism in all his official pronouncements. The following are his chief denunciations: Encyclical, 21st April, 1878; 28th December, 1878; 29th June, 1881; 15th February, 1882; 1st November, 1885; 10th January, 1890; 1st May, 1891. Apostolic Letter to the Nations and Princes of the Universe, 20th June, 1894.

The famous Encyclical of 15th May, 1891, "on the Condition of the Working Classes," is described by Catholics as "The Workers' Charter." They claim that it sets forth the basic principles of social justice. It was translated by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. Henry Canon Parkinson, D.D., and published by the Catholic Social Guild, Oxford. We are quoting the forty-five thousand edition, published in 1926.

Canon Parkinson, in his introduction, declares:—

> "The Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, on the condition of Labour, announces no revolution in the teaching of the Church: it merely applies—but with the majesty and support of St. Paul—those eternal laws of social duty and Christian affection of which the Church is the guardian and the exponent."

Note the reference to the "eternal laws"!

How can any church that upholds slavery and blesses kings and war, as the Church of Rome has done, be the guardian and exponent of the "eternal laws of social duty and Christian affection"? We suspect persons who incline to redundancy. Why "Social Duty and Christian Affection"? Ought not "social duty" to be synonymous with "Christian affection"? Should not "social duty" as the clearer phrase suffice?

Canon Parkinson proceeds to prove that the Encyclical was most opportune and depicts the Pontiff's keen interest in the work "of the Knights of Labour, whose cause Cardinal Manning and Gibbons

supported." He dates the pilgrimages the Pontiff received at the Vatican: —

1884—French Employees of Labour.

1887—Labour Pilgrimage, consisting of 100 employers 1,400 workers, and 300 priests.

1889—Succession workers' pilgrimages from France. The workmen repeatedly called the Pope "their father and protector."

At these 1889 audiences, the Pope gave the continual assurance: "We shall never cease to do for the betterment of your conditions all that our office and Our fatherly heart can suggest."

It is not noticeable that the condition of the working-class has improved in consequence of all this pontifical energy for working-class betterment.

In 1890, the Pope traced the "leading" ideas of his Anti-Socialist "wisdom," in a letter to the Emperor William II. on the occasion of the Berlin Congress. And so the way was prepared "for the complete and final pronouncement of May 15, 1891." Adds Canon Parkinson. "This weighty document has blessed and sanctified the cause of true social rectification."

Cardinal Manning, who should have known better, in view of his summary of the evils of capitalism, is cited by Canon Parkinson as an eulogist of the Pope's Encyclical. Manning wrote: —

> "Since the divine words, 'I have compassion on the multitude,' were spoken in the wilderness no voice has been heard throughout the world pleading for the people with such profound love and loving sympathy for those that toil and suffer, as the voice of Leo XIII. . . . None but the Vicar of our Divine Lord could so speak to mankind."

To our mind there is no comparison between the direct, simple language ascribed by tradition to Jesus of Nazareth, and the involved, argumentative Anti-Socialist apologetics of the Pope of Rome. We consider the comparison an evidence of bad taste and worse understanding.

Canon Parkinson concludes his introduction with the following evidence that Leo XIII. wrote with lasting authority: —

> "Pius X., in his *Motu Proprio* of December 18, 1903, has summarised, and, with all the weight of his supreme authority, has laid down as fundamental rules of thought and conduct, the principles which Leo XIII. expounded to an astonished world in his inspired utterances. The Encyclicals *Quod Apostolici muneris* (December 28, 1878), *Rerum novarum* (May 15, 1891), and lastly the *Instruction of the Sacred Congregation* of January 27, 1902, have furnished us with a code of doctrines which will be the guide of Catholics during these momentous years of social readjustment."

In an appendix, Dr. Parkinson publishes an analysis of the Encyclical, from which we excerpt the following sections: —

Introduction

Statement of the Social Problem.

Socialism and the Pope.

I.

The Socialistic Remedy (transference of ownership to the State) is Rejected.

The Right of Private Property (in chattels and land) is Established.

II.

The True Remedy (to be sought in the combined action of (a) the Church; (b) the State; (c) employer and the working class).

Conclusion.

Respective Duties of the State; of the Wealthy; of the Poor; of the Clergy.

The above skeleton proves beyond all possibility of dispute that the Pope rejects the idea of the workers coming together for their emancipation. It accepts the perpetuation of poverty.

Canon Parkinson also divides the Encyclical into "contents." A selection from these section-descriptions also tell the same story:—

"The Socialist Solution: Its Refutation."
"Private Property a Natural Right."
"The Right of Private Property proved by the Family."
"Labouring and Suffering Must Exist."
"Class should help Class."
"The Rich must help the Poor."
"Poverty and Labour no Disgrace."
"The State should be solicitous for the Working Population."
"The Working Man should be Encouraged to acquire Property."

Indisputable testimony to the Anti-Socialist nature of the Encyclical is to be found in the opening paragraphs:—

"It is no easy matter to define the relative rights and mutual duties of the rich and of the poor, of Capital and of Labour. *And the danger lies in this, that crafty agitators are intent on making use of these differences of opinion to pervert men's judgements and to stir up the people to revolt.*

"But all agree, and there can be no question whatever, that some remedy must be found, and found quickly, for the misery and wretchedness pressing so heavily and unjustly at this moment on the vast majority of the working classes . . .

"To remedy these wrongs the Socialists, working on the poor man's envy of the rich, are striving to do away with private property, and contend that individual possessions should become the common property of all, to be administered by the State or by municipal bodies . . ."

The pope proceeds to cite the laws of nature, the civil laws, and Deut. v. 21, as the Divine law, to prove that

"The practice of all ages has consecrated the principle of private ownership."

He concludes:

"Hence it is clear that the main tenet of Socialism, community of goods, must be utterly rejected, since it only injures those whom it would seem meant to benefit, is directly contrary to the natural rights of mankind and would introduce confusion and disorder into the commonweal. The first and most fundamental principle, therefore, if one would undertake to alleviate the condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property."

The Papal Attitude Defined.

The rest of the Encyclical is absolutely mediocre and ridiculous. "No man can be a Socialist and a Catholic," is its theme, monotonously reiterated.

The 1902 Encyclical concluded Leo XIII.'s Anti-Socialist labours and enunciations of capitalist doctrines for Catholics. He died a year later and was succeeded by Pope Pius X., who continued the "good work" of Anti-Socialism, as Parkinson terms it in wonderful but unconscious self-revelation.

Pope Pius XI. follows faithfully in the Anti-Socialist footsteps of his predecessors, Leo XIII. and Pius X. The Catholic workingman may look to Rome for his religious inspiration if he wishes, but even so he should pause before accepting the absolute authority of the Pope as the interpreter of Christian faith and morals. Just as the Gods have nodded, so the Popes may err, and indeed, often have erred. It should be recalled that the Vatican Council of A.D. 1869, decided the question of papal infallibility, and that of the relative superiority of the Pope and the Council. After all the bishops who were opposed to the idea of papal infallibility had left the Council, under threats of excommunication, on July 18, 1870, by a vote of 535 prelates against 2, passed the decree of Papal Infallibility, which was confirmed immediately by the Pope. It was a coerced, senseless, and worthless vote: Stalinism in the Vatican. But it did not commend itself to John Henry Newman, whose name is one that the Catholic Church holds in honour.

Cardinal Newman regarded the decison of the Vatican Council as "a great calamity" and declared distinctly that "an aggressive, insolent faction" was responsible for it. He went so far as to address a letter to the leader of the English Catholic nobility, the Duke of Norfolk, in which he enumerated certain instances in which he would disobey the Pope's command. Supposing himself to be gravely exercised by such a mandate, he says, "I should look to see what theologians could do for me, what the bishops and clergy around me, what my confessor, what friends whom I revered; and if, after all, I could not take their view of the matter, then I must rule myself by my own judgement and my own conscience." Surely such a position, so taken up, is utterly irreconcilable with the decree of papal infallibility; and strange it is to reflect that he who thus fell back upon the right and authority of private judgment, should have been made a cardinal. Such words as he left on record show that even among members of the Church of Rome, the doctrine of papal infallibility is not settled.

Newman's attitude was correct. The Council had the right to declare that the decision of the Pope, in all questions of faith and morals, or in any other question in relation to which the Church wanted to speak officially, was "final." It had no power to declare that it was infallible. That was beyond its powers, absolutely ultra vires. The old Catholics, headed by Dr. Dollinger and Dr. Friedrich, challenged the decree of infallibility; but slowly they

faded away. Their failure to maintain their influence does not affect the point at issue.

Although it is the privilege of the individual to accept the private authority of the expert in private matters, and although he has the right to regard the Pope as an expert, if the individual be a worker he should look to his class for his economics and for his social faith and ethics. In the workless queue associates are Atheists and Protestants, but all members of the one class, suffering the same economic misery. Their economic hope is not the pulpit, *but* the Council of Action. If the Vatican opposes that economic hope, and the struggle it involves, it is speaking not in the name of God, but in the name of Mammon. And Mammon will be cast down from its throne and trampled beneath the feet of the hosts of labour. Truth will never pass. It is for the Church to choose whether it will uphold Truth or Mammon.

The Capitalist system is collapsing and Pope Pius XI.—imitating his predecessors Popes Leo XIII. and Pius X.—is troubled with the question of Socialism involving Atheism or Materialism. But the working-man is concerned with the other practical question: Can Christianity tolerate Capitalism? Our answer is simple: It cannot.

Christianity involves Socialism: and to oppose Socialism because Atheism in proletarian garb also means Socialism, is to sacrifice the very first principles of Christian teaching. Unity should be the message of the Church to Labour. Across the frontiers, against all alienisms, should be thundered the great message from every pulpit: the unity in struggle and joy, the common happiness of mankind. Religion, if it must exist and function as a private matter, should be a matter not of shame, but of inspiration. The pulpit should seek to transform the earth with its eternal verities, and not be the travelling stage of capitalist exposition. The purpose of the Church should not be to excommunicate men and women for their Socialism, but to denounce them for their Anti-Socialism.

II. Protestant Big Business Agrees.

The Catholic Truth Society publish a halfpenny leaflet, headed "Facts About Communism," and sub-titled "An Armoury of Arguments for the Vigilant Catholic." We quote the opening paragraphs: —

> "Communism aims by every means, even the most ruthless, at two objects: relentless class-war, and the total abolition of private property. And wherever it holds power, it shows an incredible and monstrously inhuman cruelty."—Pope Pius XI. Encyclical, May 15, 1931.
>
> "*No Catholic Can be a Communist.*—'Communism,' says Pope Pius IX. (Encyclical, Sept. 11, 1846), 'is completely opposed to the natural law itself, and its establishment would entail the complete destruction of all property and even of human society'."

The interesting fact about these quotations is the agreement between Pius IX. and XI. There was no Soviet Union in 1846 to explain the attitude of Pius IX. But his opposition to Socialism or Communism was as definite as that of his successor. That opposition is explained, not by the alleged atheism of the Soviet Government, but by the natural antagonism of the Catholic Church to Socialism. It is not unworthy of notice that Pius IX. expressed his antagonism, in the hungry forties, at a time of economic disruption in Europe, and the murderous persecution of Chartists in England. Charles Dickens, attending the Unitarian Chapel in Little Portland Street, was insisting on the simple humanity of Jesus, and challenging the individualism of his time in his immortal novels, whilst Bumble and Gradgrind were identifying themselves with the Pope. Dickens was putting Xmas on the map and developing the idea of Christian joy and service. He came under the Pope's charge of "nefarious atheism" whilst he was busy challenging the solemn cant of inane leering Puritanism which blessed the Papal campaign against Socialism.

When Pius IX. declared that no Catholic could be a Socialist or Communist, he erred in the direction of understanding the position. He would have proclaimed a greater truth if he had said that no Catholic could be a Christian. The Protestant big guns and minor canons went further than Pius IX. In an ecstasy of appreciative enthusiasm they excelled "His Holiness." They declared that *no Christian* could be a Socialist or Communist. They meant *no* Protestant could be a Socialist or Communist. Which only meant that no Protestant could be a Christian. Summarised, the conclusion is that neither Catholics nor Protestants are Christians. A fact that explains why Jesus wept. He visioned that this would be so.

In endorsing the attitude of Pius IX., and so minimising the fraudulent superstitions of the Catholic Church, the Protestants were following the unfortunate example set them by the great German pioneer of Protestantism. Martin Luther was more opposed to the

Communism of the Anabaptists than he was to the Real Presence imposture of the Catholics. His instinct to defend property, even though he possessed little, was greater than his desire to conquer Popery, even though his reason revolted at the Pope's claims. He deliberately trampled on his scruples, and brought his views on the Real Presence into line with those of Rome, from very fear of upsetting the rising Capitalist society.

Modern Protestants lack the intellectual audacity and integrity of Luther. Christianity is not to them, a challenge, but only a fashion. It is dead, current, and conventional: a thing accepted. They go to Church as the Romans, under Nero, went to the arena: to pose, strut, and chatter. A double conventionalism, and a surfeit of property self-interest, move them to endorse the Pope's attacks on Socialism and to identify even their Christianity with the absurdities of the Roman priestcraft and superstition. They parade their Sunday Christianity from the same motive as impels them to parade their week-day democracy and air their alleged standing in society every day, Sunday to Saturday inclusive. They pose, doze, and pray on Sunday; pose, prose, and *prey* from Monday till the following Sunday. The day of rest is a day for the recuperation of scoundrelism and usury. Property is the substance of their faith, and the verbiage of Christian piety is the reflected shadow of the substance. Protestant Christianity established is unwilling to identify Christianity with Socialism, because its big-business sensitiveness feels that this is giving a handle to the reckless outcasts who have not where to lay their heads.

Contemporary with Pius IX., and his property declaration of faith, was Dr. Guthrie, the famous Scottish preacher who ranked as a philanthropist. He flourished from 1803 to 1873. At the theological disruption of the Church in Scotland, Guthrie followed the renowned Dr. Chalmers, and raised the sum of £116,000 for providing manses for Free Church Ministers. He also pioneered the ragged schools. In his autobiography, he tells a story which illustrates the failure of the Church to give an adequate social and economic content to the word "Salvation."

Guthrie had paid a visit to a poor old woman in an Edinburgh Slum. He found it almost impossible to rouse her from her apathy. Finally she said, "Eh, Sir, if ye were as cauld and hungry as me, ye could think of naething else."

This is a peace-time story against Capitalist Christianity or Christian Capitalism. Whichever you prefer to have, as noun and adjective. The hypocrisy remains the same. And here is a true war-time story, illustrative of the same hypocrisy.

During the great war, a minister of religion, in Lancashire, was asked at the conclusion of a recruiting speech, whether he believed Jesus Christ would have supported the prosecution of the war. On replying in the affirmative, he was asked whether he could conceive

the Nazarene bayoneting a German. "Oh," he exclaimed, "Jesus Christ would not have had to do that. He would have been an officer on the General Staff."

This same minister endorsed the Pope's objection to Socialism on the ground that it involves Atheism. Many divines have sat in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords as politicians and defenders of Capitalism. We are forced from this fact to conclude that the profession of Christianity is consistent with the unfledged support of Capitalism, Militarism, exploitation, and parliamentarism. For our part, we should have thought it impossible for a man or woman to have upheld the parliamentary and other institutions of Capitalism and have remained a Christian. Jesus was a Socialist in thought, and the first Christians were Communists in practice. The two bitterest opponents of Socialism possessed of intelligence were Atheists, although one styled himself an Agnostic, namely Charles Bradlaugh and Professor T. H. Huxley. Their disciple, J. M. Robertson, was also an Anti-Socialist. If Socialism implies Atheism, it would seem that Anti-Socialism is Atheism also. So that, whatever side be taken, there is no escape from Atheism, since Atheism is everywhere. Actually, a very sound and a very logical conclusion.

Capitalism is a Mammon-Prison, and it maintains itself through the medium of State and Church. The State is not merely the Crown and Privy Council, not merely Lords and Commons, but also the Town and County Councils and P.A.C.s. The Church organisation includes the Episcopacy of St. Paul's and extends to the dissenters of the veriest little Bethel. It is ramified, although so-called Protestant, by the Vatican. The Law is modelled, of course, on the "Codex Romanorum." Christian Europe has copied the institutions of Pagan Rome, which crucified Jesus, the enemy of "Property," and burned the Christians for refusing allegiance to Caesarism. The parsons look back on Rome with horror, and perpetuate its iniquities in the name of Christianity. Church and State continue, as in the time of Caesar, the twin children of Mammon, and maintain the one true religion, the sanctity and divinity and omnipotence of Property!

The Churches have landed interests, and also hundreds of thousands of pounds invested in stocks and shares, in railways, cotton mills, and all forms of industrial exploitation. Hence its opposition to Socialism. Industry may not be able to pay wages to the real labourers, but the Gospel Limited — *and very much limited* — like Patriotism Limited, can "afford" about six pounds a week minimum wage or "salary" plus a free house, etc., to its labourers in the Lord's Vineyard, whether they possess talents or not. One qualification they must have: no scruple, no great penchant for veracity. This permits them to uphold property, and to denounce the workers when they strike against low wages. When wheat is destroyed by the bushel, and coffee burned by the ton, "to get it off the

market," although millions are starving for want of bread and perishing for want of warmth and stimulant, the Church must raise its hands in prayer, and adore the God of Property.

