

In the Shadows of *Vanity*: Religion and the Debate over Hierarchy

J. Daniel Hammond

10-19-06; revised 5-15-07¹

From our very infancy, on the knees of our mothers, we have been taught to believe, that to be a Catholic was to be a false, cruel, and bloody wretch; and “popery and slavery” have been wrung in our ears, till, whether we looked on the Catholics in their private or their public capacity, we have inevitably come to the conclusion, that they were every thing that was vicious and vile (William Cobbett, *A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland*).

Introduction

Religion is in the shadows of Sandra Peart and David Levy’s excellent history of the debate between philosophers and scientists and economists and Evangelicals over race and hierarchy in nineteenth century Britain. Peart and Levy adapt the term “philosopher” from Adam Smith’s statement that “the difference between the most dissimilar characters, between a philosopher and a common street porter, for example, seems to arise not so much from nature, as from habit, custom, and education” (Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, I.2.[4]). In Peart and Levy’s account, the philosophers are members of the English literary establishment such as John Ruskin, Thomas Carlyle, Charles Dickens, and Charles Kingsley. Scientists include James Hunt, founder of the Anthropological Society of London and later professor at Columbia University, naturalist Charles Darwin, and a slew of Darwinists and eugenicists. There is considerable overlap between the Darwinists and

¹ Thanks to Glenn W. Olsen for comments on the previous draft.

eugenicists. Among the individuals who figure prominently are Leonard Darwin, Francis Galton, W. R. Greg, Thomas H. Huxley, and Karl Pearson. The philosophers and scientists believed that humankind is comprised of a hierarchy of races.

Classical economists who adopted Adam Smith's belief in natural equality include J. E. Cairnes, T. R. Malthus, Harriet Martineau, Nassau W. Senior, and most prominently, J. S. Mill. These economists believed that humans come into the world as equals, and as equals share fundamental rights and capacities. The economists were joined in this belief by Evangelical Christians such as William Wilberforce, Hannah More, and other so-called Exeter Hall philanthropists. The practical issues for these groups were slavery, immigration, democracy, and birth control.

Peart and Levy understandably emphasize the debate between economists and their critics. The book's subtitle is "from equality to hierarchy in postclassical economics." It is their aim to explain why a generation of economists after the classical period went over to the side of natural heterogeneity and hierarchy. For instance post-classical economists such as Frank A. Fetter, Irving Fisher, and A. C. Pigou enthusiastically served the cause of scientific eugenics. The Evangelical Christians who were classical economists' allies in the debates over race and slavery play a supporting role to the economists' lead in Peart and Levy's history. Peart and Levy note the correspondence between the Golden Rule of Christianity and the greatest happiness principle of utilitarianism. But this is as far as religion enters the story. No religious groups other than the Evangelicals play a role. Jews figure prominently, but as a racial group, not a religious group. Neither Judaism, nor the Church of England, nor the Roman Catholic Church merit index entries. So religion, which has much to say about what it

means to be human, remains in the shadows of *The “Vanity of the Philosopher.”* The purpose of this paper is to make a start at casting light on the role of religion in the debate over race and hierarchy in 19th century England.

Religion in *Vanity*

J. S. Mill wrote in *Utilitarianism*:

[T]he happiness which forms the utilitarian standard of what is right in conduct, is not the agent’s own happiness, but that of all concerned. As between his own happiness and that of others, utilitarianism requires him to be as strictly impartial as a disinterested and benevolent spectator. In the golden rule of Jesus of Nazareth, we read the complete spirit of the ethics of utility. To do as you would be done by, and to love your neighbor as yourself, constitute the ideal perfection of utilitarian morality (Mill, 218; quoted in P&L, 137-38).

The equation of these two principles was a base of the anti-slavery coalition of Evangelical Christians and utilitarian economists. Another base of the coalition was Adam Smith’s philosophy and economics, which came into the Evangelical anti-slavery movement through William Wilberforce. Wilberforce (1759-1833) was a Tory MP and member of the Evangelical Anglican group known as the Clapham Sect.¹ Wilberforce found in Smith’s economics and philosophy ideas that seemed to complement the Calvinist doctrine of a world permeated by original sin. “To use the terms of an older Christian community, for Wilberforce Adam Smith is an inspired guide to a world without God, a doctor of the Fallen World” (Peart and Levy, 167). All humans are prone

to self-love, the substance of original sin. Therefore, no one is fit to be the master of others.

