

### III

#### THE SOCIETY OF THE CATHOLIC COMMONWEALTH

##### 1. American Christian Marxists (1939-48)

The Society of the Catholic Commonwealth was born in controversy. A few days after the professions on October 19, 1939, long articles on the new community, including photographs of the newly professed in their habits, appeared in Boston newspapers. The articles included an interview with Smyth, outlining the new society's purposes, both religious and political, and suggesting a close relationship with Christ Church and its rector, C. Leslie Glenn.<sup>1</sup> Glenn was embarrassed and outraged. Time magazine began to make plans for an article on the new Christian-Marxist community but Glenn intervened to prevent it. He informed the bishop that he would not renew Smyth's permission to work in the parish.<sup>2</sup>

Smyth, however, found a friend in James DeWolf Perry, bishop of Rhode Island, former presiding bishop of the Episcopal church and J.F. Russell's uncle. Perry mediated among Smyth, Glenn and the bishop of Massachusetts, Henry Knox Sherrill, and eventually became the Society's episcopal visitor. Relations with Christ Church gradually diminished so that eventually the community functioned without any reference to the parish. Sherrill and successive

bishops of Massachusetts continued to renew Smyth's license to officiate as a priest in the diocese yearly until his death. Smyth never became canonically resident in the diocese.<sup>3</sup>

In terms of a traditional monastic life with members under vows, the first year of the S.C.C. was its most stable and developed. The four members settled into a routine in which Smyth spent his time reading, writing and attending political and labour events; Russell continued his community and labour organizing activities; and Brothers Paul and Francis ran the household. The four joined together in a daily Eucharist and three short daily offices. They received encouragement from a sympathetic article on the community in Christian Century in May 1940.<sup>4</sup>

Difficulties, however, soon developed. The financial burden of the oratory increased and Smyth found that he and Russell could not bear it alone. The burden was increased by a \$10,000 loan to E.A. Brown in 1938 to set up his private practice and the \$1,750 subsidy required to publish Manhood Into God. Smyth began to consider moving the oratory to an income-producing farm or working as a salaried parish priest. The search for a parish continued for the next three years.<sup>5</sup>

However, the different expectations of the four members of the community also came into conflict. Russell, always more interested in political and labour organizing

than the religious life, moved out in the spring of 1940 to take up full-time labour organizing. The parting was amicable and Russell continued to work with and support the oratory. In the fall of 1940, Brothers Paul and Francis, alarmed at Smyth's increasingly radical political activities and always more interested in the religious life than theology or politics, declined to renew their vows. They moved to Roxbury and reestablished themselves as the Brothers of St. Paul. Smyth was left as the sole member of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth.<sup>6</sup>

The formation of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth took place two months after the Soviet-Nazi non-aggression pact and the dissolution of the Popular Front, a time of major crisis for the Communist left in the U.S. The non-aggression pact, the Soviet invasions of Poland and Finland and the U.S. Communist Party's decision to renounce the Popular Front and advocate non-intervention in the war left many on the American left, both Communist and non-Communist, feeling deeply betrayed. At a time when U.S. Communists, including leading intellectuals such as Granville Hicks, were leaving the party by the thousands and others on the left, such as Reinhold Niebuhr, were strongly denouncing Soviet perfidy, Smyth was attempting to build a religious community with a basic commitment to a Marxist political and economic stance, including support of the

Soviet Union. That Smyth actively advocated the new Communist Party position of non-intervention in the war did not make matters easier.

Smyth's decision to support the new Communist Party position did not come easily and caused conflict within the Oratory. Smyth's European perspective contributed to the decision. Aware of the sympathy of some in the British government towards fascism, Smyth feared that the war was really a "capitalist plot" to extend fascism to England and the U.S. In responding to John Wild's opposition to non-intervention in July 1940, Smyth cites the example of France, where French fascists supported war with Germany as a way to ensure a German victory. Smyth continues,

The Capitalists [sic] classes in the so-called "democracies" are deliberately working to fasten Fascism and Nazism upon the rest of us, and the way they will do it --indeed the only way they can do it at this juncture, is to get us into war.