When Socialists speak of socialising the land, they are met with cries of "confiscation" and "compensation." In the beginning of Edward VI.'s reign Acts were passed *against* enclosures, but they were ignored—the landlords were more powerful than any Government. Bernard Gilpin, preaching before the King in 1552 (three years after the Kent rebellion), said:—

> "Be the poor man's cause never so manifest the rich shall for money find six or seven Councillors that shall stand with subtleties and sophisms to cloak an evil matter and hide a known truth. Such boldness have the covetous cormorants that now their robberies, extortion and open oppression have no end or limits. No banks can keep in their violence. As for turning poor men out of their holdings they take it for no offence but say their land is their own and they turn them out of their shrouds like mice. Thousands in England through such, beg now from door to door, which once kept honest houses . . . Poor men are daily hunted out of their livings; there is no covert or den can keep them safe."

"Poor men who once kept honest houses" were termed "unemployed," "thieves" and "vagabonds." During Tudor times they were massacred by Act of Parliament. In the reign of "Bluff King Hal," otherwise Bluebeard the Second, 72,000 were put to death. During Edward's reign they were branded, hanged, or sold as slaves. During Elizabeth's reign "these rogues were trussed up apace, and there was not one year commonly wherein 300 or 400 of them were not devoured and eaten up by the gallows in one place or another." Later were driven men, women and little children into hellish factories of Capitalism, and the clergy blessed the murderers and destroyers!

Denis Tilden Lynch, who told the story of "Boss Tweed," the king of New York corruptionists, termed the third quarter of the nineteenth century in American history, "A Grim Generation." It was not merely grim. It was hysterical and hypocritical. It was the period of grab and pseudo-romance, a post-revolutionary period of land and money-grabbing, of "revivals," and of that phenomenon of phenomena, the "Great Preacher, Henry Ward Beecher. The story of Henry Ward Beecher puts Sinclair Lewis's story of "Elmer Gantry" in the shade, and emphasises once more the accuracy of the old dictum: "Truth is stranger than fiction."

In 1927, Paxton Hibben published through the George H. Doran Company, his documentary history of "the greatest preacher of all times," under the title: "Henry Ward Beecher, An American Portrait."

Paxton depicts the fearful and wonderful amount of hypocrisy that went to make up the showman-preacher career of Henry Ward Beecher: the theatricality, the publicity stunts, the religious commercialism, the love of the limelight, the sexual impulses and

desires, satisfied by stealth and covered by deceit and conceit. The more Beecher sinned the greater became his popularity. Paxton Hibben writes: —

> "People who had never been to church before in their lives flocked across Fulton Ferry, climbed the steep hill to Columbia Heights and waited for hours for the doors of Plymouth Church to open, just to catch a glimpse of this genial, white-haired, thick-necked man with boyish manner and disarming egoism, who at sixty stood accused of so many reputed adulteries. Never had Henry Ward Beecher been more popular. . .
>
> "No one felt more keenly that Henry Ward Beecher the attraction of this atmosphere of profligacy—or appreciated more fully its possibilities. From the days when he looked up to the expelled West Pointer, Fitzgerald, at Mount Pleasant, down through his persistent intimacy with Alvord, the gambler, at Indianopolis, Beecher himself had felt the pull of a certain frailty of reputation. He knew its power over its romance-hungry middle-class public. The stories afloat about him were as much a part of his equipment as the Melton coat he wore, with its great cape that he threw over one shoulder or his slouch hat, or his long hair, or the jewels he carried in his pocket, or the flowers he was always surrounded with. They marked him out amongst men. They made people turn and look at him and whisper to one another. They filled his lecture halls and brought three thousand attendants to Plymouth Church. But there was a point beyond which such reputation must not go. People might whisper, but they must not talk. There must be nothing in the newspapers."

Beecher represented a heavy investment and an essential asset to a gang of solid business men of the "grim generation." He had to appear solvent, like many another rotten business enterprise. Hibben quotes Elizabeth Cady Stanton's story of the "mock hearing before his hacked self-chosen committee" of Plymouth Church. Elizabeth Stanton pointed out, in correct anticipation of the event, that Beecher's *"position will be maintained for him . . . in face of the facts,"* because *"he is the soul and centre of three powerful religious rings"*: —

(1) Plymouth Church; (2) "The Christian Union"; (3) "The Life of Christ."

The untaxed church property was valuable to the bondholders who rallied round Beecher to protect their pockets. Beecher's downfall would have rendered their bonds worthless. Beecher was the editor and chief moralistic contributor to the "Christian Union." The shadowing of his good name meant financial grief to another circle of suffering stockholders. It would have blown his "Life of Christ" (in the words of one of his fold) "higher than a kite." And he had been paid £5,000 for the work before he put pen to paper. He had ground out one volume prior to his impeachment. But the English market refused to touch the first volume until the second had been produced. The entire investment depended upon the vindication of Henry Ward Beecher, and his completion of the work The economic motive power explained the number, strength, and activity of Beecher's partisans. Not his morals nor his honour were

their concern, but their own pockets. Monstrous efforts all—faithfully detailed and checked in Hibben's book—were made to save Beecher, "the star lecturer" of the Redpath Lecture Bureau, including blackmailing, bullying, and the destruction of the records of Beecher's church in Laurenceburgh: mutilating the files of Indiana newspapers kept in the public libraries to get rid of evidence of ancient controversies; spiriting away servants who had been employed in the Tilton household.

Who shall say that this covering of tracks to save the reputation of the "Great Preacher" did not succeed? Not only did his "disciples" save their investments, but they created the Beecher myth that grew and multiplied to his death, and long afterwards, the myth of the Great and Godly Preacher. The rise, evolution, and demolition of this myth, is social history. It symbolises the place of the Protestant Church, and of the popular Protestant preacher, in class society. His function is the perpetuation of parasitism. He is opposed to Socialism, because Socialism means the abolition of the wages system, the passing of profits, and the doom of the parasite and his panderers.

For these reasons, Big Business Protestantism identifies itself with the Papal Denunciations of Socialism.

III. "Sacred Heart" Literature!

In his letter, dated February 2, 1930, addressed to Cardinal Pompili (published in English by the Catholic Truth Society), Pius XI. denounces "infamous carnival pageants" organised in the towns and villages of the Soviet Union, at which lorries paraded the streets on which

> "were erected large Christmas trees, on which numerous dolls, dressed to represent Catholic and Orthodox Bishops, were hung by the neck. Then, in the middle of the city, other youths performed acts of sacrilege of every kind against the Cross."

It is a pity that His Holiness, in his opposition to blasphemy, did not consider the outrages committed against the persons of Bishops Hooper, Ridley, and Latimer, and Archbishop Cranmer, to mention no others, before the Papal authorities consigned them, via the Secular power to the flames. And these disgraceful mockeries, let me remind Pius XI., were not in effigy. If the Church objects to being the victim of mockery it should not have pioneered it against others. Did not Jesus mention the intimate connection of reaping and sowing?

The Pope concludes his protest with a mockery, which is supposed to combine faith with rhetoric: —

> "Therefore, that We Ourselves may make, in the best possible way, an act of reparation for all these outrages, and also that We may invite the faithful of the whole world to this reparation, We have determined on the feast of St. Joseph, the nineteenth day of March to go to Our Basilica of St. Peter's and there to celebrate over the tomb of the Prince of the Apostles a Mass of expiation in propitiation and reparation for these great and awful offences against the Divine Heart . . . After having asked pardon and pity from his Sacred Heart, for the sufferers and likewise for their oppressors. We shall pray to the most holy and immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, to her chaste spouse, St. Joseph, patron of the universal Church, to the special protectors of Russia, the holy Angels, St. John the Baptist, St. Nicholas, St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom, SS. Cyril and Methodius, and all the other Saints, and especially St. Teresa of the Infant Jesus, to whom We have in a particular manner entrusted the future of these souls."

Was ever printing press devoted to the spread of more appalling drivel?

According to the Irish "Messenger of the Sacred Heart" (organ of the Apostleship of Prayer, published in Dublin) the Sacred Heart to which the Holy Father appeals, blesses the races and promotes machine-gun practice. In its issue for November, 1923, this precious journal, under the heading, "Thanskgiving," published the following testimony to the power and grace and glory of the Sacred Heart: —

> "SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL FAVOURS.
>
> "A fine day for the races. . . .
>
> "285 letters of thanksgiving.

"SUCCESS IN MACHINE-GUN PRACTICE.

"Dear Rev. Father,—I hope you will find space in your little 'Messenger' to publish my grateful thanks to the Sacred Heart and Our Lady for the help they have given me in my work. I fired a machine-gun course a few weeks ago, and the first course was a complete failure. However, I never lost trust in the Sacred Heart, and kept on repeating the ejaculation, 'Sacred Heart of Jesus. I place my trust in Thee,' and at the next trial I obtained a splendid score. *An unworthy client of the Sacred Heart.*"

"SPIRITUAL AND TEMPORAL FAVOURS

"Our hurling team won two matches on promise of publication (Offaly).

"191 letters of thanksgiving."

I quote from the same Irish "Messenger of the Sacred Heart" (organ of the Apostleship of Prayer), vol. XLVI., No. 9, issued from 5 Gt. Denmark Street, Dublin, nearly ten years later—that is, in September, 1933. During a decade, the superstitious rubbish had continued to be published regularly in the name of the Catholic Church, and continues to be published as these lines are being penned.

On page 389 of this issue of the *Messenger* there is a eulogy of "Blessed Thomas More" by the Rev. M. Bodkin, S.J., as one of the "Patrons of Life." It is true that Sir Thomas More was martyred for a scruple of conscience and died bravely and usefully, as all martyrs must. But the Jesuit father does not point that More was secretly a Theist and not a Christian, and his wonderful Utopia, outlined a deistic semi-Socialist Commonwealth. Yet the same Sir Thomas More sat on tribunals that condemned Protestants to the stake, and was angered at Erasmus when that great satirist and thinker ridiculed the absurd doctrine of the Real Presence. Father Bodkin failed to portray a true picture of More as either persecutor or secret heretic, but did bring out an interesting point in connection with More's trial:—

"At his trial he easily confuted his embarassed and shame-faced judges. 'The king has been made head of the church by parliament,' said Solicitor-General Rich, 'must you not obey the parliament?' 'And should Parliament make him God,' said More, 'must I obey then, too?' "

The same reply might be made to the papal claim to speak with the authority of God.

Let us pass to the "Letters of Thanksgiving."

"WONDERFUL ESCAPE IN ACCIDENT.

"IRELAND. DEAR REV. FATHER,—Please publish my grateful thanksgiving in the MESSENGER for the miraculous escape which four of us had in an awful motor accident some months ago, when a big touring car ran right into us. We escaped death—though the car was completely destroyed. We had the badge of the Sacred Heart in our car and it was this, I firmly believe, that saved us. We were badly injured, but thanks to the Sacred Heart, we are all well again . . . .—A LOVER OF THE SACRED HEART."

"A THANKSGIVING—AND A WARNING.

"NEW YORK CITY. DEAR REV. FATHER,—Please publish in your little MESSENGER my heartfelt thanks to the Sacred Heart of Jesus

and the Immaculate Heart of Mary for a wonderful and almost miraculous answer to my prayers. I had been out of employment for some time and, although I searched everywhere, I could not find another job—not even working for my meals. The fact that I am not a citizen of the United States made it much harder for me to find work as nearly everywhere I went the American citizen got the preference, a preference which is only right in these trying times of depression. I am only three years in this country, and as one has to be five years here before one can become a citizen it is easy to understand my plight. All my money was spent and I had no friends to whom I could turn to for support. There was nothing for me but starvation. I tramped New York's streets with very little to eat, no money, no work, and without a friend.

"I decided to make a Novena to the Sacred Heart through the Immaculate Heart of Mary, asking Him to help me if it was His divine will and promising publication if my request was granted. My Novena finished on the 9th May and I got a good job on the 13th—one I never expected. Thanks to the Sacred Heart and His holy Mother! . . . .—CLIENT OF THE SACRED HEART."

"GREAT TROUBLE AVERTED.

"IRELAND. DEAR REV. FATHER,—Will you please publish in your dear little MESSENGER my thanksgiving for favours received. Amongst the favours which I have received I might mention the following: Some time ago I was in great trouble which, if I did not get out of, might be the cause of ruining my prospects. I spent many a restless day and night until at last I had recourse to prayer, placing my whole trust in the Sacred Heart of Jesus and His Blessed Mother, and promising if the favour were granted publication in the MESSENGER, of which I have been a reader since childhood. Thanks to the Sacred Heart of Jesus and His Blessed Mother who heard my prayers and granted my request.

"Other favours have been granted me after promising to have them published in the MESSENGER. I attribute all to the divine help of the most Sacred Heart of Jesus and the intercession of Our Immaculate Mother for which I thank them most fervently.—A GRATEFUL SINNER."

"OUR MOST NEEDFUL FRIEND.

"DEAR REV. FATHER,—I humbly ask of you to publish a most miraculous favour I received from the Sacred Heart through the MESSENGER, the true Catholic's most needful friend in the time of distress. For two years I was unemployed, I had searched everywhere for work and I had given up all hope. One day I took up a copy of the MESSENGER and read the thanksgivings and something urged me to fill in the Petition Form. I did, and six weeks later I got a wonderful position, it was the sort of work I had prayed for. I love the work and will never be able to thank the Sacred Heart enough, especially as there is so much idleness at the present time. I sincerely recommend the MESSENGER to every Catholic who is in despair, to have faith and pray to God, for there is surely an answer to prayer.—A FIRM BELIEVER IN THE SACRED HEART."

And then, although the quotation is made from a paper ten years later, our old friend, the hurling team, turns up again. Obviously, God approves of hurling!

Socialism and the Pope.

On page 425, we read:—

"A HURLING TEAM'S SUCCESS.

"IRELAND. DEAR REV. FATHER,—Some time ago I was elected Captain of the local hurling team. I made a promise to the Sacred Heart that if my team won the Championship I would publish a thanksgiving in the MESSENGER. Strange to relate when everything was going against us on the field I placed my trust in the Sacred Heart and repeated the ejaculation, "Sacred Heart of Jesus I place my Trust in Thee, and to the surprise of all we won on the whistle.

"Hoping you will find space to show your readers what the Sacred Heart can do if you only trust in Him.—A FOND LOVER OF THE SACRED HEART."

True Catholic literature! Literature of the Sacred Heart that promotes machine-gun practice! Assists hurling! Discovers jobs! Recovers purses! Believers in rubbish are told by Willie Gallacher in Britain, and Earl Browder in America that the Communist Party does not wish to make war on their faith! Perhaps the Sacred Heart will be invoked to keep Gallacher in the House of Commons till he dies! What matters that John Chrysostom, dead and sainted, is invoked to curse Communism by the Holy Father! John Chrysostom, who preached Communism! Fine Catholic Literature!

Isaac D'Israeli (1766-1848) father of the famous Earl of Beaconsfield, in his six volumes of the "Curiosities of English Literature," has thrown light on this subject of "True Catholic Literature." He mentions the amours attributed in this literature to the Virgin Mary. He also cites John Oldham's (1653-83), "Satires Upon the Jesuits," which summarises the "lying legends" of the Church in a masterly commentary, and denounces the innumerable impositions practised on the credulous by the Papal Church.

Referring to the extravagant pictures in the "Golden Legend," Oldham writes:—

"Tell, how *blessed Virgin* to come down was seen,
Like play-house punk descending in machine,
How she writ *billet doux* and *love-discourse*,
Made *assignations*, *visits*, and *amours;*
How hosts distrest, her *smock* for *banner* wore,
Which vanquished foes!—
—— how *fish* in conventicles met,
And *mackerel* were with *bait of doctrine* caught:
How cattle have judicious hearers been!—
How *consecrated hives* with bells were hung,
And *bees* kept mass, and holy *anthems sung*!
How *pigs* to th' *rosary* kneel'd, and *sheep* were taught
To bleat *Te Deum* and *Magnificat*;
How *fly-flap*, of church-censure houses rid
Of insects, which at *curse of fryar* died.
How *ferrying cowls* religious pilgrims bore
O'er waves, without the help of sail or oar;
How *zealous crab* the *sacred image* bore,
And swam a catholic to the distant shore.

With shams like these the giddy rout mislead,
Their folly and their superstition feed."

Oldham attacks the Church for publications on topics not less singular. The tales he has recounted, Oldham says, are only baits for children, like toys at a fair; but they have their profounder and higher matters for the learned and the inquisitve. He goes on (Satyr IV.):—

"One undertakes by scales of miles to tell
The bounds, dimensions and extent of HELL;
How many German leagues that realm contains!
How many chaldrons Hell each year expends
In coals for roasting Hugonots and friends!
Another frights the rout with use stories
Of wild Chimeras, limbo's PURGATORIES:
Where bloated souls in smoky durance hung,
Like a Westphalia gammon or neat's tongue,
To be redeemed with masses and a song."

In the above lines Oldham alludes to actual publications of the Church.