Peart and Levy juxtapose Robert Fellowes (1770-1847), also an Anglican, against Wilberforce and Hannah More (1745-1833). Hannah More, like Wilberforce, was an Evangelical abolitionist. Fellowes was a hierarchist, but not a racist. He thought that peoples had different capacities for living according to the golden rule. Indeed, they had different capacities for accepting Christianity. Fellowes thought a certain level of civilization was a precondition for Christianity. “For though christianity is fitted to soften the ferocity of barbarians, if they could be brought to listen to its precepts, yet it seems better adapted and received and more likely to be practiced by those who have made some advances in civilization and in the arts of social intercourse” (Fellowes, 1807, 1:126-27; quoted in Peart and Levy, 170). Fellowes was not a Darwinist. He died twelve years before *Origin of the Species* was published. The tie between Fellowes and Darwinists was that he believed in a law of progressive human development (Peart and Levy, 170). The Evangelicals, on the other hand, believed that the doctrine of original sin implied that there had not been any such progressive development of human nature. All people everywhere, past, present, and future, were sinners. The famous Exeter Hall preacher Charles Haddon Spurgeon conveyed the Calvinist message of total depravity to thousands of Englishmen in sermons such as one the delivered March 7, 1858 at the Music Hall, Royal Surrey Gardens:

Permit me to show you wherein this inability of man really does lie. It lies deep in his nature. Through the fall, and through our own sin, the nature of man has become so debased, and depraved, and corrupt, that it is

impossible for him to come to Christ without the assistance of God the Holy Spirit (Spurgeon, 1858).

These are the main loci of religion in Peart and Levy's account. But there are other points of contact scattered through the book. Another of Peart and Levy's prominent subjects, Charles Kingsley, was a clergyman. Cambridge historian and novelist, Anglican clergyman, and chaplain to Queen Victoria, Kingsley appears in the book as an advocate of racial hierarchy and opponent of the economists. His story for children, *Water-Babies*, was about spiritual transformation of the human body through obedience to one's betters. Other clergymen include geneticist and Catholic priest Gregor Mendel, who appears briefly in Leonard Darwin's comment that it would have been shocking for Mendel to visit his father Charles Darwin. Presumably, Mendel would have been unsettled by Darwin's theory of evolution. Francis W. Newman, brother of Cardinal (John Henry) Newman, was one of the reformers parodied in the Cope's Tobacco literature, which Peart and Levy cover in chapter eight, "Who Are the Canters." Newman is mentioned for having written on economics and, as a Christian, for not being a neo-Malthusian (birth control advocate). T. R. Malthus, himself an Anglican clergyman, approved of delay of marriage rather than artificial birth control for control of population. Further along chronologically in the history, Peart and Levy consider S. J. Holmes's (1939), presidential address to the American Eugenics Society, where he identifies Catholics such as G. K. Chesterton,² as being among the few opponents of eugenics. Holmes's "list comprised: a poet, a libertarian lawyer, a Catholic literary figure, and a dead classical economist. ... Early opposition to eugenic 'science' was remarkably thin" (Peart and Levy, 118).

The Shadows of *Vanity*

Peart and Levy's book traces the analytical use of sympathy in economics from Adam Smith through the classical period, and its loss in the post-classical period, when many economists embraced eugenics. They are currently exploring the foundations of Smith's belief that sympathy is a universal component of human nature, and that, to recall Smith's example, the philosopher is fundamentally no different from and no better than the street porter (Levy and Peart, 2006). Levy and Peart find the foundations of Smith's use of sympathy in Stoic philosophy. Following the Stoics, Smith elevated the ordinary experience of living one's life to the level of the specialized expertise such as a philosopher might possess.