He doubts the sincerity of Americans such as James Conant at Harvard or William Manning, Episcopal bishop of New York, who are advocating intervention. He warns Wild that the situation is a crisis, even at Harvard:

. . . I think you have not brought yourself to see how truly dangerous the situation is right under our noses. it is under cover [of] excitement and fear, from whatever source, that our Capitalists will do--even now seek to do--their evil work of giving us a Fascist regime. I think they may succeed, even within a year. I think you may find Harvard quite in the position of the German Universities--but this will tickle Conant half to death. It is what he is working for.

Smyth distrusted any talk of "saving democracy" or "saving

civilization" coming from those on the political right. "We must keep away from this war", Smyth concludes in his letter to Wild, "It is a war deliberately plotted in order to spread Nazism throughout the western world!"<sup>7</sup> Despite Smyth's arguments, Wild boycotted the oratory during the non-interventionist period.<sup>8</sup>

Smyth put forward a similar view in a speech at a Radcliffe forum on December 12, 1940. He explains that he is not an absolute pacifist but believes that the present effort does not meet the criteria of a just war in Thomist theory. He affirms democracy as humanity's "free and effectual participation in control of [its] own social and economic processes" but argues that both sides in the war are opposed to genuine democracy. U.S. business interests support the war not in the interests of democracy but because they see it as a solution to unemployment, falling profits, inability to use accumulated capital, poor distribution of wealth and the rising power of labour. He likens American business leaders to Hitler and Mussolini:

I think our economic & industrial leaders (like Hitler & Mussolini), welcome war, not for democracy at all, but because it gives them arbitrary power to solve these other problems under a false veil of "patriotism".

Smyth cites business pressure to regulate labour, outlaw strikes and guarantee profits in war industries. He argues that at this point the war is really in the interest of fascism rather than democracy.

At the end of the speech, Smyth's notes put forward the conditions under which he would support the war:

With a genuinely popular socialist labour government (or system) in England

With a popularly & democratically controlled political & economic system here at home (including our foreign policy)

With an England willing to liberate India & a United States willing to enter into full & friendly relations with the Soviet Union for the support of the Chinese people in their war for liberation against Japan.

Smyth concludes by affirming that all of the the above conditions are achievable but when they are achieved there will be no war to fight.<sup>9</sup> In a similar vein, Smyth urged a Quincy, Mass. Congress of Industrial Organizations (C.I.O.) housing meeting in February 1941 not to be deceived into giving up democratic rights of organization, strikes and demonstrations for the "'sacrifice'" of war, a "hellish kind of shortcut" to employment.<sup>10</sup>

Smyth joined the American Peace Mobilization, successor to the American League for Peace and Democracy, and took a major part in state and national A.P.M. activities, including public meetings and radio broadcasts. On March 27, 1941 he presided and spoke at the Massachusetts Peace Rally Against War at Symphony Hall, Boston. In early April, as Massachusetts chairperson of the A.P.M., he led a state delegation of 400 to the American People's Peace Meeting in New York. On May 11, he picketed the White House in the "Eternal Peace Vigil". A picture of Smyth holding his pla-

card at the White House fence appeared in the Daily Worker. By June Smyth was on the National Executive Council of the A.P.M. and chair of its National Religious Committee.<sup>11</sup>

During late 1940 and early 1941, Smyth was joined at the oratory by Ed Seldon, a former Harvard student from the Quincy Street period, who had recently returned to Cambridge. Seldon shared Smyth's political views and joined the Young Communist League. Seldon recalls that on party orders, he and Smyth worked in different groups. He and Smyth were not uncritical of the Communist Party line (particularly on Finland) but Smyth remained committed to the position that Christians had to ally themselves with the most radical political group available; for Smyth, that group was the Communist Party, given its influence, reputation and unambiguous commitment to revolutionary socialism.<sup>12</sup>

Smyth developed close personal relations with some of the leadership of the Communist Party in Boston. Seldon remembers Smyth returning from a meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in New England, which he proudly attended in his clerical collar.<sup>13</sup> On December 14, 1940, Smyth spoke at a testimonial dinner for Philip Frankfeld, secretary of the Communist Party of Massachusetts:

Fortunately we are here to pay tribute to a definite objective, material man, one who combines excellently in himself, his principles & theories with his practice. This is what really counts. This is what gives this occasion its peculiarly invigorating flavour.<sup>14</sup>

A few days later, Frankfeld wrote Smyth:

In your person, we see a Christian who practices and symbolizes Christianity, Father Smythe [sic]. . . . As an atheist I want to say, that in your teachings, your complete selflessness, your extreme modesty, your quiet, unpublicized and daily work and life -- the story of Christ assumes a living expression in you. Your courage and fearlessness flows out of your convictions.