"Treatises and topographical description of HELL, PURGATORY, and even HEAVEN," comments D'Israeli,

"were once the favourite researches among certain zealous defenders of the Romish Church, who exhausted their ink-horns in building up a Hell to their own taste, or for their particular purpose. We have a treatise of Cardinal Bellarmin, a Jesuit, on "Purgatory"; he seems to have the science of a surveyor, among all the secret tracks and the formidable divisions of the 'bottomless pit'."

Bellarmin states that there is, beneath the earth, a profound place divided into four parts. The deepest of these parts is Hell; it contains all the souls of the damned, there will be also their bodies after the resurrection, and likewise all the demons. The place nearest Hell is Purgatory, where souls are purged, or rather where they appease the anger of God by their sufferings. He says that the same fires and the same torments are alike in both these places, the only difference between *Hell* and *Purgatory* consisting in their duration. Next to *Purgatory* is the *limbo* of those *infants* who die without having received the sacrament; and the fourth place is the *limbo* of the *fathers*; that is to say, of those *just men* who died before the death of Christ. But since the days of the Redeemer the last division is empty, like an apartment to let!

The famous Catholic theologist Tillemont did not share this "larger hope" opinion. He condemns *all the illustrious pagans* to the *eternal torments of Hell*: because they lived before the time of Jesus, and therefore could not be benefited by the redemption!

I conclude this chapter with the following extract from D'Israeli:—

"Anthony Cornellius, a lawyer in the 16th century, wrote a small tract, which was so effectually suppressed, as a monster of atheism, that a copy is now only to be found in the hands of the curious. This author ridiculed the absurd and horrid doctrine of *infant damnation* and was instantly decried as an atheist, and the printer prosecuted to his ruin!"

IV. The Status of Jesus

The Pope denounces Socialism for its propaganda of "nefarious atheism." He declares that Socialism is anti-Christian because it repudiates the deity of Jesus. This complaint does not indict Socialism, but the Pope. John Wesley developed the fallacy, among Protestants, that no man could be a Christian unless he subscribed to the doctrine of Christ's divinity. When Wesley made this assertion he ran counter to the weight of Christian Scholarship. When the Pope makes the same assertion he shares Wesley's error. Belief in the divinity of Christ is not the teaching of the Christian Church. Christ's divinity is not maintained by the scholars of the Church, nor is it upheld by the leading writers, thinkers, jurists, divines, and philanthropists.

Contemporary with Wesley were Dr. Edmund Law, the celebrated Bishop of Carlisle, who flourished from 1703-1787; Theophilus Lindsey, Vicar of Catterick and founder of the Essex Hall pulpit, who lived in 1723-1808; Dr. Samuel Parr, 1741-1825, the famous schoolmaster, scholar and Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral; and Archdeacon Paley, the famous author of Christian Evidences and the watch argument so dear to orthodoxy, who lived from 1743-1805.

Dr. Parr maintained that "Wakefield, the Unitarian, was a profound scholar and earnest Christian." He defined Christianity as "a religion intended for general use," which "never clashes with unbiased dictates of our reason." And he claimed "that the author of it abstained from all abstruse speculations."

This declaration is an obvious denial of the doctrine that belief in the deity of Christ is a first principle of Christian faith.

Law, Lindsey, and Paley were avowed Unitarians, that is, believers in the humanity and not the divinity of Jesus.

Bishop Law edited the writings and wrote the biography of John Locke. He embraced Arianism at Cambridge, where he was educated, and where he became Professor of Moral Philosophy and Master of Peter's College. The first edition of his work, "Consideration on the Theory of Religion," was Arian. It denied the Trinity and the divinity of Christ, but favoured his pre-existence. The final edition, published in 1784, was revised so as to divest it of all expressions of pre-existence of Jesus. Dr. Law surrendered the Arian to the strictly humanitarian conception of Jesus. The following year Archdeacon Paley dedicated his famous work on "Moral Philosophy" to Bishop Law, in these memorable words:—

> "Your researches have never lost sight of one purpose, that of recovering the simplicity of the Gospel from beneath that load of unauthorised additions which the ignorance of some ages and the learning of others, the superstition of weak men and the craft of the designing ones have heaped upon it. And your purpose was

dictated by the firm—and I think, just—opinion that whatever renders religion more rational renders it more credible. He who by diligent and faithful examination dismisses one article which contradicts the experience or reason of mankind, does more towards recommending Christianity to the understanding and consciences of serious inquirers than can be affected by a thousand contenders for creeds and ordinances of human establishment."

Dr. Law took an active part in the "Feathers Tavern Petition" of 1773. Two hundred clergymen of the established Church signed this petition asking for relief from the subscription of the Athanasian Creed and the thirty-nine articles. The House of Commons refused, by two hundred and seventeen votes to seventeen, even to receive the petition.

One of Dr. Law's sons became Bishop of Elphin, in Ireland, and in spite of his prelatic rank, was a resolute and pronounced Unitarian. Another son, Thomas Law, was one of the main founders of the Unitarian Church at Washington. Bishop Law's quarto Bible is in the British Museum and contains Unitarian annotations by him.

Archdeacon Paley was educated at Cambridge and taught divinity there from 1768 to 1776. His lecture notes, now in the British Museum, confirm his Unitarianism. In 1776, he was appointed to a living in Westmoreland, and in 1782, he became Archdeacon of Carlisle. Through all his numerous writings Paley avoided sedulously any reference to the doctrine of the Trinity. His language about Jesus never went beyond Arianism.

Professor Blunt admitted ("Quarterly Review," 1828): "He (Paley) *made no explicit declaration of our Lord's Divinity*." Paley never attributed "personality to the Holy Spirit," and studiously employed the reference "it" instead of "He."

Lindsey was one of the signatories to the "Feathers Tavern Petition." He was born at Middlewich and became Vicar of Catterick, Yorkshire, in 1763. The following year he organised the *first* Sunday School in England. One hundred and ninety-nine signatories to the "Feathers Tavern Petition" accepted the refusal of the House of Commons and continued to enjoy their livings. Lindsey found this position untenable. Encouraged by his wife, and by her step-father, Archdeacon Blackburn, he surrendered his living, sold his library and furniture, and proceeded to London, where he and his wife rented two small rooms in the ground floor of a house in Holborn. On Sunday, April 17, 1774, Lindsey held his first service as an avowed Unitarian Minister, and established the first Unitarian Church, in an auction room hall, in Essex Street, Strand.

Benjamin Franklin was present at this opening meeting with Joseph Priestly, Richard Price and John Disney. Born on January 17, 1706, Franklin died on April 17, 1790. He made a confession of faith a short time before his death, in which he avowed his belief in one God. He added:—

> "As to Jesus of Nazareth, I think his system of morals and his religion, as he left them to us, the best the world ever saw, or is like to see; but I apprehend it has received various corrupting changes. *I have*, with most of the present dissenters of England, some doubts of his Divinity."

Joseph Priestly, the discoverer, scientist and scholar, was born at Fieldhead, near Leeds, England, in 1733. He was educated in strict Calvanism but soon embraced Unitarianism. He studied at Daventry under Dr. Samuel Clarke, and settled as Minister of the Needham Market Church, in Suffolk, 1755. He removed to a parish at Nantwich, 1758. Three years later he went to Warrington as a teacher. He now became in turn Minister at Leeds, Birmingham, and Hackney, of chapels where the congregations had drifted into Unitarianism. His sympathy with the French Revolution caused his house, library and scientific apparatus to be burned and destroyed by a reactionary Birmingham mob in 1791. Three years later he emigrated to America and settled at Northumberland, Pa., where he died in 1804.

Priestly relentlessly trimmed away from the Christian faith conventialities, traditions and mysteries. His histories of "The Corruptions of Christianity" and his "General History of the Christian Church" are excellent works in this respect. He developed Christianity without superstition.

Of his philosophical writings, the late Professor Huxley said:—

> "They are among the most powerful and unflinching expositions of materialism and necessarianism which exist in the English language."

Lindsey rightly claimed Dr. Samuel Clarke (1675-1725), under whom Priestly studied; Dr. Gilbert Burnett, Bishop of Salisbury (1643-1715); John Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury (1630-1694); and Sir Isaac Newton (1642-1727) as Unitarians.

Samuel Clarke was a philosopher, metaphysician, and divine. Born at Norwich, he was chaplain to Bishop Moore in 1699 and rector of Drayton two years later. In 1712 he published his famous work attacking the Trinity. His memoirs were edited by the celebrated Unitarian scholar, Whiston.

Gilbert Burnett was born at Edinburgh, on September 18, 1643. His father was a lawyer whom many praised but none employed. After the Restoration, Burnett *père* was made one of the Lords of Session, and Burnett was sent to Aberdeen to graduate M.A. In 1633, he visited England and met Tillotson, with whom he formed a life friendship. After a sojourn in Holland and France, he was ordained a priest at Edinburgh, in 1665, by Bishop Wiseheart, and presented to the parish of Saltain by Sir Robert Fletcher. In 1669, he was appointed Professor of Divinity at the Glasgow University. Here he remained for four and a half years. He migrated to London, and in 1675 was appointed Preacher of the Chapel of the Rolls. Whether the legal atmosphere influenced him

one cannot say, but in 1682 he published the "life" of Sir Matthew Hale, who had died six years before.

Sir Mathew Hale was considered a great lawyer and a famous judge. For six years he was chief Judge of the King's Bench. He wrote many religious works. Like Wesley, Hale believed in the absurd and terrible doctrine of Witchcraft, and as a judge on the King's Bench, actually engaged in the solemn and tragic farce of sentencing "witches." But unlike Wesley, he was brought by study to believe in Arianism, in the humanity and not the deity of Jesus of Nazareth. Since Hale was born in 1609, he at least lived in an earlier period than Wesley.

On the accession of James II., Burnett retired to the Continent, but returned at the palace revolution of 1688. He was appointed to the Bishopric of Salisbury. Archbishop Sanscroft refused to consecrate him, but was compelled to grant a commission to do so. Burnett was consecrated on March 31, 1689. Five years later he conducted the funeral service at the burial of his friend, Archbishop Tillotson, and defended Tillotson's memory against attack. Burnett died on March 17, 1715, and was interred in the Parish Church of St. James of Clerkenwell, London.

Burnett's friend and master in heresy, Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury, was appointed to the See against his own wishes in 1691. He was charged with being an Atheist, Deist, and Arian. Burnett championed his memory, knowing that Tillotson rejected the divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the Trinity. Yet he questioned the mentality of the martyred Joan Bocher.

I have no doubt that Burnett's idea was to censure the murderers and persecutors of Joan Bocher. But he did this weakly and meanly, as became a scholar wanting in supreme audacity. He shared her views, and he had the advantages of social position and of time, since he lived a century later. Yet he challenged her martyrdom by questioning her mentality. Nevertheless, Burnett did strive for freedom of thought, did challenge superstition, and did oppose persecution. In contemporary courage he was superior to Miles Coverdale, who presided at persecutions against his own conscience.

Burnett was contemporary with John Strype, who flourished 1643-1737. Born in Stepney, Strype became Vicar of Layton in 1669. He is regarded as one of the greatest English ecclesiastical historians and biographers. His works are of great value to all students of historic theology. He depicts the "heresies" that "were vented abroad" in "little more than ten years" after the 1537 publication of the Bible in England. This translation was adapted, without acknowledgment, from Tyndal's and Coverdale's translations. For nearly two centuries before their time, translations of the Bible had been circulating in England. All translations previous to that of Wycliffe were acknowledged to be lawful. Fresh translations without authority were prohibited. Wycliffe had made

the Bible a book of freedom, and the idea of freedom could not be tolerated by the ruling oppression. Its circulation, in any form, destroyed superstition, and finally turned the great theologians and divines, jurists, Statesmen, and men of letters, into believers in the humanity as distinct from the divinity of Jesus.

According to Strype, within ten years of the official circulation of the Bible, and eight years after Coverdale's own translation of the Bible was introduced for Public Reading into the churches throughout England by Act of Parliament the following "heresies" were widespread:—

(1) Denial of the Doctrine of the Trinity;

(2) Assertion that Jesus Christ was mere man and not God;

(3) Assertion of the doctrine that the only benefit which men receive from Jesus consists in his teaching, which brings them to a knowledge of God and of service to man.

This was in the year 1547, when Miles Coverdale returned to England from his long sojourn on the Continent.

Coverdale was born in Yorkshire in 1488, and was educated in the convent of the Augustines, in Cambridge. He became a monk of this Order. In 1514, he was ordained a priest at Norwich, but continued to reside at Cambridge. When Dr. Barnes was apprehended, Coverdale assumed the habit of a secular priest, and travelled throughout the country, preaching, until he deemed it prudent to take refuge abroad.

The year after Coverdale's return, on December 28, 1548, to be exact, John Assheton, Vicar of Middleton, Lancashire, was summoned to appear before Archbishop Cranmer, at Lambeth, for denying the Trinity, asserting the mere manhood of Jesus, and also denying the deity of the Holy Spirit. Assheton abjured his heresies under threat of the stake; but their character point to the nature of the opinions that thoughtful minds tended to embrace. Once men and women thought, the impossible Pagan-Christian theology declined at a rapid rate.

Assheton only recanted under threat of torture. But Coverdale preached, the very same year, for purposes of advancement, to his very shame, at St. Paul's Cross, when an Anabaptist, inspired by the very Bible Coverdale had translated, was forced to do penance.

"Life, not Dogma, makes the Christian," was the sound slogan of the Anabaptists. This may have led to mysticism, but it developed also, Communism. At the beginning Anabaptism was indistinguishable from Unitarianism. But Unitarianism tended to rationalism and individualism. Unitarianism was an ideal expression of Protestantism in all the logical glory of its capitalist development. It embodied the essential truth against which Coverdale should never have warred. Coverdale should have sympathised with the Anabaptist slogan.

In 1550, Joan Bocher, for denying the incarnation and maintaining that Jesus was not God but a creature, was persecuted to death

by Cranmer and Latimer. Edward VI. objected to signing the death warrant, but Cranmer insisted. Over a century later, Bishop Burnett denounced Joan Bocher's execution on the ground that she was a wrong-headed woman, who was burnt for some extravagant notions concerning Christ, but was fitter for Bedlam than the stake. Actually, Joan Bocher was a zealous and intelligent Reformer who sought to give understanding and sympathy to her fellows in times of unexampled and formidable difficulties.

In 1551, Coverdale sat on the Commission, under whose instructions, Van Paar or Van Parris was executed for Arianism. Parris was a surgeon, who came to England as a refugee from Menz in Hesse. Burnett describes him as a man of strict and virtuous life and most wonderful devotion. He joined the Strangers' Church in Augustin-Friars, in London, and publicly avowed his faith: *"God the Father is the Only God, and Christ is not Very God."*

Proceedings were taken against Parris, at Lambeth. He refused to recant, and was denounced as an obstinate heretic and delivered over to the secular power as "a child of the Devil and of all unrighteousness." He was executed at Smithfield, April 25, 1551.

Sir James Stephen in his "History of Criminal Law" declares that the sentence on Van Paar, like that of Joan Bocher, was clearly an illegal one. Is not power too often illegal?

For his share in the illegal farce, Coverdale was given the Bishopric of Exeter. Dr. Veysey was compelled to resign in his favour. Have we not seen a Lord Justice Clerk resign in favour of an astute politician who passed from Toryism to Socialism and on to "National Socialism" for the sake of Judicial elevation?

The desire of the principal leaders of the Reforming party to retain unchanged, the views of the Athanasian Trinity taught by the Church of Rome, is one of the strangest fascinations and compromises of history. Philosophically and historically, the Trinity is a contemptible doctrine. Its growth, as a departure from Truth, and an imposition on human thought, can be traced step by step. Every detail of this terrible criminal error of false faith can be explained and exhibited. Yet the "reformers" were moved by some strange fascination to make human torches of those who displayed more logic and consistency of thought and protestantism.

Hallam describes this persecuting solicitude for the doctrine of the Trinity, as:—

> "The deadly original sin of the reformed churches; that which cools every honest man's zeal for their cause, in proportion as his reading becomes more extensive."

Burnett denounced these Trinitarian persecutions for casting "a great blemish on the Reformation." Referring to the Marian persecution, he added that "what Cranmer and Ridley suffered was thought a great retaliation on them."

Miles Coverdale did not long enjoy the award for participating in the persecution and burning of Anabaptists and Unitarians. He discovered his scruples and sacrificed his career on account of them.

In 1554, the Papal Supremacy having been established by Act of Parliament, and the celibacy of the priests being re-introduced, Coverdale, who was married and unwilling to part from his wife, was deprived from his bishopric. He retired to the Continent and returned to England in 1558. He officiated at the consecration of Dr. Parker, who was the successor of Cardinal Pole, in the See of Canterbury. But he refused to wear episcopal dress. Coverdale was not restored to his bishopric. Archbishop Grindal endeavoured to secure him a Welsh bishopric, and finally appointed him Rector of St. Magnus, London Bridge, in 1564. He resigned this living two years later because he could not conform. He died in February, 1569, and was buried in St. Bartholomew's Church, behind the Exchange. He was the strange product of a period of crisis: pioneer, man of scruple, coward and persecutor.