In addition to looking back in history for Adam Smith's sources, it is instructive to look to the side, to the shadows of the eighteenth and nineteenth century English religious landscape. During the period covered in *Vanity* Britain was officially a Christian nation with a state church, the Church of England. Englishmen were supposed to be Christian and to live by the Golden Rule. But even so, who is one's neighbor? During at least part of the period Britain was de facto a Christian nation as well. Owing to the political nature of the English reformation, and the national political threat perceived by many of the English from Roman Catholicism, Catholicism may have played a larger role in the debates over racial hierarchy than would be suggested by the Roman Catholic proportion of the English population and clergy.³ Catholicism may be, in the words of that eminent Victorian, Sherlock Holmes, the dog that did not bark.

In November 1534 Parliament passed the Act of Royal Supremacy, which made Henry VIII the supreme head of the Church in England. Initially the Anglican break with

Rome was a matter of governance only, not doctrine. Henry had written *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum* (1521), a defense of the Catholic Church's seven sacraments against Lutheranism, for which Pope Leo X declared Henry *Fidei Defensor* (Defender of the Faith). However, as the Act gave the king authority "to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend all such errors, heresies, abuses, offences, contempts, and enormities, whatsoever they be," the way was cleared for doctrinal separation from Rome (Gee and Hardy, 1921, p. 244). Three of the king's advisers and agents in the break from Rome, Thomas Cromwell, Thomas Cranmer, and Edward Seymour, were in sympathy with Protestant doctrines from the continent, and the English schism soon took on doctrinal hues. The Treasons Act, also of 1534, declared it high treason, punishable by loss of property and death, for anyone to call the king "heretic, schismatic, tyrant, infidel or usurper of the crown" (Gee and Hardy, 1921, p. 248).

With the succession of Edward VI in 1547 the pace of doctrinal and liturgical change accelerated. Cranmer was the chief author of the *Book of Common Prayer*, whereby a communion service replaced the Latin mass. Catholic practices such as pilgrimages, and sacramentals such as the blessing of ashes were suppressed. In 1553 Forty-two Articles of Anglican Faith became law under Edward. Some of the articles, such as those on the Trinity and Christ's resurrection, concerned doctrine shared by Anglicans and Catholics. Other articles bore the marks of Swiss and German Protestantism, explicitly denying Catholic doctrine and practices.⁴ After Mary (1553-58) became Queen, the Act of Royal Supremacy was repealed, and England once again was

officially Catholic. Elizabeth (1558-1603) restored Protestantism, and throughout her reign Anglicanism became increasingly Calvinist.

The political nature of the English reformation is seen in the executions of Englishmen by their government in the name of the nation's religion as England shifted from Catholicism to Protestantism to Catholicism and back to Protestantism. As Gairdner (1908) observed, heresy and sedition were virtually interchangeable. From Elizabeth's reign until 1778 English Catholics had virtually no religious freedom or civil rights. Under Elizabeth it was treasonous for an English subject to obtain Roman Catholic holy orders abroad and return to England. Giving aid to a person who did so was a capital offense. Catholic parents were forbidden from giving their children religious instruction outside their Anglican parish church. A Catholic who did not attend Anglican services was subject to a fine of twenty pounds per lunar month.⁵ Under William and Mary (1689-1702) the restrictions on Catholics became less severe but more likely to be enforced. There was a 100 pound reward for anyone who aided in the arrest of a popish priest or bishop, and life imprisonment for any man convicted of holding holy orders in the Church of Rome. All Catholic subjects who reached the age of eighteen were required to take an Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy.

In 1778, two years after Smith's *Wealth of Nations* was published, Parliament passed the first Act for Catholic Relief. This began a gradual restoration of religious freedom and civil rights to Catholics. Among the concessions, Catholics were allowed to own and inherit land and their Protestant next-of-kin no longer had the right to enter and use their estate. A second Catholic Relief Act was passed in 1791, significantly restoring

religious liberty. With the Catholic Relief Act of 1829 emancipation came close to being complete.

The Act of Union united Ireland with England in 1800, introducing to British public life a second fusion of religion and nationalism. Although Ireland gained about one-fifth of the seats in the House of Commons, the Test Act all but prohibited Catholics from occupying the seats until its repeal in 1828-29. Soon after Dublin lawyer Daniel O’Connell was elected to Parliament in 1828, there began an Irish movement for repeal of the Act of Union and full Irish independence. Meanwhile the potato famine in the 1840s led to massive Irish immigration to England. In 1849 the inflow of Irish immigrants was 4,000 per week (Klaus, p. 25). The Irish population of England swelled, especially in midland cities and London. Like their English fellow countrymen, the newly arrived Irish may have been more or less devout, but their church was part of their national identity.