Frankfeld had been clearly moved by his discussions with

Smyth:

It was indeed a great honor & greater pleasure knowing you and discussing social and political questions with you, Father Smythe. I sincerely hope that my present assignment will not last too long in Phila[delphia] so that we could renew our friendship.<sup>15</sup>

Frankfeld's warmth was in sharp contrast to the response Smyth usually met in the Episcopal church. While there is no clear evidence that Smyth joined the Communist Party, Seldon believes that at this time Smyth was at least a "token" kind of member, maintaining close personal relations with party members and having access to decision-making groups.<sup>16</sup> It is also clear that at this point Smyth did not require Communist Party members who joined the S.C.C. to give up their party membership.<sup>17</sup>

Smyth's account of the S.C.C.'s activities in a letter to an inquirer, Richard Young, in March 1941, clearly describe the activist character of the Oratory:

. . . we are becoming increasingly concerned with political and labor union matters. We go into all sorts of groups, political, social, and labor, as opportunity offers, and we concern ourselves with helping the working people of our environment in their effort to organize, to assert their political and economic strength, and thus to broaden and deepen the democratic processes of our national life.



Smyth saw this work as revolutionary: "The reason why we have banded together as a religious Society is that we are convinced that a Catholic Revolution (if one may call it thus) must be lived, as well as talked about in advance."<sup>18</sup>

As Smyth's Radcliffe talk indicated, he was open to changing his position on entry into the war if the world situation changed. It did so dramatically on June 22, 1941 with the German invasion of the Soviet Union. Richard Young, then trying his vocation at the oratory, remembers Smyth's announcement at mass the next morning that he now supported U.S. intervention in the war because "this is a people's war now".<sup>19</sup> On June 27, Smyth wrote Roosevelt on behalf of the National Religious Committee of the A.P.M., demanding "genuine assistance to the Soviet Union and United China". Within the A.P.M. Smyth argued that the group ought to "fold up" as the war had taken on a new character with the entry of the Soviet Union into it.<sup>20</sup> The American Peace Mobilization became the American People's Mobilization and soon dissolved.

With the entry of the Soviet Union into the war, Smyth became active in the Massachusetts Committee for Russian War Relief. He also became acting chairperson of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder. Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party in the U.S., was imprisoned by the U.S. government on a passport violation. Smyth de-

fended Browder's cause in a radio broadcast in early 1942.<sup>21</sup> In July 1942, Smyth organized a petition drive to the State Ballot Law Commission of Massachusetts against William H. MacMasters' attempt to keep the Communist Party off the ballot in Massachusetts. In August, he joined the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges.<sup>22</sup>

After U.S. entry into the war in December 1941, Smyth strongly supported Roosevelt's foreign policy of armed resistance to fascism. In June 1942, he addressed a Student Christian Movement gathering of 190 delegates in East Sebago, Maine. He opposed the pacifist position of the S.C.M. leadership and Norman Thomas. Smyth describes the scene in a letter to a friend:

I ended up with a ringing call for full participation in the war and full backing of our country's foreign policy. This had the effect of a bombshell thrown into a dove-cote. It also enabled much of the inarticulate opposition which had been smouldering against the official leadership to come out into the open.

Smyth is very critical of the S.C.M.:

It is my opinion that these student conferences are deliberately devised to confuse as many young people as the SCM can reach. They are culturally perfectly poisonous, with all their horrid sentimentality, their singing on beaches in the dark, their telling of mild and "religious" jokes, their anaemic sexuality (always in the background) their blithering, mawkish hymns and prayers. There is no reforming this sort of thing, there is no working with it. It is part of the whole apparatus of middle class Fascist reaction, and it has simply got to be destroyed.<sup>23</sup>

Smyth was consistently critical of sentimental bourgeois Christianity that could not take difficult stands.