Of the bigotry of the persecuted reformers, a remarkable and curious incident is recorded in the case of Archdeacon Philpot, who spat upon some of his anti-papist fellow prisoners under the Marian persecution. He endeavoured to vindicate himself in a pamphlet entitled: —

> "An apology of John Philpot, written for spitting upon an Arian; with an invective against the Arians, the very natural children of Anti-Christ, with an Admonition to all that be faithful in Christ to beware of them, and of other late-sprung heresies, as of the worst Enemies of the Gospel."

In 1575, twenty-seven foreign Baptists were indicted for denying the Trinity and the Deity of Christ. Only four of them recanted their opinions under terror of the stake. Shortly afterwards two Dutchmen were burnt to death in Smithfield for a like offence. Fox, the Martyrologist, addressed an eloquent expostulation to Queen Elizabeth. His apology resembles the modern pleas for substituting penal servitude for the death penalty on shell-shocked soldiers. He asked that some milder form of death should be the penalty for heresy. He thus conceded the right of persecution for opinion to the fullest extent. Fox's plea carried little weight, as the following cases show: —

Burned at Norwich for believing in the simple humanity of Jesus and denying the Trinity and the Deity of the Holy Spirit: —

1579: Matthew Hamont, a plough-wright, of Hetherest.

1583: John Lewis. The historian declares that Lewis "died obstinately without repentance or any speech."

1587: Peter Cole. A tanner of Ipswich, and Francis Kett, a fellow of Corpus College, Cambridge.

This brings us to the case of Bartholomew Legate, the last of the Smithfield martyrs, and Edward Wightman, the last English martyr.

Legate was born about 1575. His enemies admitted that Legate possessed a fine personal appearance, high character, and scholarly attainments. He was a fluent speaker. He was a native of Essex.

Fuller, the quaint historian of these times, described Legate in these terms of justice and bigotry combined:—

> "Person comely, complexion black, age about forty years; of a bold spirit, confident carriage, fluent tongue, excellently skilled in the Scriptures. His conversation, for aught I can learn to the contrary, unblameable; and the poison of a heretical doctrine is never more dangerous than when served up in clean cups and washed dishes."

Legate declared that Jesus was not God, but only the anointed of God. For this preaching he was cast into Newgate prison, but subsequently released. He preached against the Trinity more boldly than ever, and was summoned again to appear before the Ecclesiastical Court. The Bishop of London presided. He was aided by several bishops and priests. Legate was convicted of heresy for the second time and handed over to the secular judges. On March 3, 1612, he was pronounced to be a contumacious and obstinate heretic. Fifteen days later he was taken from prison to Smithfield and fastened to the stake, in the midst of a great number of spectators, and burnt to death. A pardon was offered him, when he was at the stake, if he would recant, but he refused it.

Describing Legate's death, Fuller says:—

> "Never did a scare fire at midnight summon more hands to quench it, than this at noonday did eyes to behold it. At last, refusing all mercy, he was burnt to ashes."

Bartholomew Legate was the last person to die at Smithfield as a martyr for religious truth. The great judge, Lord Coke, declared that Legate had not been tried by the proper court, and warned the King that the execution was illegal.

Edward Wightman, the last English martyr, was born in 1560, at Burton-on-Trent. He was cited to appear before the Bishop's Court at Lichfield, to answer for his heretical depravity. He was accused of sixteen "heretical, execrable, and unheard of opinions," and adjudged by Dr. Neile, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, to be "an obstinate and incorrigible heretic and left under the sentence of the greater excommunication." He was handed over to the civil power, and by Royal Warrant to the Sheriff of Lichfield, was left for execution.

Wightman was convicted of heresy as an Arian and Anabaptist, and deemed guilty of eight "pestilent heresies" as well. The Royal Warrant directed him "to be committed to the fire in some public and open space below the City: to be burned in detestation of the said crime, and for manifest example of other Christians that they may not fall in the same crime."

The first effort to burn Wightman failed, for he was rescued by the crowd, some of them whom "got themselves scorched to save him." Wightman perished in the flames on April 11, 1612.

Fuller in his "Church History of England," says:—

> "About this time a Spanish Arian being condemned to die, was, notwithstanding, suffered to linger on his life in Newgate, where

> he ended the same. King James politically preferred that heretics hereafter, though condemned, should silently and privately waste themselves away in prison, rather than grace themselves and amuse others with the solemnity of a public execution, which in popular judgements usurped the honour of a persecution."

Death by jail fever was substituted for death by burning. Barbarism was evolving into civilisation. Legate and Wightman were the last on whom the atrocious and horrible sentence of death by burning was actually carried into execution, in England, although the Act for the burning of heretics continued to disgrace the English law till the year 1676, the year that Sir Matthew Hale, Unitarian and witchcraft judge, died!

Tillotson, the friend of Burnett, the biographer of Hale, referred to:—

> "The incomparable Chillingworth, the glory of his age and nation."

Canon Curtees, in his Brampton lectures, declared:—"Chillingworth died a Unitarian." Lord Mansefield pronounced Chillingworth to be "a perfect model of argumentation." Lord Chancellor Cowper averred that he owed all his power of reasoning to the study of Chillingworth.

William Chillingworth had scruples against the Three Articles, but was induced to subscribe to the creed formally as a bond of peace and union, although he avowed openly his opinions. In 1637, only twenty-five years after the death of Legate and Wightman, he published his great work: "The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation."

Twenty years after this event, the immortal William Penn, who further rationalised Unitarianism and linked it with Quakerism, was born. He was arrested in 1667 with other Quakers and sent to prison. He began to preach in 1688. In one of his works, "The Sandy Foundation Shaken," Penn refutes "the notion of One God subsisting in three distinct and separate Persons." Later he wrote against belief in the divinity of Christ. Ten years later he obtained from the king, in payment of a claim (left by his father), a tract of land now known as Pennsylvania. He set sail in 1682 and in November of that year made his famous treaty with the Indians. In 1686, he returned to England, and obtained the proclamation which released 12,000 Quakers. He was arrested and tried for treason in 1688, and returned to America in 1699. He again returned to England in 1701, and died in 1718.

Joseph Taylor (1694-1761) was born at Lancaster, and ordained Preaching Presbyter, 1716. He removed to Norwich, 1733. Branded by John Wesley heretic, deist and atheist, Taylor maintained the Common rights of Christians to enjoy Communion without subscribing to any creed. He insisted on the right of a Christian to believe in the humanity of Jesus only. Defined Popery as the corruption of Christianity and maintained that there were three stages of Popery: Romish; Protestant; Dissenting. Taylor's

studies of the New Testament were commended by Bishop Watson; Dr. Bentham, of Oxford; and Archdeacon Paley. His teaching was admired greatly by Dr. Parr.

James Foster (1697-1753) was born at Exeter. He commenced preaching in 1718. In 1724, he became Minister to the Baptist Congregation at Barbican, London. From 1728 to his death, conducted open meetings for all, including Freethinkers, at the Old Jewry. Pope immortalised these lectures in his verse, and drew Lord Bolingbroke's attention to a maxim Foster introduced into a sermon on "Mystery, Heresy and Schism." Foster said: *"When mystery begins religion ends."*

It is believed that Foster adopted this maxim from Bishop Fleetwood who died in 1723.

Bolingbroke, writing to Pope at a later date, expressed his pleasure at this aphorism: —

> "The aphorism pleased me much: and I was glad to hear such a truth from any pulpit, since it shews an inclination, at least, to purify Christianity from the leaven of artificial theology, which consists principally in making things that are plain mysterious, and pretending to make things that are impenetrably mysterious, plain."

Finding his text in Titus iii. 10-11, Foster declared that this was the only place in the New Testament where the term heretic, occurred. He explained that it meant one who knowingly espoused a false doctrine and was insincere in his profession. Hence no mere error of judgment was heresy. No honest man can be a heretic. He concluded that those who excommunicated, and not those who were excommunicated, were heretics.

In his celebrated essay, "On Fundamentals in Religion," he avowed that no doctrine is a fundamental and necessary article of the Christian faith, unless it was so plainly and distinctly revealed that an ordinary Christian could not miss the knowledge of it. No Christian studying the Bible fully, could err in fundamentals. The points so heartily debated by theologians were not essentials.

Answering Tindal, Foster was excellent at the dubious alliance between the Magistrates and the theologian. He averred that to support Christianity by methods of restraint and violence was an infringement of the most sacred natural rights of mankind, and a dishonour to religion itself. He wanted all who disbelieved to be free to throw off their disguise and to attack with all the skill and strength of argument possible.

Thomas Rundle was born at Milton Abbey, in Devonshire, in 1686. He was educated at Oxford, where he formed the acquaintance of Whiston, and became a clergyman. Rundle became Archdeacon of Wilts, and attained many other preferments. In 1733, although denounced by the Bishop of London for Deism, because he insisted on the humanity of Jesus, he was appointed Bishop of Derry on the advice of Lord Chancellor Talbot.

The celebrated Richard Watson, Bishop of Llandaff (1737-

1816), who wrote the most famous reply to Thomas Paine's "Age of Reason," referring to the contemporary Duke of Grafton, who was a Unitarian, said: "If any one thinks that a Unitarian is not a Christian, I plainly say, without myself being a Unitarian, that I think otherwise."

Dr. Watson makes quite clear what he means by Unitarianism, because he states that if the Unitarian "be in error" he has "fallen into it from the dread of becoming an idolator—of giving that glory to another which he conceived to be due to God alone."

Here we have a lucid distinction drawn. The Unitarian is defined as a worshipper of God alone, who denies the deity of Jesus, but who is yet a Christian. His Trinitarian opponent, and often persecutor, is described as a "worshipper of Jesus Christ." Watson ranks both as Christians. My view is that, historically, the Trinitarian is not a Christian, although a person might profess Trinitarian principles and embrace a large element of the Christian ethic. Nevertheless his vision would be incomplete, and it would not be Christian. It should be added that in his 1787 lectures at Cambridge on Divinity, Dr. Watson avoided the word "Trinity," because he was unwilling "to use unscriptural words to propagate scriptural dogmas." Twenty years later De Quincey found him "talking openly" of his Unitarian opinions.

Augustus Henry Fitzroy, third Duke of Grafton, was born on October 1, 1735, at Euston Hall, Suffolk. After serving (1765) in the Cabinets of the Marquis of Rockingham and the Earl of Chatham, he was Prime Minister from 1767 to 1770, and enjoyed office in every successive ministry down to 1783. He resigned office because of his opposition to the American War. In 1768, he was elected Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. In 1794 he published a summary of his thought on religion, in which he declared "that the corruptions of Christianity alone form the weak part" and that "it has been rendered incredible to many men of sense" because these corruptions were mistaken "for essential parts."

It is interesting to reflect that Chatham, in whose Government Grafton served, denounced as contributing towards the viciousness of mankind "the chattering of some unintelligible sounds called creeds, the unfeigned assent and consent to whatever the Church enjoins—religious worship and consecration feasts—pardons rightly sued out, and absolutions authoritatively given."

Earl Russell, K.G., twice Prime Minister of Britain, better known as Lord John Russell, was born August 18, 1792, and died May 28, 1878. In his seventies he wrote the "Rise and Progress of Christianity." He was denounced as one "who rejects the doctrines of the Trinity, and denies the deity of Christ." Lady Russell recorded how bitterly he deplored "the multiplication of creeds and dogmas" by which the Anglican Church overlaid the revealed simplicity of Christianity.

This means that, down to 1878, three British Prime Ministers,

and most distinguished ones, held definitely that a Christian was a man who believed in the human and not the divine Jesus. In America down to the same date, and not including Abraham Lincoln, the following five Presidents were Unitarians and held the same view: —

(1) John Adams. (1736-1826.)
(2) Thomas Jefferson. (1743-1826.)
(3) John Quincey Adams. (1767-1848.)
(4) John Caldwell Calhoun. (1782-1830.)
(5) Millard Fillmore. (1800-1874.)

Abraham Lincoln is excluded from this list because he is known to have been a Deist rather than a Christian. He could rank with them as a believer in the simple humanity of Jesus, but the five Presidents mentioned all rank as Christians.

Dr. Thomas Arnold, Master of Rugby, 1759-1842, professor of history and divinity, is regarded as the greatest of English schoolmasters. He was the father of Matthew Arnold. Dr. Arnold championed the claims of Dr. Dickson Hampden, afterwards Bishop of Hereford, to believe in the humanity as opposed to the divinity of Jesus. Dr. Arnold declared: "A Unitarian, as such, is a Christian."

Dickson Hampden (1793-1868) was Principal, St. Mary's Hall, Oxford, 1833, and Professor of Moral Philosophy the following year. He received both these appointments after his Bampton Lectures in 1832, when he declared for the humanity of Jesus. Four years later he was appointed Regius Professor of Divinity, and in 1847 became Bishop of Hereford.

Brewster, who ranked as a Trinitarian, referring to Milton, Locke, and Newton as Unitarians, stated: "England may well be proud of Milton, Locke, and Newton for the champions of its faith and its Protestantism."

Lord Brougham made the same reference when he described as misguided men, of more zeal than knowledge "those who would thus distinguish the Unitarian from the Christian." He concludes: "Who was ever a better judge of legal evidence than Hale; of moral evidence than Locke; of mathematical and physical evidence than Newton."

Richard Porson, the greatest Greek scholar of his time, was born in 1759, at East Ruston, in Norfolk, where his father was parish clerk. His mother, though but the daughter of a village shoemaker, was, nevertheless, familiar with the standard English authors, having had the use of a library in a house where she was a servant. Her husband, too, must have been a man of sense, for he took pains to train his children from their earliest years, and he taught Richard, before he was nine, to work all the common rules of arithmetic up to the cube root by memory alone, without pen or pencil. When nine years old, Richard was sent to the village school. The progress which he made here excited the interest of

rich patrons, who sent him to Eton, and in 1778 to Trinity College, Cambridge. At Cambridge he won the Craven Scholarship and the first Chancellor's medal; and in 1782, whilst only a Junior Bachelor, he was elected a fellow of Trinity—an honour which, between Newton's election in 1667 and Thirlwall's in 1818, was only attained by three Junior Bachelors besides Porson.

For some years he devoted himself to studying and editing the classics, and then the hour came for his great Biblical labour, the final expulsion from the New Testament of the forged text about the three heavenly witnesses. All the critics from Erasmus to Bentley, had agreed on the spuriousness of the verse (John v. 7). Archdeacon Travis challenged the critics and was answered by Porson. This reply settled the question forever. Gibbon describes it as a most acute and accurate piece of criticism.

Other scholars who definitely upheld the humanity as opposed to the divinity of Jesus include:—

(1) Elizabeth Carter (1717-1806), the translator of Epictetus. Pronounced by Dr. Johnson the best Greek scholar he knew. She published two vigorous pamphlets, anonymously, attacking the Athanasian Creed and Trinitarianism.

(2) Anna Swanwick (1813-1899), the translator of Aeschylus and Goethe's "Faust."

(3) Ezra Abbot. Born April 28, 1819, in Maine, U.S.A.; died March 21, 1884. Adolph Harnack said: "Ezra Abbot's name will always have a place in the history of Biblical learning." Bishop Westcott, of Durham, wrote: "No scholar in America was superior to Abbot." In 1872, Professor of New Testament Criticism at Harvard. Received Doctor's degrees from Yale and Harvard, and offered one from Edinburgh. Layman all his life.

Sir Henry Tate (1819-1899) may not rank as a great scholar. But he was a citizen not without taste and culture. He was responsible for the hospital in Liverpool, the library wing at Oxford, and the famous Tate Gallery. He insisted on the humanity, and was opposed to the deity, of Jesus.

In literature, the classical New England school of Emerson, Thoreau, Longfellow, and James Russell Lowell were all Unitarian, and radically so. Whittier was Unitarian and Quaker. There is no need to describe these writers or their works.

It follows that Christian scholarship, culture, and tradition is opposed overwhelmingly to the Pope's deification of Jesus of Nazareth and his attempt to make the idolatrous worship of Jesus and his mother an item of the Christian Faith. When Socialism rejects such idolatry, it has no apology to make. Its "nefarious atheism" is in line with Christian thought and tradition. Not so the contention of the Pope. Since Jesus was not God, and since Christian scholarship does not hold he was God, it is the Pope who is the anti-Christian. If Socialism is in error, at least it errs in the company of the saints which settles the question of status at least.

V. The Primitive Church and Slavery

Classical antiquity despised the working class. Artisans, said Aristotle, were not worthy of the name of citizens. This idea still prevails in some quarters, such as when statesmen propose concentration camps for the unemployed, and also their municipal disfranchisement. Almost all manual and most mental work was done by the slaves. In the beginning, the Christian Church honoured work. Christians neither felt themselves miserable nor disgraced because they had to work with their hands. Their leader was Jesus, the carpenter. The founder of their theology was Paul, the tent maker. It is a pity that he diluted his practical commonsense with so much mysticism and authoritarianism.

The "Apostolic Constitutions" forbade a man to mix with the idle crowd, and advised him to engage in useful work. They taught that if a man did not work, "neither should he eat."