“We’ll get a rope, and hang the Pope”

The Irish question looms large in Peart and Levy’s history, primarily as a racial issue, to a lesser extent as a national issue, but not as a religious issue. Were the Irish a devolved race? Were they capable of self-government? Would they respond to incentives to become more productive, or did they require direction from their betters? The Irish caricatures in *Vanity* are of a people who are primitive and brutish, impulsive and void of self-control. Peart and Levy reproduce anti-Fenian illustrations by John Tenniel from *Punch*. One shows Paddy being given the boot by John Bull for his support of Jamaicans who had been hanged. In another Paddy is being whipped by his mistress Britannia. The apelike Irishman holds a pennant proclaiming “Fennianism For Ever.” These two

illustrations reveal the racial and the nationalistic side of anti-Irish sentiments. Another illustration in *Vanity* is George Cruikshank's picture of Irish bacchanalia in the palace of the Bishop of Ferns during the 1798 Rebellion⁶ (from Maxwell, 1845). Like the whipping of the Fennian, this picture concerns the Irish threat to British sovereignty. Peart and Levy do not remark on the revelry being set in the Catholic bishop's palace.

Racial, national, and religious matters were intertwined in English attitudes toward the Irish, French, and Italians. During the Papal State war of 1860-61 "Punch" wrote a letter to George Bowyer, Esq., M.P. in consolation for the disloyalty of Irish troops in the Papal Brigade.⁷

As the Pope's Knight-errant, I wonder you have not come forward to break a lance with those unworthy Irishmen – those bad Catholics – who, having apostatized from the Papal brigade and sneaked home, go about complaining of the usage which they experienced in the service of his Holiness. It seems that I must do the Holy Father's business for you. ...

They complain that some of their number were shot for breach of discipline. If so, had they not the friars of San Giovanni Decollato to confess them; and did they not therefore go to paradise? They even murmur because some of them were flogged. Their grievance was a privilege. How many holy men are continually whipping one another; how many are obliged to whip themselves, not having anyone whom they can trust to perform that pious office for them! The ungrateful grumblers ought to have kissed the cat-of-nine-tails which "whipped the offending

Adam out of them.” Excuse me for quoting a heretical poet (*Punch*, August 4, 1860, p. 41).

It is reported that when Italian Risorgimento hero Giuseppe Garibaldi visited London in April 1864 thousands of children lined the streets chanting:

“We’ll get a rope,
And hang the Pope:
So up with Garibaldi!

A year after the tragic Irish potato famine, *Punch* published a “letter to the editor” from “Verax”:

Sir,

In refutation of the calumny that ascribes to the Roman Catholic priesthood an influence unfavourable to the political and social advancement of a nation under its control, allow me to refer you to the history and present state of Ireland – subjects whereon the most extraordinary misconceptions prevail.

Before St. Patrick converted the Irish to the holy faith of Rome, they were a set of miserable savages, but one degree elevated above the brute. Indeed, they are said to have gone actually on all fours; but I will not venture to vouch for the correctness of this last assertion; being scrupulously anxious to confine all my statements strictly to fact. ...

At the present moment we behold, in that blessed land, a spectacle of moral elevation and material greatness. Fields waving with corn attest to the perfection of agriculture. Inexhaustible peat bogs, by the aid of

chemistry and capital, are converted into mines, yielding boundless wealth.

...

But, foremost among the attributes which render Ireland a model nation, is that noble sentiment which abhors and scorns deceit, prevarication, and falsehood. If there is any one trait which distinguishes the Irish character, it is scrupulous adherence to veracity. (*Punch*, vol. 20, 1851).

