

CARDINAL MORAN ON SOCIALISM

TRUE AND FALSE DEMOCRACY

In the course of a speech at the opening of a new college at Ashfield, his Eminence the Cardinal-Archbishop of Sydney made the following further comments on the subject of Socialism:—

Looking back upon the series of statesmen who had been Premiers in successive Governments, he thought every one of them had declared that he was carrying out the principles of genuine democracy, and he (the Cardinal) thought that genuine democracy it was that was destined to crown the great work hitherto carried on, and to lead Australia to attain its true destiny. If they asked him what he meant by genuine democracy, he replied, just precisely that genuine spirit of freedom which gave to everyone his rights, asserted the rights of every citizen, be he the highest or the humblest, and which at the same time insisted that the State should do its duty, and do it not merely to monopolists and high individuals, but to the very humblest citizens in the whole Commonwealth, and in asserting the rights of the citizens, and seeing that the State performed its duty, would endeavor to bring peace and contentment, and a certain amount of comfort, even to the humblest homes amongst our citizens. There were some States at the present day, some countries, where the great wealth of the country was concentrated in the hands of a very few, whilst at the same time a great mass of the people was overwhelmed in the depth of misery, almost on the verge of starvation. Well, he thought the

Object of True Democracy

was to remedy such matters, to try to make the wealth of the country the heritage of every family in the place, as far as anyone was entitled to it, and at the same time to bring within the reach of all those blessings which they said were the true inheritance of Christian civilisation. He thought no statesman among them, whether he called himself a Free-trader, or a Protectionist, or a Home Ruler, or whatever he was, would say that those were not genuine principles on which all our political programmes should rest. While he advocated that, he might say that he never identified himself with any political party, and he trusted he never would. And perhaps he might be permitted to add that, instead of him trending on any political ground, he feared that some politicians had been trending upon religious ground. But he did not know that he should enter into those matters except to amuse them.

He had some communication from Brisbane, from Queensland, during the past few days, and he was asked the question was it true 'that he had repeatedly declared that he had the Labour Party under his thumb. It seemed a ridiculous thing to ask such a question, and to be obliged to answer it. But he said in the fullest and amplest way that he had never used such words, and never given expression to any such sentiments. He admired the Labour Party for their energy and devotedness to Australia, just the same as he admired all the other political parties in contending who would show the best patriotism, the greatest devotedness in developing Australian interests. But, at the same time, to say that he had a party under his thumb was so supremely ridiculous that those people must have been awakened from a dream when they imagined he had given expression to such a statement. While referring to such a matter, it would seem, too, that some persons asked was it true that he was antagonistic to the Holy Father. That seemed almost more ridiculous than the preceding matter, inasmuch as he happened to have the privilege to be a privy councillor of the Holy Father. It would be strange indeed if he were antagonistic to his teachings. That reminded him of some quixotic scene that had been on the stage during the past few weeks. They knew the Cervantes' tercentenary was being celebrated with great pomp throughout Spain, and it would not do if they did not have some scenes corresponding here. Well, he thought the most quixotic scene his attention had been called to was when two redoubtable knights, in full panoply, appeared on the stage to state that it was their mission to tell the Cardinal what was the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. It seemed that one of those knights declared that he had a special mission to say that a most useful lesson had been given by the See of Rome. Those were the words of Sancho Panza, the companion of Quixote. He did not think there was any antagonism in the lessons of the Holy Father. They were identical with

those he (the Cardinal) had given expression to. The Pope commended democracy in all its legitimate aims, but at the same time he condemned, and condemned in the fullest manner, just as every sensible man amongst us condemned, what was known as

Continental Socialism.

Continental Socialism had four distinctive branches, and the latest letter of the Holy Father to the Bishops of Italy condemned one special feature of it. I say it has four special developments. One feature was called anti-monarchical socialism, specially predominant in Italy and Germany. Its special aim was to remove all monarchical or imperial forms of government. It aimed at what they called universal republicanism. It was the dream of these men, and they called themselves Socialists—what we would call academic Socialists. They spoke of it as a matter to attain by political means, but the real agents in that anti-monarchical socialism were the secret societies in Italy and Germany, which did not hesitate to avail themselves even of the assassin's dagger to accomplish their purpose. They had seen how the King of Italy was assassinated not many years ago, and how the Empress of Austria fell a victim to the same conspiracies. That was what was known as anti-monarchical socialism. Another branch was anti-clericalism. That was especially triumphant in France at the present time. Its greatest object was to clear away the Catholic Church. They thought that, if once they removed the Catholic Church, the world would be at peace, we would have perfect order and perfect republican ideas, and society would attain its end without coming into collision, as it so often did at the present hour, with Catholic principles. In France it had been in a great measure triumphant during the past years, and it seemed bent on achieving, as far as it could, its diabolical purpose, not restricting itself to judicial or just means, but merely to accomplish its end, and banish, as far as it could, the Church from all connection with the State in that country.

The third feature of Continental Socialism was the anarchical.

The Anarchists

were not satisfied with clearing away the monarchy and the Catholic Church; their special aim was to do away with the Ten Commandments. They said if only the Ten Commandments were swept away, then matters would be very peaceful, and people would get on without much trouble here below. He was reminded of a dream that one of those leading Socialists had that was published in one of the papers many years ago. He had a vision—a dream he supposed. Probably he had taken a glass of wine before he went to bed. He dreamed that he had been summoned before the Eternal Judge, and after giving his career in life he got sentenced to go to hell. He replied at once to the Judge, 'But our Parliament has decreed there is no hell.' The Judge replied, 'You go to hell and you will find your Parliament there before you.' When he woke up he thought that was a curious thing. So it was. Men would say, 'Abolish the Ten Commandments,' but whether they were pleased or not, those were the Divine guide given to man, and no matter what man decreed those were the rules they were bound to follow in conscience, and it would be the criterion of their judgment. Besides the anarchists there was a fourth class known as communists. They would put an end to all private property, thinking it would be a great advantage to make use of everything going around, especially those who had nothing of their own, and take advantage and take hold of something that belonged to others. Their aim was to pull down every institution that Christian civilisation had built up in these past 1900 years. It was in that uniformity of ruin, that levelment of all institutions, that they would find their purpose. Well, he said when men stated that these decrees of the Holy Father condemning European Socialism referred to our Australian democracy, they did not understand what they were talking about.

There were several other decrees of the Holy Father years ago which he well remembered, although the younger people present might not. They condemned what was known as

Liberalism.

There was a great hubbub at the time. The Liberals of England protested that the condemnation was levelled at them, and the great Liberal party in Canada felt terribly annoyed. He supposed that those who called themselves Liberals in Australia would say that they also were condemned in those encyclicals. Nothing of the sort. 'It was that false liberalism which was known as Continental Liberalism. It was only another