The Primitive Church, since it was unable to overthrow slavery, advanced the libertarian struggle, under the democratic cover of teaching the equality of the slave. It was not until it became thoroughly Trinitarian and Paganised that the Church condoned and practised slavery. The tradition of opposition was retained even in the teachings of the very Church Fathers who had played the most prominent part in adapting Christian doctrine to the needs of Pagan superstition. This was called "Popularising Christianity" or "converting the heathen." All difficulties in the way of conversion were smoothed away by adapting the teaching to the convert's understanding. Notwithstanding this complacency, the Fathers did not compromise on the question of slavery.

> "No one is a slave by nature."—Basil of Alexandria.
>
> "God who created the first two beings free and equal, never created slaves to serve them."—Chrysostom.
>
> "I call noble and lord, the slave who is covered with chains, if it accord with his life; I call him low and ignoble who in the midst of dignities retains an enslaved soul."—Chrysostom.
>
> "Do not imagine that an injury to a slave will be regarded as indifferent, because it is only to a slave. The laws of the world see a difference between the two races, but the laws of the commonwealth of God ignore it."—Chrysostom.

Christians called themselves servants and bondservants of Christ. Even Paul, his theology notwithstanding taught service. From this fact the word "service" is retained in Church Worship to-day. It does not mean an empty parade of words, but continues as an idea the first Christian challenges to slavery. It proclaims the supreme worth of service or of serving.

The Primitive Church bowed to slavery only as a human institution it could not overthrow. The Council of Chalcedon recognised slavery completely as an institution of right and indentified it with Christianity. It was but a step to its acceptance as a divine institution.

The Council of Chalcedon took place in A.D. 451. It declared for many evils and errors besides slavery. This Council witnessed the contention between Cyril of Alexandria and Nestorius as to the right designation of the Mother of Jesus. Here we have the rise of the controversy as to the "Two Natures in Christ." It was a pretty study in absurdity, futility, corruption and degradation.

Christianity, and its traditions, were opposed to slavery, the Chalcedon decision notwithstanding. Gregory Nazianzen and Chrysostom urged the release of slaves. Hermes, Prefect of Rome under Trajan who embraced Christianity, with his wife, children, and 1,250 slaves, freed the slaves on the day of their baptism. He was converted by Bishop Alexander with whom he was afterwards martyred. Chromatius, Prefect of Rome under Diocletian, freed 1,400 slaves, saying that since God was the common father they should be servants to no man. Melania, with the consent of her husband, Pinius, freed 8,000 slaves; and Ovanius, a French martyr, freed 5,000. The Church refused baptism to Gladiators, unless they gave up their profession. because it was opposed to the sacrifice of slaves.

Christians who attended Theatres were declared to be unworthy of Communion because of the slave nature of the entertainment at the Theatres. The Church sided with the slave and preached Communism.

> "It is not the census, but the qualities of the soul that show the rich man."—Ambrose.
>
> "We ought not to consider anything as belonging to ourselves alone, but to share everything with our neighbours; for if there is communism in spiritual and everlasting things, with how much greater right ought it to exist in these material things."—Barnabas.
>
> "Nature created everything for common use. If, then, there are men who are excluded from the enjoyment of the products of the earth, it is contrary to nature. The unequal division of this wealth is the result of egoism and violence. Nature is the mother of common right, usurpation is the mother of private right."—Ambrose of Milan.
>
> "It is better to do the work of charity, than to ornament churches, or to enrich them with precious vases."—Hieron.

The Church at Rome, under Sotir, Stephen, Cornelius and during the second and third centuries, the Church at Antioch in the time of Chrysostom, maintained the poor and eased the burden of the persecuted. Prelates sold the vases and the ornaments of their churches to help the slaves to freedom. Acacius, Bishop of Amida, sold 420 vases and sent back to freedom 7,000 imprisoned Persians; Deogratias of Carthage, Augustine, and Ambrose ransomed captives. Paulinus of Nola, and Hilary of Arles sold their large estates for the poor. Martin of Tours sacrificed his sacerdotal robes. The Bishop of Escupere in Toulouse went hungry and used only a basket and a glass for the bread and wine in the Eucharist, in order to help the poor. When the martyr, Lawrence, was asked for the treasures of the Church by the Pagan Governors, he showed them

the poor. Peter, the tax-gatherer under Justinia, on being converted, sold himself to a slave merchant for the benefit of the poor. Clement of Rome wrote truly to the Church in Corinth: "We have amongst us, many who have given themselves to servitude, in order that others might be free."

Bishop Eleusis of Cyzicus took the pagan temples and sovietised them into hospitals for the old and widowed. Special collections were made for the prisoners. The funds of the Church were used to ransom brothers sentenced to public works in the arena.

The Church was an asylum. Alaric, when he took Rome, spared those who took refuge in the churches. Bishops saved defenceless men from their oppressors; interceded with the Emperor and the magistrates; undertook long journeys; assisted country people against rapacity, oppressive proprietors, and usurers.

During the Plague of Carthage, the Christians showed great bravery and love.

The first hospital was due to the Church. The most important one was founded by St. Basil in Cassarea. It rose, says Gregory Nazianzen, like a new town, providing lodgings for travellers, rooms for invalids, workshops for the poor, and asylum for lepers. It bore the name of Basilias. Chrysostom founded several hospitals. By the time of Theodosius, most of the large towns had hospitals. Thalassius founded one for the blind.

The Council of Elvira (A.D. 305) excluded the magistrates whose duties, as Decemvirs, caused them to judge cases involving Capital punishment, from joining in worship during the year. The early Church emphasised *Hospitality* and opposed *War*.

> "Yes," said Tertullian, writing near the year A.D. 200, "we love one another; we are brothers, for we have a common Father, and the same spirit has led us from darkness to light. We are also your brothers, because, although you are our persecutors, you are men like us. We support one another; we have everything in common except our wives; each one freely brings his offering to relieve the poor, the sick, orphans, widows, travellers, and prisoners. We are not incapable of the business of life, for do we not live with you, sharing your habits and necessities? We use everything with thanksgiving; we sail with you; we mix with you in the Forum; in camp, in commerce; we refrain only from your spectacles, sacrifices, disorders, and crimes."
>
> "We give to all and communicate to everyone who is in need."—Justin.
>
> "Give simply to all, without asking doubtfully to whom thou givest, but give to all."—Shepherd of Hermas.

Clement of Alexandria warns against trying to judge who is deserving and who is undeserving.

Clement pities the insatiables who collect their dainties from all parts of the world, with whom, "the blasting ladles and the kitchen form the central point of existence." In an old catalogue of the apostles, Peter and Andrew and the sons of Zebedee are

fishermen; Philip, an ass-driver; Bartholomew, a vegetable gardener; James the son of Alphaeus, a mason. Later, when the Church became corrupt, men like Chrysostom vehemently attacked the luxury of the day. Said Chrysostom of the luxuriously dressed woman: "Of how many poor, O woman, dost thou bear upon thine arms, the spoil!"

Montanism arose as a protest against these worldly excesses. It taught strict discipline and limited Church membership to the select few. Hence arose the superstitious distinctions between "religious" and "secular," which produced the vices of monasticism, asceticism and increased worldliness. From opposing slavery, the Church palliated slavery. Gregory the Great makes no apology for having a slave who was a fugitive, brought back, "by any means" from Otranto, though he was torn from his wife and children, to serve as a baker in Rome.

Up to the twelfth century there was an absolute power of the master over the life of the slave. Which proves that Christianity never triumphed over property, although 37 Church Councils are reported to have passed Acts favourable to slaves.

In 305 A.D. any master ill-treating his slaves was condemned. In 517 the murderer of a slave was excommunicated. In 549 the right of asylum in a Christian church was offered to the runaway, and slaves freed by the church were protected. In 585 the ornaments and property of the Church were permitted to be sold for ransoming slaves. In 566, Christians were forbidden to reduce free men to slavery. In 656 any slave compelled to work on Sundays became free by the fact, or if he were held over the font for baptism. The decree of the Council of Chalons (650 A.D.), with 44 bishops in session, ordered that no Christian slaves should be sold outside the kingdom of Clovis. In 922 no Christian was permitted to enslave a fellow Christian. In the eleventh century, the Emperor Conrad speaks of the sale of human beings as a thing nefarious and detestable to God and man. In the fourteenth century the Count of Valois, brother of Philip the Beautiful, freed the serfs of his comte with the words: "because these men and women ought to be free by natural right."

In 1256 the city of Bologna freed all its serfs paying an indemnity to their masters, closing the decree with these remarkable words:

> "The city of Bologna, which has always combatted for liberty, remembering the past, and its eyes fixed on the future, in honour of our Saviour Jesus Christ, hath ransomed all the serfs on its territory, and decreeth that it would not suffer there a man not free."

One of the first Christian kings of Norway, Knut the Holy, at the end of the eleventh cenury, publicly proclaimed that slavery should be abolished. It required three centuries for all traces of it to disappear. In Sweden, King Magnus Eriksen, 1335, made a similar proclamation.

The Primitive Church and Slavery.

In England, as on the Continent, slavery arose from many causes—birth, captivity, punishment, poverty. Thousands of Britons, in the first century after the Norman Conquest, sold themselves into thraldom. Children were sold by their parents. Bristol was the great slave market, and there might be seen long trains of British youths and maidens—the latter often received for the sake of selling their offspring—all to be sold either to Ireland or to foreign countries. One authority says that from Ethelwulf to William I., for 230 years, a great part of the English peasantry became reduced to slavery. By the Doomsday Book (1068-71 A.D.) the number of male slaves in Sussex was 9,200, which would make the whole number about 50,000, while the freemen were only about 38,000. In the whole of England there seems to have been 25,000 slaves, 89,000 serfs, and 110,000 villeins. There is proof that slaves were branded and yoked as cattle.

Bishop Wulfstan of Worcester, about 1086, came yearly to Bristol and spent several months preaching against the slave trade.

St. Aidan of Northumbria ransomed slaves. Bishop Wilfred, having received an estate with 250 Christian slaves, freed them. Under William I. the law forbade the slave trade. A council in London (1102), called by Anslem, forbade absolutely the nefarious business of selling human beings as brute beasts. This proves, of course, that the "nefarious business" flourished. Since the country was nominally Christian and very much Romanist, it proves that established Christianity was not opposed to slavery. That, again, only proves how far established Christianity has travelled from the teaching of early Christianity.

VI. The Church and Poverty : Medieval to Protestant

The Medieval Church, notwithstanding its superstition, and imposture, retained ideas of levelling. The Protestant Church modified the imposture, concentrated the superstition, and opposed all suggestions of equality. The clerical order was the one profession in which it was possible for a man of the humblest birth to attain to the highest position. It was the halting place of democracy en route to a higher development of the social struggle. Two facts contributed to this development: —

(1) The Church remained free from the distinction of classes which belonged to outside society.

(2) Owing to his celibacy, the churchman could attain the highest rank without threatening the noble families.

Grostete, the son of a serf, was the most distinguished scholar of thirteen-century Oxford, the Oxford that existed long before a college was founded. He was the friend of the reforming friars, the enemy of the Roman Court, the advocate of England for the English. After the lapse of many centuries, a slave who became ordained was, *ipso facto,* a free man.

The monasteries and nunneries and brotherhoods of the Medieval Church were not merely centres of Christian equality but asylums for the oppressed. Thorold Rogers makes good reading on this point. He avers that the relief of destitution was the fundamental duty of the Medieval Church. Democratic Athens and Imperial Rome made the relief of poverty a function of the State. The Church made it the duty of the individual. The tithe arose for the relief of the poor and not for the maintenance of the clergy. When Peacock urged that churchmen could dispose of ecclesiastical revenues as they wished, fifteenth century Gasgoine is moved to righteous wrath. Heresy, simony, sorcery, were reckoned offences: and it is scandalous that Heresy should count first. But covetousness or avarice was classed almost with heresy. Mendicancy was deemed no disgrace, and alms-giving was a virtue. Monasteries were noted for their alms-giving. Hence they became the centre of townships. · Oxford, Abingdon, Reading, St. Albans, Coventry, and Durham all grew up around monasteries.

Some of the monastic orders were under special duties to the poor. The Hospitalers were founded to relieve casual destitution. When the Oxford Hospitalers surrendered their house to Waynflette, he founded his college to discharge their obligations to the poor. The college evaded this obligation.

> "The preaching and begging friars," adds Rogers, "were the nurses of the sick, especially of those who laboured under infectious diseases. There were houses where doles of bread and beer

were given to all wayfarers, houses where the sick were tended, clothed, and fed, particularly the lepers. There were nunneries, where the nuns were nurses and midwives; and even now the ruins of these houses contain living record of the ancient practices of their inmates in the rare medicinal herbs which are still found within their precincts."

Palgrave's "Dictionary of Political Economy" points out that the monks employed themselves in clearing forests, draining marshes, and making roads and bridges. The Cistercian Order, through the activity which it displayed in sheep-farming, promoted in a singular degree the production of the staple commodity of England. Through the immense extent of their property, the churches and religious houses came to take an important share in the industrial development of the country. It is acknowledged that the clergy were, as a rule, milder landlords than the aristocracy. The attacks of the Lollards upon the landed property of the Church were inspired by *a priori* objection to the system itself. Bishop Pecock, writing in the middle of the fifteenth century, stressed the case for the Church as a landlord. The advantage to the tenant was relative, and the slightly better treatment meted out by the clerical (as opposed to the lay) landlord tended to reconcile public opinion to the enormous estates held by the Church. At the close of the Middle Ages this argument no longer obtained, and the abuses of Church property called forth Lollardy.

The architects, the physicians, the lawyers, the scribes, the historians, the jurists, the philosophers, and the teachers of the Middle Ages, were almost all clergymen. They enjoyed the monopoly, but they had the merit of being anonymous as though not concerned with their own grandeur of greatness, but conscious only of working in the common interest. No one was at pains to proclaim his own reputation or to record the reputation of another. It is believed that Waynflette designed the beautiful buildings at Magdalen College; and that Wolsey, in his youth, planned the matchless tower, which has charmed every spectator for nearly four centuries. Owing to the labours of the monks, we know something of our annals, of the events by which the political history of England is interpreted. They were often frivolous, frequently credulous, but they collected the facts to the best of their ability. Schools were attached to every monastery. The extraordinary number of foundation schools established just after the Reformation of 1547 was not a new zeal for a new learning, but the fresh and very inadequate supply of that which had been so suddenly and disastrously extinguished. They were not monks of the lower ranks who did manual and literary work, but ecclesiastics of the highest rank. We find such men as Hilary of Arles, one of the leading prelates in the French Church, working in the field. Beckett, the Archbishop of Canterbury, when he visited a monastery in harvest time did not hesitate to labour in the fields. St. Dunstan is reported to have been an excellent blacksmith.

The political influence of the medieval Church was enormous. Much of it was used to further ambition for temporal power, but many of the leading prelates used their commanding influence to protect the rights of the common people against the aggression both of the barons and of the king. Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, was the leader or the prime mover in wresting from King John the Magna Charta, which has become the birthright of every Englishman and American. The influence of Wycliffe's poor priests and, above all, of John Ball must not be forgotten.

The poor priests could traverse the country by right and, without suspicion, advise their followers. They were precisely the persons who could organise resistance among the serfs, could win and keep their confidence, and could be trusted with their subscriptions, their plans, and their communications. Wycliffe's poor priests had honeycombed the minds of the upland folk with what may be called religious socialism. By Wycliffe's labours on the Bible men had been introduced to the new world of the Old Testament, to the history of the human race, to the primeval garden and the young world, where the first parents of all mankind lived by simple toil, and were the ancestors of the proud noble and knight, as well as the downtrodden serf and despised burgher. They read of the brave times when there was no king in Israel, when every man did that which was right in his own eyes, and sat under his own vine and his own fig-tree, none daring to make him afraid.

With this book, so old, yet so new, the peasant preacher could stir up the souls of these clowns with the narrative of another people, and would be sure that his way to their hearts and their confidence would be by sharing and entirely sympathising with their wrongs, their sufferings, and their hopes. When they told him that the lords had determined to drag them back to their old serfdom, the preacher could discourse to them of the natural equality of man, of the facts that all, kings, lords, and priests, live by the fruits of the earth and the labour of the husbandmen, and that it would be better for them to die with arms in their hands than to be thrust back, without an effort on their part, into the shameful slavery from which they had been delivered. As their eyes kindled, and they grasped their staves, he could tell them to keep their ears open for the news of their deliverance, that on the password being given, they were at once to hie to the appointed place, where a great work could be done for God's people by his appointed servant.

With the Reformation, or at least soon after, we have a great change in the history of the Church and social reform. The Protestant churches as a whole accomplished but little, and Rome attempted even less. The Reformation, in its appeal to personal faith, to the right of private judgment, to the letter of the Scriptures, had largely the effect, both on Roman and Protestant churches, of exalting belief, creeds, dogma, and discussion above life. It divided Protestantism into so many sects, each discussing and

battling to sustain its own peculiar belief and separate church machinery. The reform of the social life was forgotten. The Protestant exaltation of "the spiritual life," as, falsely, meaning a life that found its chief interest in the life hereafter, and seeking comfort here under cover of "other worldliness," emphasised the capitalist tendency to individualism. Orthodox Protestantism definitely maintained class individualism and exploitation There were exceptions. The Anabaptists of Germany, referring directly to the New Testament, learned there of its communism, and not a few attempts were made to reproduce it. Anabaptism led to a series of Protestant attempts at communism. These attempts were made by sects, and so were limited by various narrow and peculiar doctrinal requirements. Secondly, they were based on the belief that Christians must go out from the world and be separate, rather than on the Catholic doctrine that the whole world is God's

The divorce between the Churches (Protestant) and the social life was expressed in the attempt of many of the first of the Protestant leaders, such as Calvin, Cromwell, and the Pilgrim Fathers in America, to set up a theocracy on earth, with their particular church organisation as the interpreter of the Divine will.. These efforts have passed into history. Their complete failure is evidenced by their renunciation by all Protestant sects. The individualism of Protestantism is admitted by friend and declared by foe. It defined a period through which the world had to pass.