In the 1830s and 1840s the Catholic presence in England grew, both from Irish immigration and prominent conversions of Anglican clergy coming out of the Oxford Movement. In 1850 the Vatican restored the Catholic Hierarchy in England, making Irishman Nicholas Patrick Wiseman, Cardinal and Archbishop of Westminster. The restoration with an Irishman holding the see of Westminster was referred to by Protestants as the ‘papal aggression.’ Cardinal Wiseman was burned in effigy on Guy Fawkes Day, November 5, 1850. *Mr. Punch* asked what:

His Holiness [would] say to a negro metropolitan – say a black Archbishop of Charlestown, with jurisdiction over South Carolina particularly, and in general over the whole of the Southern States of America? Make the man a Cardinal as well; give him a scarlet hat, carefully engaging him, of course, not to go hop in it. Here would be a fine opportunity of reading the Yankees a lesson of humility, -- of proclaiming the great Catholic dogma of the essential equality of the human race, -- and, withal, of dealing a heavy blow at slavery. Will the only answer to

this suggestion be, that the idea of making a nigger a Prince of the Church, is too ridiculous? (*Punch*, vol. 19, 1850)

All God's Children

Mr. Punch was onto something, for the brotherhood of the entire human race was a Catholic doctrine. This principle is repeated over and over in papal encyclicals, and having been forcibly removed from the Catholic Church by the English reformers under Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth, the English people were for 300 years outside the ambit of the Catholic magisterium.

Just three years after Henry's break with Rome, Pope Paul III spoke directly to the issue that concerned 19th century post-Darwin elitists:

The Sublime God so loved the human race that He created man in such wise that he might participate, not only in the good that other creatures enjoy, but endowed him with capacity to attain to the inaccessible and invisible Supreme Good and behold it face to face; and since man, according to the testimony of the sacred scriptures, has been created to enjoy eternal life and happiness, which none may obtain save through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, it is necessary that he should possess the nature and faculties enabling him to receive that faith; and that whoever is thus endowed should be capable of receiving that same faith. Nor is it credible that any one should possess so little understanding as to desire the faith and yet be destitute of the most necessary faculty to enable him to receive it. Hence Christ, who is the Truth itself, that has never failed and can never fail, said to the preachers of the faith whom He chose for that office

'Go ye and teach all nations.' He said all, without exception, for all are capable of receiving the doctrines of the faith.

The enemy of the human race, who opposes all good deeds in order to bring men to destruction, beholding and envying this, invented a means never before heard of, by which he might hinder the preaching of God's word of Salvation to the people: he inspired his satellites who, to please him, have not hesitated to publish abroad that the Indians of the West and the South, and other people of whom We have recent knowledge should be treated as dumb brutes created for our service, pretending that they are incapable of receiving the Catholic Faith.

We, who, though unworthy, exercise on earth the power of our Lord and seek with all our might to bring those sheep of His flock who are outside into the fold committed to our charge, consider, however, that the Indians are truly men and that they are not only capable of understanding the Catholic Faith but, according to our information, they desire exceedingly to receive it. Desiring to provide ample remedy for these evils, We define and declare by these Our letters, or by any translation thereof signed by any notary public and sealed with the seal of any ecclesiastical dignitary, to which the same credit shall be given as to the originals, that, notwithstanding whatever may have been or may be said to the contrary, the said Indians and all other people who may later be discovered by Christians, are by no means to be deprived of their liberty or the possession of their property, even though they be outside the faith of Jesus

Christ; and that they may and should, freely and legitimately, enjoy their liberty and the possession of their property; nor should they be in any way enslaved; should the contrary happen, it shall be null and have no effect.

(Sublimes Dei, 1537).

Several popes, over an extended period, condemned slavery: Pius II in 1462, Paul III in 1537, Urban VIII in 1639, and Benedict XIV in 1741. In 1815 Pius VII demanded that the Congress of Vienna halt the slave trade. Pius IX, who was hanged in effigy for restoring the Catholic hierarchy to England, called trade in slaves “supreme villainy.” *(New Advent, “Slavery and Christianity”)*. His predecessor, Gregory XVI, wrote that before God, slaves and their masters are equals:

Placed at the summit of the Apostolic power and, although lacking in merits, holding the place of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Who, being made Man through utmost Charity, deigned to die for the Redemption of the World, We have judged that it belonged to Our pastoral solicitude to exert Ourselves to turn away the Faithful from the inhuman slave trade in Negroes and all other men. Assuredly, since there was spread abroad, first of all amongst the Christians, the light of the Gospel, these miserable people, who in such great numbers, and chiefly through the effects of wars, fell into very cruel slavery, experienced an alleviation of their lot.