Private property was encouraged by Protestantism. Luther in his "Sermon on Usury" (1570) speaks of three grades "of dealing well and worthily with temporal goods." While Erasmus complained of the "rage of ownership," Protestantism endeavoured to make a compromise, maintaining the ideal in theory and encouraging what Fr. A. Lange calls a "moderate egoism" or "ethical materialism" in practice.

Individualism in religion and industry go together. Both involve superstition. It is not strange, therefore, that slavery, suppressed in Europe by the medieval Church, reappeared in the slave trade after the Reformation, practised by both Protestant and Roman Catholic peoples; and that the evils of individualism and competition should be condoned, defended, allowed, and practised by individualistic and competitive churches. These churches maintained a false theory of earth and heaven. They worship a Christ of miracles and paganised deification, in place of spreading the message of a human Jesus, who had a genius for signs, and for preaching the feeding of the hungry and the emancipation of the poor. The works and teachings of Jesus were all distinctly secular and socialistic; works for health against disease; works restoring beauty and harmony and pleasure where there had been ugliness and discord and misery; taking care to see that the people were properly fed; subduing nature to the human good; showing that mirth and joy

have a true place in our life; and also showing that premature death should not be tolerated.

The Church denies the manhood of Jesus and the right to exist of mankind in the same breath. It believes in a false heaven and a false earth and a false God who dwells in its heaven, and a supreme God of Property who presides over both its heaven and earth. On this account it must be destroyed as Anti-Social and Anti-Christian.

VII. Christian Socialism

The property declaration of Pius IX. remained unchallenged for three years. Then the Rev. Frederick Denison Maurice stirred himself to answer the suggestion that no Christian could be a Socialist. His reply was a snappy direct negative. He declared that every Christian must be a Socialist.

Maurice made this declaration in December, 1849, at a dinner to inaugurate a Co-operative movement. He used the phrase "Christian Socialism" for the first time. The phrase was original, not the idea it expressed. The idea that a Christian must be a Socialist or Communist is historic. It is as old as the Church itself, and was preached vigorously in England by John Ball and the Lollards.

The movement founded by Maurice published a periodical called "The Christian Socialist." This journal was edited by Ludlow, the famous Chartist, who claimed that it was the duty of Christians to replace the Capitalist watchwords, "Competition" and "Profit," with the Christian slogans, "Association" and "Exchange for Use."

Ludlow contended that Christianity and Socialism were akin in nature. Christianity was the eldest, and Socialism was the youngest of the forces that work in society for its regeneration.

Under Class-society, Christianity was an eagle at moult. Divorced from Socialism it lacked plumage, and its wings even were crippled. Socialism was but the wings of Christianity being spread for a broader and more powerful flight. Socialism was the eagle glorious. It was Christianity, vital, challenging, audacious, triumphant.. Socialism was the true livery of the cause of Jesus.

Without Christianity or the Christian vision, Socialism was as lifeless as the feathers without the bird. Divorced from the idea of God and the righteousness of Common brotherhood, Socialism was chilly and helpless. It possessed only an artificial semblance of life.

The great Christian revolution of the nineteenth century had Socialism for its true character. It had before it a long and deadly fight against all the armies of Mammon.

The Christian Socialist movement that Maurice inaugurated failed. It certainly was never an eagle either at moult or concerned

with flight. It was more like a sparrow inarticulate from fright. There is an old fairy-tale which describes how a king-eagle, for pride, was transformed by the fairy god-mothers into a sparrow. It is said that is how the name arose: to express the eagle's humiliation and fall from grace. Whether that particular eagle, father of sparrows, was released from its enchantment and restored to his high dominion I do not know. But Christian Socialism remained a sparrow and died one. It was succeeded by another "Christian Socialism," blessed by the papacy, which formed "bosses' trade union" in the German Empire prior to the world war of 1914-1918, and murdered Social Democracy in the interests of Fascism in Austria in 1934. With this "Christian Socialism" Maurice had nothing in common. He was crippled as were his colleagues, by the desire to save the Church rather than humanity and the truth. He was incapable of seeing the Church only as an instrument and viewed it as an eternal and incorruptible institution. Churches could pass away: but *not* the Church. But the Church is no more eternal than the churches. The eternal verities are Truth and Humanity, Bread and Freedom.

Maurice's fatal fascination for the Church myth confused his conception of Christianity and paralysed his understanding of Jesus. He was unable to applaud the memory of Jesus for what Jesus really was, a wandering working man with a genius for seeing and telling the Truth. He could not see the son of man because of his anxiety to worship and parade the Son of God, invented by the Church Councils and manufactured by ecclesiastical interests and compromises of power. He wanted, not that the Church should serve man without question, but that the Church should redeem man to serve the Church. He wished man well, but he wished man subject to the Church. Consequently, he perpetuated the theological superstitions of the Papacy and the trinitarian fallacies of the Protestant Church established, and promoted neither Christianity nor Socialism. He established the fact that Christian Socialism was neither Socialism nor Christianity.

The fallacies of "Christian Socialism" were brought home to me a short time ago when I saw a placard: "From Communism to Christ." The announcement seemed so typical of the idea of capture that pervades the Church. Denison Maurice would not have approved of the slogan: "From Communism to Christ." He would have worded it: "To Christ and Communism." But the idea would have been identical in one respect: the supremacy of Christ, the supremacy of the Church. But why not the supremacy of human happiness, with the Christs, Buddhas, Mahomets, and Voltaires in the background? Monuments, Statues! Milestones! Ornaments of thought and progress! Whatever indicates their natures and services. Remembrance and respect, as much affectionate regard as the living can pay the dead, always remembering that the dead have passed and are unconscious of it all. But

never worship; and never supremacy over the living. The dead hand is a symbol of a race of "dead-heads" living in a land of dead-souls.

"Christian Socialism" was destined to save neither Socialism nor Christianity. It saved the Church and Capitalism when it should have challenged both without mercy. It saved the Church until to-day the Church issues placards: "From Communism to Christ." The next announcement will be the blasphemy: "For Fascism and Christ"! Indeed, this is the "Christian Socialist" slogan in Italy, Germany and Austria. This means that, in the conflict with the Papacy, the Christian Socialist lost. He failed because his ideal was not proletarian and lacked proletarian understanding.

Socialism is a concept of society that cannot be qualified by philosophic or religious adjectives. Christianity is a noun and not a qualifying adjective. The combination of the terms is an unhappy attempt to advise all and sundry that there are Christians in the world who wish to be called Socialists and to be distinguished from other Christians who defend Property Society.

The starting point of Christian Socialism is the incarnation. The Church has developed this to a superstition, and the Christian Socialist does not repudiate the superstition. There was a time when those who claimed to be Socialists and Christians did challenge the superstition and insisted on the incarnation as a truth devoid of all mythological and superstitious appendages. They defined the incarnation as the translation of thought into language and of language into action: the social living embodiment of idealism and principle. The incarnation, to them, was the revelation that anticipated the revolution. It challenged the world of power and property with its vision of the poverty-arrayed prophet. The grandeur of his cause was symbolised by the tatters of his garments. Thus depicted, the incarnation declined the sovereignty of kings and denied the rights of power and authority. It struck at exploitation and proclaimed the spiritual life of the individual, which was identified with the ideal of service. Conversion meant the end of exploitation and the beginning of Communistic freedom, and the incarnation meant the individual existence dedicated to the law of service. The way of truth and life was the social way. Jesus was but a prophet who made known the eternal purpose of eternity and of internationalism.

Down the ages, under very different titles this type of rational Christian Socialist has pressed his simple but drastic claim to recognition. His conception of Socialism has been more limited than his enthusiasm for the Christian life. He has been handicapped by the fact that it is impossible really to understand the history of the Church without knowing something about the history of society. The latter knowledge is fundamental. But it was impossible for men to possess this knowledge until so much social evolution and

so much martyrdom had enlightened their minds. It was a knowledge unfolded through the generations and widened and deepened with the passing from father to son. It is a knowledge against which the Papacy fought ruthlessly and relentlessly.

The Pope writes of the "nefarious atheism" of Socialism. The historian records the "nefarious paganism" and "atheism" of the Papacy. The Papacy had persecuted men for maintaining the essential humanity of Jesus because the humanity of Jesus is the Christian teaching. The Papacy had persecuted men for insisting on the Socialism of Jesus because Socialism is the Christian ethic. The Papacy has warred against the intellectual and economic philosophy of Christianity with all the fanatical zeal of a degenerate Emperor of Pagan Rome in its days of decline and fall.

The most famous of the Christian Sects persecuted by the Papacy for Socialism was the Brethren of the Free Life. Mosheim depicts their sufferings and outlines their philosophy in his classic history. They arose in 1376, and despite all manner of tortures and persecutions, they continued down to the year 1700. Their theology was rational and devoid of superstition.

The Brethren of the Free Life saluted Jesus as the greatest of human teachers, but they paid him no superstitious adoration. Their ethic of living was equally simple and rational. They believed in the Common Lot, the Common Life, and Goodwill between man, woman, and child.

The Brethren defined their creed as follows:—

> We believe:—
>
> (1) All social, political, and industrial relations must be based upon the principle of the brotherhood of man. This is the teaching of Jesus.
>
> (2) The idea of the Early Church was that of a small propaganda association growing into a universal society, expanding through the nations to their overthrow as divisions of mankind, and so merging them into a complete human fellowship.
>
> (3) Jesus summarised human struggle in his person, and defined the essence of brotherhood in his teaching. He is a leader into brotherhood and the fulfiller of the law. He reduces the whole duty of man into two simple commandments. He recognises no duty to the State or to authority or to legal Society, but exalts man's obligation to love and to serve his fellows into the definition of the love of God as the central harmony of the world. His great practical mind reduced ten commandments to two, and then redefined the two to one.
>
> (4) The spiritual way is true of society as well as of individuals, and spells revolution from within. "Ye must be born again," applies to society and means social regeneration and revolution. The distinctive function of the Church is to spiritualise the life of the common people—to enable them to apply the social law of Christianity to their lives, and to be the soul of the people's revolt against slavery and the State."

Since the time of the Brethren, other sects, the Baptists for example, have formed Socialist Brotherhoods of the Kingdom. These have degenerated into Christian Social Unions, which

travestied Communism with Capitalist counterfeits, and dulled Christianity into mediocrity and superstition. In their periods of vigour these sects have been denounced and persecuted by the Papacy, assisted by Property Protestantism. During the period of persecution they have preached Socialism vigorously in these terms: —

(1) Personal Salvation consists in realising social salvation. Souls are not to be saved for heaven hereafter, but souls and bodies are to be saved for heaven here.

(2) The teachings of Jesus are applicable directly to all social and economic questions, and embrace Socialism and the revolutionary reconstruction of society upon a basis of association and fraternity.

(3) Since Jesus was the pioneer enemy of wrong, United Christianity must combat Capitalism in all its expressions of economic individualism.

These Christian Socialist sects have challenged the Papal claim to ecclesiastical international domination, with the assertion that Christianity is world-wide and international in its service, but individual in its freedom. Christianity knows neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision or uncircumcision, neither bond nor free, but merely the communion of persons. It taught Peter to call no man common or unclean. It led Paul, once a Pharisee of the Pharisees, to address the Ephesians as being "no more strangers nor foreigners, but fellow citizens." Originally "The Holy Catholic Church" was used to define this very internationalism: one faith, one baptism, "the communion of the Saints, the union of believers, the kingdom of God." Literally "communion" means in the Greek text, "Communism." So the Pope translates "Communion" into Anti-Socialism, and condemns the Socialists who have endeavoured to preserve the word of Jesus.

VIII. The Pope Does Not Understand

The Pope opposes Christianity to Socialism because he has no conception of Christianity. "His Holiness" does not understand Jesus, which is why the faithful address him as "Holiness." He does not realise that when Jesus conceives of God as the invisible supreme Father of All Mankind, he is thinking poetry and not theology. Jesus invoked the idea of God not to explain the universe but to sustain it. He wanted the universe not merely one, not merely a unity, but a complete world replete and warm with love and understanding. He was thinking of humanity and not divinity. He had no idea of Popes and their ridiculous pompous encyclicals. Jesus was a prophet, not a priest.

The Pope does not understand Jesus. The Vatican will never understand Nazareth. The Pope knows the grandeur of power, whereas Jesus know the glory of freedom. The Pope proclaims where Jesus more usefully declaimed. The gulf cannot be bridged. The Pope does not understand Jesus because it is impossible for a Pope to understand the proletarian man of sorrows, of genius, and of joy.

Jesus was really the pioneer of Proletarian Atheism. He completely rationalised the idea of God and insisted on the integrity of the universe and of man. His concern was with service and with conduct. He translated God as the principle of worth in life and society. His God was the progressive power of idealism and truth. His heaven was this side of the grave. His very greatness destroys the argument for God. His very message was a real message of earthly righteousness addressed to the mortal soul of man. Man can no more believe in living for a future life and the practical message of Jesus than he can accept the integrity of Capitalism and reconcile it with a belief in Communism.

I do not accuse the Pope of believing in the future life. I believe the Papacy to be an imposture from start to finish. I accuse the Pope of speaking in the name of Jesus and being incapable of capturing the atmosphere of Jesus and his apostles. Jesus was a man and citizen. The Pope does not understand this man, Jesus, and his citizenship. The Popes have never wanted to understand. That is why they burnt Servetus' "Restitution of Christianity" along with its imperishable author, and banned Priestley's famous record of Christian "Corruptions." Jesus, the man and the citizen, was no communicant of the Papal Church.

A few years ago, Professor Robertson, of Aberdeen, published a very useful work, entitled "Jesus the Citizen." The Pope should read this study. Robertson depicts Jesus as a liver in cities and shows how he reacted to the city life and how the city life reacted to him. He depicts him living in Nazareth, Capernaum, and Jerusalem. Nazareth rejected him. Capernaum treated him with

idle curiosity. Jerusalem crucified him. Certainly he could never have become a city father nor have worn the magistrate's chain. Robertson makes this very clear. He contrasts the city life of the time of Jesus with that of to-day.

> "When we strip our modern civilisation of its few distinctive outward marks, have the conditions of life in the city changed so very much? Has the so-called Christian civilisation of our day made it any easier to find God in the town? Row on row of Godless brick and mortar, the heartless pavement stretching on interminably, the insignificant individual lost in the indifferent crowd, the monotony of it all, throngs the loneliness, uneasy pleasure, muttering poverty, restless prosperity, lurking shame. Futile, vain, without purpose, without end, seems the daily round of toil, and sin and sorrow. Now and then there are the same dissatisfactions—rich young rulers with every earthly ambition reached, all the world at their feet, and yet crying out of their deep unrest, 'What lack I yet?' Now and then there is the same loud clamour for more meat, more pay; now and then there are the same social anomalies, and the same nagging friction between class and class; now and then there is the same vague longing for some cataclysmic change of government, some revolution to alter the face of society. What does it mean?"

It means that Jesus was one of the many prophets and that his message has been denied by his disciples. It means that, like those other prophecies, Christianity has not altered the world but has adapted itself to the needs of authority and exploitation and has grown in volume by declining in authority. It seems that the world of Caesarism and of Mammon rolls on without aim or purpose. It means that when the Pope speaks about the "Sacred Heart of Jesus," a horrible cannabalistic conception, and declaims against Socialism, he knows nothing about the essential teachings of Jesus. It means that the Pope and his Property Protestant allies do not understand.

IX. Parliamentary "Socialism" and the Poor Clergy

The Pope does not understand! His ignorance is well backed by the clergy of the Anglican establishment. Let us consider how a "Socialist" M.P. reacted to their ignorance.

On May 24th, 1924, under the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act, 1919, the House of Commons directed that the Bishopric of Blackburn Measure, 1923, and the Diocese of Southwell (Division) Measure, 1923, be presented to His Majesty for Royal Assent. The first Measure was to divide the Diocese of Manchester into two parts, because it had increased enormously in population, and contained nearly three million inhabitants and over 600 parishes. The Southwell Measure was a proposal to divide that Diocese into a Diocese for the County of Nottingham and a Diocese for the County of Derby.

Viscount Wolmer, the Conservative Member for Aldershot, then moved that the Diocese of Winchester (Division) Measure be presented to His Majesty for Royal Assent. Major-General Seely, the Liberal Member for the Isle of Wight, moved an amendment, recommending that the Measure be not presented for the Royal Assent "until the poorer clergy in the diocese have received an adequate stipend."

After Colonel Wedgwood had explained that the Government had no representative upon the Ecclesiastical Committee of the House of Commons, and was not consulted upon such Measures, George Buchanan (Gorbals), said:

> "It is as well that we should take this debate with a certain amount of seriousness. I come here in the capacity in which we all find ourselves occasionally, of a member of a jury. My knowledge is limited on this question, and I have listened to the debate with a very open mind, and must say that I gave the matter a fair amount of attention and also read very carefully the Report which I have in my hand.
>
> "When Committees have sat, and there have been inquiries into a subject of this kind, the House of Commons, the great bulk of whom have no knowledge or intimate connection with the subject, must be guided by the Committees which have inquired into it.
>
> "Having regard to that fact, I listened to the speeches to-night, and I must say that, taking it from a neutral point of view, the whole weight is behind the Measure brought in. But I must also have regard to this fact, that the Right Hon. and gallant Member for the Isle of Wight (Major-General Seely) made one observation which gave every member cause to think, and which I would ask those connected with the Church of England to take into account, or it will mean that some of us will have to take steps in future occurrences of this kind. I refer to the poorer clergy, who will suffer undisputed——"

Lord Hugh Cecil intervened to point out the division of the diocese did not affect in any way the income of the poorer clergy.

> —"I am obliged to the Noble Lord for his intervention, but I am concerned for the poorer clergy. It is a disgraceful thing that in a question of religion you are going to have the sort of obstruction repeated as before when trying to improve conditions not only of the clergy, but of others who work about the church. I submit to the House in all seriousness the view I am putting forward, and though it may be that I am in strange company this evening, I say that those concerned ought at the earliest possible moment to set about passing a Measure to secure to the poor clergy of this diocese something, at least of a decent adequate income to maintain the Church in its dignity."

After which, George Buchanan voted for the divided diocese! The idea of a Socialist, especially one who considers Parliament merely a sounding board, gravely considering the case for the division of a diocese and the creation of a new bishopric, and deeming that his duty to his supporters in the Gorbals, is distinctly funny. But when we have added to that, grave concern for the income of the poorer clergy, the humour becomes wearisome.

What is the church but an edifice of reaction and superstition? What have we to do with the bishoprics except to abolish them? And what useful function does a clergyman, poor or rich, discharge that we should concern ourselves with him? As well insist on adequate incomes for fortune-tellers.

The reader is referred to the author's numerous essays and pamphlets on this subject, published since 1916. All will be collected and reissued as funds permit. All reports of his debates on religion, especially those in London and Glasgow with Father Vincent M'Nabb, O.P. Particular attention is directed to the essay, "What is a Christian?" published in *The Inquirer* for September 9, 1933.

APPENDICES.

I. Rise and Persecution of Quakerism

I find the following notes in my scrap-book, culled mostly from the Chronological notes of J. Stephenson Rowntree, and limited largely to Yorkshire. They indicate the period to study and should be supplemented by references to the terrible American persecution of Quakers.

The name of "Quaker" was used in derision, in 1650, by a magistrate at Derby, named Gervase Bennet, when Fox called upon him "to tremble at the name of the Lord."

It should be noted that Comber, Dean of Durham, in his "Christianity no Enthusiasm" (1678), contends that Winstanley and his fellow "Diggers" were the real founders of the Society of Friends.

1. PIONEERS OF QUAKERISM.

GEORGE FOX. Born at Drayton-in-the-Clay, Leicestershire, 1624. Spent many years of his life in prison. One imprisonment at Nottingham of uncertain length, about 1649; second at Derby, 1650-1; third at Carlisle, of uncertain length, 1654; fourth at Launceston, January to September, 1656; fifth (after the Restoration), Lancaster, June—October, 1660; sixth, Lancaster and Scarborough, 1664-1665; seventh and last, Worcester, fourteen months, 1673. Died in London, 13th of eleventh month, 1690 (old style). First month, 1691 (new style).

THOMAS ALDAM, of Warmsworth, Yorkshire. One of the first Quakers imprisoned in York Castle. Kept there two years and a half. Died 1660. Buried at Warmsworth.

JOHN BLAYKLING, of Drawell, near Sedburgh, Yorkshire. Born 1625. Many times imprisoned in York and Tynemouth Castles and elsewhere. Died 1705.

STEPHEN CRISP. Born in Colchester, 1628. In 1660, when arrested for preaching Quakerism, ill-used at York by Leonard Thompson, then Lord Mayor. Died 1692.

WILLIAM DEWSBURY. Born at Allerthorpe, near Pocklington, Yorkshire. Became the principal leader of Yorkshire Quakerism. Spent about nineteen years in jail, nine of which were in Warwick Castle. Died at Warwick, 1688.

RICHARD FARNSWORTH. Imprisoned at Banbury for twelve months in 1655. Died in London, 1666.

THOMAS GOODYEAR. Suffered much persecution and imprisonment. Died at Selby, 1693.

RICHARD HUBBERTHORNE, of Yealand, Lancashire. Laboured in Wensleydale. Died of jail-fever in Newgate, 1662.

ROGER HEBDEN, of Malton. Born about 1620. Had a draper's shop in Malton, which he gave up for the sake of the Quaker preaching. Imprisoned at York. Died 1695.

RICHARD ROBINSON, of Countersett, in Wensleydale. Born at Preston, 1628. Imprisoned in York Castle, where he had to lay in a great oven in the castle yard wall, the jail being so full of friends who were prisoners. Prisoner in Richmond Jail, 1678 and 1684. Died at Countersett, 1693. Buried at Bainbridge.

THOMAS TAYLOR, of Skipton, Yorkshire. Born 1616. Educated at Oxford. Surrendered his benefice at Richmond, Yorkshire, to preach Quakerism. Imprisoned for nearly two years in Appleby Jail, 1657; in York and Lancaster Castles, 1660; in Derby Jail, 1661; Stafford for nearly ten years. Died 1681.

CHRISTOPHER TAYLOR. Brother of Thomas Taylor. Imprisoned 1654 and 1661. Emigrated to Pennsylvania about 1682, and there died, 1686.

THOMAS THOMPSON, of Skipsea. Born 1631. Suffered ten and a half years imprisonment. Died 1704.

JOHN WHITEHEAD. Probably born in Yorkshire about 1630. One of the most prominent of the early Quaker preachers in North-East Yorks. Often imprisoned. Died 1690, and was buried at Lincoln.

ROBERT WEDDERS. Born about 1618 at Upper Kellet, Lancashire. Imprisoned 1653 in Carlisle Jail. Died at Kellet, 1686.

2. CHRONOLOGICAL MEMORANDA.

RISE OF PURITANISM 1559
Robert Brown, the first "Independent" 1550 (?)—1633 (?)
Jacob Boehme ... ... 1576—1624
John Milton ... ... 1608—1675
Pilgrim Fathers 1620
Blaise Pascal ... ... 1623—1662
GEORGE Fox born 1624
Michael Molinos ... ... 1627—1696
John Bunyan ... ... 1628—1688
John Locke ... ... 1632—1704
Madame Guyon ... ... 1642—1717
George Fox began his Ministry 1647
George Fox's imprisonment at Launceston 1655
One Thousand Friends imprisoned in Great Britain ... 1656
DEATH OF CROMWELL 1658
Martyrdom of Mary Dyer, Marmaduke Stevenson, William Leddra, and William Robinson at Boston. Restoration of Charles II. ... ... 1659—1660
4,200 Friends Imprisoned 1662

The Rise and Persecution of Quakerism.

ACT OF UNIFORMITY. St. Bartholomew's Day. Ejectment of 2,000 Nonconformist Ministers ... 1662
George Fox imprisoned in Lancaster and Scarborough Castles 1663-66
CONVENTICLE ACT PASSED 1664
FIVE MILE ACT PASSED 1665
Robert Barclay and William Penn join the Friends ... ... 1667—1668
GREAT PERSECUTION OF FRIENDS 1670
Trial of William Penn and William Mead 1670
Liberation of many Friends from prison; also John Bunyan 1672
William Penn founds Philadelphia. Great persecution 1682
DEATH OF CHARLES II. MORE THAN 5,100 FRIENDS IMPRISONED DURING HIS REIGN. 1,383 FRIENDS IN JAIL ON ACCESSION OF JAMES II. RELEASE OF MANY FRIEND PRISONERS 1685
TOLERATION ACT PASSED 1689
FRIENDS AFFIRMATION ACT PASSED 1696
Simplification of Friends' Form of Affirmation legalised 1722
RISE OF METHODISM 1739
Calendar amended. New Year's Day, January 1st, instead of March 25. January becomes the "first month" with corresponding changes throughout 1752
John Woolman dies at York. Growing interest in Anti-Slavery Movement 1772
Surrender of Friends' Registers of Births, Marriages, and Deaths 1840
Abolition of Religious Tests in Scottish Universities 1853

The rise of Quakerism, and its legal establishment or recognition as an expression of Christian belief, are fatal to the claims made by the Papacy in its attack on Socialism. Quakerism strikes at the very root of the Catholic conception of Christianity and denies the Pope's claims to be the representative head of the Church on earth or in the world. This means that the Pope's attack on Socialism is also an attack on Christian teaching and excommunicates him and his following from the Church founded by Jesus.

II. The Pope and Spain

(*Reprinted from "The Word," May,* 1938)

Dedicated to the memory of William Tyndale, who died at the stake, 6th October, 1536, for his faith, as shown by his translation of the Bible into English, whereby the English language has been coloured by powerful expressions of liberty.

Some years ago I published a pamphlet on *Socialism and The Pope.* Many persons objected to the title because it related Socialism to religious discussion. Time has shown that these objectors were wrong. Others disliked "Socialism" being placed before the "Pope." Socialism is a doctrine, philosophy or gospel. The Pope is only a man. Therefore, whatever his office, Socialism comes before the Pope. The message is greater than the messenger. And the Pope is *not* a messenger. He is but a priest, not a prophet. To-day, it is necessary to add another chapter to my pamphlet. This time we put the Pope first: for he has spoken repeatedly since the July days of 1936 on the issues in Spain. He has spoken wrong. He has played the *rolè* of Balaam without the ass. It is the nature of popes and priests to forsake the humble.

Recently, following the bombing of Barcelona, and the cutting off of Catalonia from Spain by Franco's forces, the Pope blessed Franco. Quite rightly, many good folk were horrified. But the Pope blessed Franco in 1936.

On 18th September, of that year, the Pope addressed 500 Spanish "refugees" from working-class Spain, at Castelgandolfo. His audience included four bishops and many priests and nuns. To this select audience, the Pope declared that the Spanish loyalists had "destroyed in the most vile and barbarous way," everything, including "persons, institutions, and sacred things, inestimable and irreplaceable treasures of faith," such as "the most holy relics." The Pope was wrong, doubly wrong. The last bombardment of Barcelona, the grand thirty-six hour enterprise of General Franco with Italian and German planes, destroyed women and children and the chief Catholic Church in Barcelona. An Anarchist rescued relics from the attacks of the legions the Pope blessed. And this was in 1938 — rescued relics the Pope avowed had been destroyed in 1936! The Pope was wrong! because Christianity is concerned with living things, not relics. Jesus believed in children, not relics: in humanity, not idolatry. The working folks of Spain are right. The Pope and his legions are wrong. As wrong as hell let loose! The Pope is at war not with Socialism only, but with Christianity primarily.

If I may make a suggestion, I would urge the Pope to approach the Sacred Heart, in which he believes, and pray for a good under-

standing of himself. Burns stated the required prayer in that bold, direct language that constitutes the charm of his prose and verse equally. The Pope ought to see himself as others see him and as history will view him. The Pope explained the alleged destructive conduct of the Spanish workers as being "the fruits of absurd and disastrous ideologies" which "seduced and inflamed the masses," and aimed "at arming them and hurling them against every institution, human and divine." Tut, tut!! What extravagant language! And how misdirected! The description fits the Pope himself and is a perfect cameo. But it is no more a likeness of the workers of Spain than a portrait of Charles Haddon Spurgeon is a picture of Karl Marx. As a biographer, and as master of character-portraiture, the Pope is hopeless. He should stick to theology and leave the political application of moral principles to wiser men. Theology is a dull subject; but dreariness and depression become a Pope. His Holiness forgets the workers never hurled themselves against the institution of democracy, which is at once human and divine, as every poet and struggler for human liberty knows.

The crimes of the Pope are crimes of commission. But they are crimes of omission also. His holiness uttered no word of censure against Franco and his Moorish mercenaries, all of them Mohammedans. Not that I am opposed to Mohammedans, I have a high regard for Mahomet. But the Pope would seem to have forgotten the crusades and Peter the Hermit. Is he ignorant of the fact that, originally Christianity stood for the liberation of the human spirit? Fascism seems to be the negation of freedom and of spiritual integrity and to involve the regime of force. It is a fact: a Christian cannot be a Fascist.

Not the Anarchists of Catalonia, not the heroic defenders of Madrid, not the miners of Asturia, but the Pope has erred. He has confounded the teaching of Jesus with the ecclesiastical degeneracy of bishops laden with jewels and corrupt with power. These prelates confuse holiness with authority and treat God like a political lackey, to be dragged into the class struggle, always to be employed against the oppressed. The Pope, in the name of the Son of Man who denounced the sword, has upheld priests and laymen, who fired from Church towers, and flung themselves into battle, like so many Chicago gangsters, armed with machine guns.

The Pope was indifferent to the protests of those Spanish Catholics, who were scandalised by seeing the Spanish clergy join the initiators of a rebellion against the legitimate Government of Spain: a rebellion financed and armed by foreign governments. Spanish Catholics witnessed the soldiers of the Republic being fired on from Church towers in Madrid. And they knew that, even in the event of a rebel victory, the Church, whose hands were stained with the blood of the people, would have no influence over the masses. Whom the Gods would destroy they first make mad! And the Gods are good. They will progress and would destroy

despotism and authority. In his madness, the Pope has chosen. The Vatican has linked the Church with Fascism. The Pope has built a new altar and a new edifice in every town and hamlet of Spain. He has reared a monument of ruin. What Communists and Anarchists could not do, the Pope has done with the able assistance of General Franco. Fascism has destroyed the Church in Spain. The Church is buried in the ruins of the cities and its influence has been swept away by the innocent blood of the working men, women and children of the Basque country, of Madrid, and of Red Barcelona. The memory of the peasants murdered by the legionaries, and of the women violated by the Moor, has built an insurmountable barrier between the Vatican and the heart and mind of the Spanish people. The Pope supports Franco. He links himself with Hitler, Mussolini, and Franco. The Catholic Church: Rome, the same yesterday, to-day and to-morrow. Well not quite! Yesterday and to-day, linked with the powers of world darkness! To-morrow, relegated to darkness—the darkness of oblivion!

The Pope has blessed Franco repeatedly since 1926! Workers and members of their families have been murdered by thousands in the towns and villages occupied by the Fascists. Seville, Carpio, Saragossa, Badajoz, all tell the same nightmare story of butchery and horror. Mothers were forced to swallow a mixture of lard and petrol by their Fascist deliverers, and then murdered. Which butchery has found favour in the eyes of the reputed Vicar of Christ resident at the Vatican.

Does his holiness consider these barbarities the expression of lawful authority? Or is he only writing the final chapter of the history of his Church: a chapter worthy of his predecessors, whom we will not name: the Gregories, the Innocents, and the Pius—es?

III. Roman Reaction

Pius X., in his Encyclical on *CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ACTION*, issued on June 11, 1905, declared that the purpose of the Church was to survive by adapting itself to the varying economic conditions of civil society. His actual words were:—

> "The Church, throughout her long history, has always, and on every occasion luminously shown that she possesses a wonderful power of adaptation to the varying conditions of civil society; . . . always safeguarding her sacred rights, she easily bends and adapts herself in all that is contingent and accidental, to the vicissitudes of time, and the fresh needs of society."

In other words the sacred rights of the Church compelled it to defend Capitalist society.

The Pope who died in February, 1939, Pius XI., made an unambiguous pronouncement on the conflict between the doctrines and practices of Catholicism and Socialism. He stated:—

> "Whether Socialism be considered as a doctrine, or as a historical fact, or as a movement, if it really remains Socialism, it cannot be brought into harmony with the dogmas of the Catholic Church."

The practical consequence of this conflict was tersely defined by him as follows: "No one can be at the same time a sincere Catholic and a true Socialist."

We know that a large number of Labour Members of Parliament and leaders of the Trade Unions claim to be Catholics. One of this type, Sir James Sexton, speaking at the Catholic National Congress in 1926, said: "The Socialism I am content to accept is the Pope's Encyclical." In other words this Labour leader, because of his Church, was an anti-Socialist.

The reactionary impertinence of the Church was made clear in Glasgow in 1929 in connection with the candidature of John S. Clarke for Parliament in Maryhill. The following extract is made from the *Daily Express* for March 29, 1929:—

"WILD SCENES AT CATHOLIC MEETING.

"*Frenzied Women Climb out of Windows.*

"CANDIDATE'S ENTRY.

"Two thousand people crammed in a hall suited for half that number, scenes of disorder, and women screaming and scrambling out of windows were features of a meeting organised by the Rev. Dr. O'Connor, Catholic parish priest of Maryhill, Glasgow, and held last night in the parish hall.