Inspired in fact by the Divine Spirit, the Apostles, it is true, exhorted the slaves themselves to obey their masters, according to the flesh, as though obeying Christ, and sincerely to accomplish the Will of God; but they ordered the masters to act well towards slaves, to give them

what was just and equitable, and to abstain from menaces, knowing that the common Master both of themselves and of the slaves is in Heaven, and that with Him there is no distinction of persons.

We reprove, then, by virtue of Our Apostolic Authority, all the practices abovementioned as absolutely unworthy of the Christian name. By the same Authority We prohibit and strictly forbid any Ecclesiastic or lay person from presuming to defend as permissible this traffic in Blacks under no matter what pretext or excuse, or from publishing or teaching in any manner whatsoever, in public or privately, opinions contrary to what We have set forth in this Apostolic Letter (Gregory XVI, *In Supremo Apostolatus*, 1839).

Leo XIII wrote several encyclicals bearing on human equality and slavery. In 1888 he wrote of the brotherhood of man:

The impartiality of law and the true brotherhood of man were first asserted by Jesus Christ; and His apostles re-echoed His voice when they declared that in future there was to be neither Jew, nor Gentile, nor barbarian, nor Scythian, but all were brothers in Christ (Leo XIII, *Libertas*, 1888).

In 1890 Leo wrote to the Catholic missionaries in Africa:

The maternal love of the Catholic Church embraces all people. As you know, venerable brother, the Church from the beginning sought to completely eliminate slavery, whose wretched yoke has oppressed many people. It is the industrious guardian of the teachings of its Founder who, by His words and those of the apostles, taught men the fraternal necessity

which unites the whole world. From Him we recall that everybody has sprung from the same source, was redeemed by the same ransom, and is called to the same eternal happiness (Leo XIII, *Catholicae Ecclesiae*, 1890).

Conclusion

From the beginning of the English Reformation, Anglicanism was a *mélange*. Soon after Henry rebelled against papal authority, Protestant currents from Switzerland and Germany swept through England. By 1800 there were at least three “churches” within the Anglican Communion: the Low Church, of Evangelical Anglicans, the High Church, of Anglo-Catholics, and the Broad Church, of Latitudinarians. From the first group, the Evangelicals, came abolitionists such as William Wilberforce and Hannah More, and the Clapham Sect. This group tended to interpret the Bible literally. The second group included John Henry Newman, E.B. Pusey, Henry Edward Manning and others associated with the Oxford Movement. From the High Church there were at mid-century prominent conversions to Roman Catholicism, including Newman and Manning, both of whom became Roman Catholic cardinals. Manning was the second Archbishop of Westminster, from 1865 until his death in 1892. The Broad Church was the party to which many Anglican intellectuals belonged, including John Ruskin, Thomas Carlyle, and Charles Kingsley. They tended to be rationalistic and, heavily influenced by biology and geology, regarded Evangelicals’ literal reading of the Bible as simple-minded.

What united these diverse groups was their Englishness. When Henry broke from Rome, declaring himself Supreme Head of the Church in England, Roman Catholicism became “foreign” and the Pope became a foreign adversarial head of church and state.

Moreover, the Church in England, to become the Church of England, was left without a magisterium. Anglican clergy and laypersons were on their own to interpret the Gospel and apply it to issues of the day. The result was twofold. When popes invoked the Catholic Church's apostolic authority to condemn slavery the English people were unlikely to receive the news, for it was not from their Church. And to the extent that information of the papal exhortation reached England, the pope's apostolic authority there was nullified by British law. If Englishmen were to conclude that slavery was wrong, or that African Blacks and Irish were their brothers, this would be on grounds other than exhortation from the Catholic Church. Not being in communion with the Church of Rome, Anglicans were without doctrinal protection from the very human temptation to treat only those humans who are like us as our brothers.

Being outside Catholic Europe, the English also lacked protection from the rationalistic idea that science and religion were incompatible. Within Anglicanism there was a divide between the Evangelicals, who placed their faith in the Bible, and the Broad Churchmen, who were willing to mold their faith to the dictates of science. For Catholics, on the other hand, there was no incompatibility between faith and science, or more broadly between faith and reason. Pope Leo XIII wrote in his encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (1893):

There can never, indeed, be any real discrepancy between the theologian and the physicist, as long as each confines himself within his own lines, and both are careful, as St. Augustine warns us, "not to make rash assertions, or to assert what is not known as known."