"The doors of the hall were locked to prevent hundreds of people crushing their way into the hall.

"The Rev. Dr. O'Connor, in his opening remarks, emphasised the fact that the meeting was not a political one. He then said: 'Mr. John S. Clarke is not a fit candidate for the Catholics of Maryhill . . .'

"Then Mr. Clarke, the Socialist candidate for Maryhill Parliamentary division, walked through the hall to the platform. His entrance aroused loud cheering, which was repeated when he asked permission to address the audience.

"This was granted, and he promised the electors that, if returned, he would oppose every effort to legislate for birth control. He next alluded to his book, *Satires, Lyrics and Poems*, published some years ago, which was stated to be objectionable to Catholics.

" 'The book was written at a time when I was a callow youth,' he said. 'The war was raging and the world was mad. I hated war and everything concerned with it.

" 'Since then, however, my ideas have undergone a tremendous change due to experience and a broader outlook on life. I repudiate the feelings expressed in the book.'

"Mr. Clarke was refused permission to refer more fully to the question of birth control, and uproar followed.

"Women, eager to escape, made a dash for the doors. They were locked. . . . Windows were thrown open and women scrambled through, many of them reaching the ground outside in an exhausted condition."

In Spain, since the beginning of the Franco rebellion, the Church of Rome has adopted a definite and most reactionary attitude. From the very beginning it took its stand by oppression and exploitation. The Vatican identified itself with the Franco "government" by sending a *de facto* representative to the insurgent chief the moment he raised his banner with the aid of the foreign Fascist powers. It was after consultation with the Vatican that the Archbishop Malines suspended two Spanish Catholic priests from their office because they spoke in favour of the legal government of their country at a private meeting in Belguim. In England, the Catholics inside the Labour movement actively agitated against support for the Spanish Medical Aid. They adopted a similar role in the Co-operative movement.

In Abyssinia, the Church openly supported Mussolini's invasion which cannot be defended on any ethical principle. Cardinal Tisserend stated in an interview with an Italian newspaper, which was afterwards reproduced in the *International Review of Missions*:

"With the conquest of the Empire, a vast field is open to Catholic missions, whose work has hitherto been hampered in Abyssinia by the unyielding opposition of the monophysite clergy (*i.e.*, of the Ancient Abyssinian Church). The work of the Catholic missionaries will nobly go hand in hand with the civilising actions which Italy, under the Fascist Government, has already begun in order to restore to the people the civilisation of Rome and, with it, social well-being.

At the National Eucharist Congress at Teramo, attended by fifty-seven bishops and nineteen archbishops of the Church of Rome, a telegram was sent to Mussolini, which was published in the *Osservatore Romano* for August 22, 1935, and read as follows:—

"Catholic Italy thanks Jesus Christ for the renewed greatness of the Fatherland made stronger by Mussolini's policy."

This telegram was undiluted expediency. If one really believed that the Church represented the teachings of Jesus, or that God existed, the sentiment would amount to treason and blasphemy. The idea of Jesus being thanked for the activity of an ex-atheist turned traitor to his class and to his principles is an insult to all understanding.

On February 23, 1936, Cardinal Paccelli, then the Pope's Secretary of State, and now Pius XII., stated:

> "Rome has a standard: that of the Cross. Rome has a rule of Government: the moral of Christ. Rome gives to the world the example of the unity between Church and State. From Rome go forth the forces that go to sacred and holy conquests. No State shall resist the power of Rome."

It must be concluded from this statement that when Rome supports Mussolini and Franco it does so in accordance with its teachings. One can only comment that its wisdom is a disastrous philosophy for the common people to accept.

In 1932, Mussolini brought in to full operation the 1929 treaty between the Italian Government and the free Vatican City of the Pope. The Church received new economic and additional political privileges; Catholic Youth Associations were legalised, and the Fascist Oath altered to include "God." Mussolini decreed that all criticisms of the Church must end. In return, on February 11, of that year, he went in a great procession to the tomb of St. Peter on the papal invitation, was sprinkled with holy water, made the sign of the cross, and prayed at the altar. The Pope called him a "Man of God" and a "Saviour of Christianity." Mussolini must have had a good opinion of himself in this role. Again we say this is nothing but a demonstration of the economic blasphemy of property to which the Church subscribes.

In Austria, in 1934, when the workers' trade unions and Socialist party members were shot down from the portals of the Churches, the Catholic Church supported the Corporate State of Austria and declared that its actions were based upon the Pope's encyclicals. When Austria was swallowed by the Nazis in 1938, Cardinal Innitzer issued an "Oath of Fidelity of the Church to the German People," in which he stated that the Catholics must support without hesitation the great German State and its Leader "whose struggle against Bolshevism and for power and for the honour and unity of Germany corresponds to the voice of Divine Providence." (*Catholic Herald*, March 18, 1938).

Let these words be borne in mind when the Communist Party tell you that the Pope Pius XI. was an anti-Fascist, and that the Church is opposed to Fascism.

The *Catholic Times*, for October 18, 1935, reported a statement made by Archbishop Hinsley of Westminster, in defence of the

Socialism and the Pope.

Pope's attitude towards the Abyssinian war. Cardinal Hinsley said: —

> "To speak plainly, the existing Fascist rule, in many respects unjust . . . prevents worse injustice, and if Fascism—which in principle I do not approve — goes under, nothing can save the country from chaos. God's cause goes under with it." (*Catholic Times*, October 18th, 1935.)

The *Catholic Times* in its issue for June 26, 1936, stated: —

> "Perhaps after all the Pope was right to be patient with the crudities of jejune Fascism, to be patient even now with the excesses of Nazism. . . . Our mission, the mission of salvation for Europe, is to establish a united anti-Communist front. We must restore friendly relations with Italy and Germany, even at great sacrifice, and then induce France, which will not be difficult, to fall into line with us, on grounds of political safety."

Notwithstanding this attitude of the Catholic Church, the tendency of the Labour movement has been to pander to its reaction and to its zeal for power. At the 1935 General Election, the Catholics stated that Mr. Attlee, on behalf of the Labour Party, had given a more favourable reply to the Catholic requests for public money for their schools than the Conservatives. At the end of 1936, Bishop Brown welcomed Herbert Morrison to the Catholic College in Clapham. Bishop Brown has the reputation of being one of the main educational experts of the Catholics in Britain. The *Catholic Times* for December 24, 1936, reported his speech on this occasion and his eulogy of the so-called Socialist L.C.C.: —

> "He took the opportunity of publicly saying that there was no Authority in the whole country which treated the Catholic colleges and convents with the generosity of the London County Council." (*Catholic Times*, December 24th, 1936.)

Author's Notes (1939)

Page 4—ARCHBISHOP MAGUIRE (1).

The late John Wheatley, before he became an M.P. and Minister for Health in the first Labour Government, made great play of Archbishop Maguire's declaration in his pamphlet, "The Catholic Working Man," which seems to have been a paper he read before the Catholic Socialist Society of Glasgow in 1909. This organisation was formed in October, 1906, by John Wheatley, and its membership was confined to practising Catholics. Actually, even in its economic aspirations this organisation was not a Socialist organisation at all. This is obvious from the definition that it published of Socialism in its pamphlets. The definition was as follows:

> "Socialism is defined as public Ownership of Land and Capital. This does not mean the abolition of all private property. The Society is in hearty agreement and co-operates with the Independent Labour Party."

On page 3 of this pamphlet John Wheatley quotes a sermon delivered by the Reverend Father Day at the Church of the Holy Name, Manchester, in December, 1908. Father Day said that by the application of Nature's forces to manufacture, the average workman of to-day produced fifty times as much as the average workman a few generations ago, and that industrial processes could, at any given time, place on the market more of any great staple than the world could consume. Yet, the priest continued, while trade year by year was leaping up by millions, with the result that the world was never so rich before, men, women, and children still starved and lived in rags. So badly were riches distributed, he said, that even in England, which was probably the richest, best governed, and most philanthropic country in the world, an enormous proportion of the people were without the necessaries and conveniences of life.

Apparently the Catholic Socialist Society concluded that this statement by Father Day should reconcile the common people to the Catholic Church and lead them to believe that the priesthood was not opposed to them in their struggle against poverty. This conclusion, and the entire propaganda founded on it, was a fallacy. Father Day became the champion of what was known as Catholic Democracy which he proposed to establish in place of Socialism. In the name of Catholic Democracy Father Day attacked Socialism so vigorously and defended Capitalism so ingeniously that R. B. Suthers, the famous *Clarion* writer, answered him in Clarion Pamphlet No. 50, entitled *"Roman Catholic Democracy,"* which was published in 1914. Every worker should read that pamphlet, especially at the present time, when the Communist Party in Great Britain is so busy eulogising the late Pope, and the Soviet Press in Russia is welcoming the elevation of the new Pope, whilst

the Communist Party in America is declaring that a Communist can be a Catholic, and that there is nothing in Communism to prevent a man being a loyal member of the Catholic Church. In plain, simple language, Suthers proves that Roman Catholic Democracy is just plain Anti-Socialist exploitation of the worker.

Page 7—CARDINAL MANNING (2).

Cardinal Manning eulogised Leo XIII.'s defence of Capitalism. The same Cardinal Manning, writing in the *"Nineteenth Century Review"* for 1908, described what Capitalism meant to the people at that time. It means the same to-day, and no one can say that the Church during the interval has made any attempt to come to grips with the squalor and misery Manning so ably indicted. Manning's actual words were:—

> "It seems almost incredible that in wealthy England so much destitution should exist, and still more that vagrancy and mendacity should so prevail. It may well be asked—is this the grand total result of the wisdom of our legislators, the efforts of our philanthropists, the Christianity of our Churches, that our streets are infested with miserable creatures from whose faces almost everything purely human has been erased, whose very presence would put us to shame but for the familiarity with the sight? Poor wretches! filthy in body, foul in speech, vile in spirit. Human vermin! Yes, but of our own manufacture, for every individual of this mass was once an innocent child. Society has made them what they are, not only by a selfish indulgence in almsgiving, but by permitting bad laws to exist and others to be indiscriminate almsgiving, but by permitting bad laws to exist and others to be so administered as to crush the weak and wreck the lives of the unfortunate."

All the evils described by Cardinal Manning are the evils of class society. It is hard to imagine that the man who could so scathingly denounce those evils, and whose portrait is carried by dock labourers in the processions as a banner, could believe in and defend private property. Yet Cardinal Manning, remembering his loyalty to the Church, denounced Socialism and defended property institutions. His eulogy of Leo XIII. is published in a 32-page pamphlet by the Catholic Truth Society of London, under the heading *"A Pope on Capital and Labour."* I have before me the new edition, issued in May, 1931, with an introduction by the Reverend L. O'Hea, S.J.

Even in this pamphlet Manning waxes eloquent on the moan of discontent, of toil and of sorrow. But he still declares that Socialism is no remedy and goes on to praise the Pope's success in exposing "the false and destructive character of Socialism." Manning adds that the law of property or of private ownership, both in land and in labour, is founded in nature, and cannot be abolished by any human authority without a violation of the divine order of natural society. He also points out that there can be no solution without the Church.

One might forgive a person being misled as to his right to the product of his own labour, although it is very doubtful what is a man's own labour. When the author of some story or play that is not merely staged but also filmed receives tremendous royalties, who shall say that those royalties are the product of his own labour? Without the original story, without the author there could have been no film; but without the huge machinery of production there could have been no knowledge and no acceptance of the story, no public entertainment supplied by the author. Despite its individual origin, the finished product is obviously a collective, and indeed a collectivised, effort. Allowing, however, that there may be some question in the matter of actual physical creation as to a man's right to the product of his toil—and it is not admitted that there should be any doubt even on this point—how can there be any question as to the social ownership and enjoyment of the land?

Page 5—FATHER WATT (3).

Father Watt's pamphlet on Communism seems to be a re-issue, or at least an extension, of the "Notes of Lectures" that he delivered before the Catholic Social Guild Week-end School at St. Mary's, Chorley, in 1925, on *"Capitalism, Communism, Catholicism."* This was published by the Catholic Social Guild, Oxford, as a penny pamphlet.

Father Watt defines Capitalism, describes the growth of the Capitalist system, and proceeds to a criticism of the Materialistic Conception of History and Surplus Value.

Of the Materialistic Conception of History, Father Watt says:—

> "The Materialistic Conception of History was watered down by Engels himself in later years. It does not explain the great social events of the world (*e.g.*, Christianity, the abolition of slavery). It is true that men are influenced in their actions by economic conditions; but also by many other motives."

Marx has much to answer for as the father of Authoritarian "Communism." One day Bakunin's indictment of his diversion of real Communism will be endorsed by every thinking person in the world. Nevertheless, Marx's Materialistic Conception of History, which was not Marx's at all but just plain commonsense interpretation of facts, will outlive the metaphysics of the Church. Engels compromised it because Engels was essentially a parliamentarian and a compromiser, and hesitated to face the realities of social revolution and the logic of the people's struggle.

Father Watt proceeds to describe modern Communism in theory and practice, and passes on to a summary as to why Communism cannot be accepted. He says:—

> "Economic theory and proposals of Communism are erroneous and impracticable on the face of them.
>
> "In practice, Communism has proved a disastrous failure. It is being abandoned by its most energetic exponents.
>
> "It is atheistic, anti-Christian, by its own admission."

The reply to these objections is very simple. The first objection applies with equal force to the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth and it is as untrue in the one case as in the other. Communism has never been practised and so could never have proved a disastrous failure. Capitalism has been practised and its practice has given us wars and tyrannies. Christianity, as Father Watt and his Church define it but not as its founder might understand it, has been practised; and it has given us struggles for power, dungeons, wars of extermination, and men and women sacrificed for their vision and for their faith. Communism may be atheistic but it can hardly be more atheistic than the Church that believes in the horrors of the Inquisition and has burnt men's bodies in the vain hope of suppressing their minds. Communism may be anti-Christian. If that charge be correct, Communism should be dear to the paganised soul of the Pope. Of course Communism is atheistic, for Atheism is commonsense and the basis of all true approach is an understanding of life. Of course it is anti-Christian, for that which passes muster for Christianity was founded historically on the negation of the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, and has been a record of class society militant sacrificing equally the mind and body of the thinker and of the worker.

Examining Catholicism and the social question Father Watt says: —

> "We must distinguish the official social teaching of the Popes, who confine themselves in the main to principles, from the various recommendations of Catholic sociologists, applying those principles to solve social problems. No loyal Catholic will dissent from the former, but on the latter there is, of course, room for differences of opinion."

This is, of course, correct, and it is interesting to note that the official social teachings of the Pope constitute a definite defence of Capitalism, and rejoice in declarations of anti-Socialism. Father Watt proceeds to expound the papal teaching and the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII., already mentioned in this work, and popularised as the "Workers' Charter."

Space does not permit the full reproduction of Father Watt's summary of Leo XIII.'s pronouncement. In any case this would be repetition. The following quotations will suffice: —

> "In this document great insistence is laid on the fact that the social question is at root moral and religious. . . . For this reason, to overlook the teaching of the Christian Church is a grave error. In social relations she teaches that men must observe justice and charity (which means mutual goodwill and mutual aid). Both employers and employed have their duties as they have their rights. . . . The employers are bound to provide decent conditions of labour, and they must not excuse themselves from the duty of paying a living wage on the pretext that labour is a commodity which may be bought in the cheapest market. The worker, on the other hand, owes a fair day's work for a fair day's pay, and must be honest and industrious. It is a mistake to

believe that class is naturally hostile to class, and that employers and workers are intended by nature to live in mutual conflict; nature requires that they should co-operate with one another for the common prosperity of both and the community."

And so on and so forth! Let it be remembered that this is an official Catholic publication recording a Jesuit priest's official interpretation of a papal announcement. Quite definitely it is anti-Socialist and it is the voice of the Church.

By the same Author

The Rebel—Or His Disciples

Historical and Traditional Christianity

"THE WORD" LIBRARY

Pamphlets by

GUY A. ALDRED

---

1. SOCIALISM AND THE POPE.
2. THE REBEL—OR HIS DISCIPLES?
3. JOHN MACLEAN: MARTYR OF THE CLASS STRUGGLE.
4. TO THE EDITOR: 30 Years' Correspondence on Subjects of Varying Interest.
5. HISTORICAL AND TRADITIONAL CHRISTIANITY.
6. STUDIES IN COMMUNISM.
7. PIONEERS OF ANTI-PARLIAMENTARISM.

Other Pamphlets are being prepared and other Reprints issued. This will bring the Author's writings up to date and restore to circulation essays too long out of print.

YOU SHOULD READ...

"THE WORD"

A monthly journal devoted to Anti-Militarism and the cause of the Conscientious Objector.

To rouse the people, to combat war, and to speed commonweal.

Obtainable from:

The Strickland Press and the Bakunin Press.
On sale at all U.S.M. meetings.

Single copies, 2d.; postage ½d. Annual Sub., 2s. 6d.

All comrades interested in *THE WORD* and the pamphlets now being published, are invited to join the United Socialist Movement. Group meetings are held every Monday, at 8 p.m., at Bakunin Hall, 29 Castle Street, Glasgow, C.4.