Leo quoted St. Augustine's rule for theologians regarding natural science:

Whatever they can really demonstrate to be true of physical nature, we must show to be capable of reconciliation with our Scriptures; and whatever they assert in their treatises which is contrary to these Scriptures of ours, that is to Catholic faith, we must either prove it as well as we can to be entirely false, or at all events we must, without the smallest hesitation, believe it to be so.

Commenting on English “theophobia,” Catholic convert and polymath, Sir Bertram Windle, wrote, “To set up science as an ‘unknown God’ seems a curious choice, even more curious than the choice of humanity, which – pitiable object as it is – was at least made in the image of God” (1919, 49).

References

- The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1907, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/index.html>.
- Chesterton, G. K. "Eugenics and Other Evils." 1922, in vol. 4, *The Collected Works of G.K. Chesterton*, San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986.
- Cobbett, William. *A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland*. London: Pickering & Chatto, (1824) 1998.
- Gairdner, James. *Lollardy and the Reformation in England; an Historical Survey*. London: Macmillan, 1908.
- Gee, Henry, and William John Hardy. *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*. London: Macmillan, 1921.
- Holmes, S. J. "The Opposition to Eugenics." *Science* n.s., 89 (o.s., 2312): 351-57.
- Kingsley, Charles. *The Water-Babies: A Fairy Tale for a Land-Baby*. London and New York: Macmillan, 1863.
- Klaus, Robert J. *The Pope, the Protestants, and the Irish: Papal Aggression and Anti-Catholicism in Mid-Nineteenth Century England*. New York and London: Garland, 1987.
- Levy, David M. and Sandra J. Peart, "Adam Smith & His Sources: The Evil of Independence," June 20, 2006.
- Maxwell, W. H. *History of the Irish Rebellion in 1798: With Memoirs of the Union, and Emmett's Insurrection in 1803*. London: Baily Brothers, 1845.
- Mill, John Stuart. *Utilitarianism* [1861], Vol. 5 of *Collected Works of John Stuart Mill*, ed. John M. Robson, 441-62. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969.

Norman, Edward. *The English Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Papal Encyclicals Online. <http://www.papalencyclicals.net>

Peart, Sandra J. and David M. Levy, *The "Vanity of the Philosopher": From Equality to Hierarchy in Postclassical Economics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005.

"Popery and Progress," *Punch*. 1851.

"The Pope's Irish Ragamuffins," *Punch*. August 4, 1860, p. 41.

Smith, Adam, *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, ed. W. B. Todd, Oxford: Clarendon Press, [1776] 1976.

Spurgeon, C. H. A Sermon, (No. 182), Delivered on Sabbath Morning, March 7, 1858 at the Music Hall, Royal Surrey Gardens.

<http://www.spurgeon.org/sermons/0182.htm>

Windle, Sir Bertram C. A. *Science and Morals and Other Essays*. London: Burns & Oates, 1919.

¹ Among other members of the Clapham Sect was the banker/economist Henry Thornton.

² See Chesterton (1922).

³ In 1850 there were 788 Catholic clergy in England and Wales; 168 in the London district. In an 1851 religious census, Catholics made up roughly 3.5 percent of all persons attending church (Norman, p. 205-6).

⁴ Sola fide (articles 11, 12, and 13); errors in matters of faith by the Church of Rome (article 20); denial of the doctrine of purgatory (article 23); prohibition of the use of Latin (article 25); denial of five of the seven sacraments (article 26); and the claim that the doctrine of transubstantiation “is repugnant to the plaine woordes of Scripture” (article 29); and renunciation of clerical celibacy (article 31).

⁵ There being thirteen lunar months in a year.

⁶ Catholic Diocese of Ferns, province of Leinster.

⁷ M.P. for Dundalk, Co. Louth. Bowyer was an English baronet, lawyer and, in his youth, member of the Oxford Movement. He converted to Catholicism in August 1850 and served as constitutional adviser to Cardinal Manning.