Smyth and the Oratory also continued to build links with the labour movement. In November and December 1941, the oratory basement served as headquarters for a strike by 50 members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of the C.I.O. against a nearby dry cleaners. Smyth reprinted "The Church Needs Organized Labor" and had it translated into Armenian and Yiddish. Smyth also spoke at a variety of labour meetings and rallies.<sup>24</sup>

In the early forties, Smyth and the S.C.C. came to the attention of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In May 1941, an F.B.I. agent who as a student at Brown University in 1937 had heard Smyth lecture on Christian revolution at St. Stephen's, Providence, urged the Boston F.B.I. office to investigate Smyth. The investigation began, encouraged by authorities at Harvard who were unhappy with Smyth's influence on Harvard students. Agents placed the Oratory under surveillance and interviewed its neighbours, Harvard, Radcliffe and M.I.T. faculty and administration, an official of the Episcopal church and former oratory residents.<sup>25</sup>

The investigation eventually included numerous interviews with classmates and faculty from Hamilton and M.I.T., colleagues from Washington and informants within the Communist Party; investigation of Smyth's birth, academic, financial, military and passport records; sending an F.B.I. agent posing as an inquirer to the oratory and assigning an agent to read Manhood Into God. F.B.I. reports noted that

Smyth "claims to be a clergyman" and that the oratory "combines a certain amount of incense swinging and Communistic doctrines". Reports also noted that Smyth "looks as though he has some colored blood" and repeated numerous rumours about his homosexuality. Reports documented in great detail Smyth's association with "Communist front" groups.<sup>26</sup>

From Smyth's F.B.I. file, it is clear that the Harvard administration and many of Smyth's former associates actively cooperated in the investigation. At first the F.B.I. regarded Smyth with some seriousness but by April 1943 concluded that he was "more odd than dangerous". However, in response to continuing complaints, they continued the investigation. In July 1943, J. Edgar Hoover recommended that Smyth be "considered for custodial detention in view of the existing emergency" and at the end of 1943 the Boston F.B.I. office placed him on their "Key Figure List".<sup>27</sup> Throughout the file Smyth is labelled a "Communist" although the F.B.I. was never able to find legal proof of membership in the party. The investigation dwindled in the late forties but continued sporadically into the early fifties. As public pressure increased in the late forties and early fifties to find Communists (Smyth was named in Herbert A. Philbrick's I Led 3 Lives), the file was re-opened and agents dug further and further back into Smyth's personal history. Smyth knew about the F.B.I. investigation but paid little attention.<sup>28</sup>

The failure of the traditional religious life to develop after the S.C.C.'s first year was alleviated by the organization of a group of oratory "associates" in December 1940.<sup>29</sup> Within a year, they were totally integrated into full membership of the S.C.C. as "members secular". They came from both Harvard and the broader community. From this time onwards, the S.C.C. had two kinds of membership: "members regular", male laity or clergy living in the oratory under annual threefold monastic vows, and "members secular", laity or clergy, men or women, single or married, living outside the oratory but committed to the Society's theology and program. Both types of members had full voting rights in chapter but the office of superior was limited to the regular membership.<sup>30</sup> Smyth remained the sole regular member until 1950 and superior until his death in 1960. The secular membership, however, slowly grew.

The development of the secular membership and the concept of S.C.C. "cells" was at least partly shaped in reaction to the Malvern Declaration concept of Christian "cells". The Church of England conference on Christianity and the economic order, held in Malvern in January 1941, declared capitalism and Christianity incompatible. In February 1941, Smyth and Seldon attended a Church League for Industrial Democracy event in New Haven on Malvern. Smyth supported the declaration but pointed out that the "cells" the conference recommended were but study groups and there-

fore unlikely to bring about real change. The Malvern concept of cell forced Smyth to clarify his own ideas about the work of revolutionary Christian cells.<sup>31</sup> These were set down in successive issues of the handbook, Society of the Catholic Commonwealth, commonly called the "Red Book", first published in December 1941.

In early January 1941, Smyth published his first book, Manhood Into God, a philosophical and creedal companion to Conrad Noel's Life of Jesus. In it, he put forward the central theme of his theology -- that the Incarnation, as the taking of humanity into the divine, is a process rather than a static event, which continues in the church and the sacraments, particularly the Eucharist. In the ongoing revolutionary Incarnational process, termed Transubstantiation (not to be confused with the Thomist term but related to it), the Eucharistic offertory of bread and wine, which materially contains the human social and economic order, is taken into the divine, perfected and given back to those who receive to strengthen them to prepare a new offertory in the world. This ongoing preparation of the offertory requires Christians to work in revolutionary ways to perfect the social order materially contained in the bread and wine of the offertory. Smyth relates the materialistic and dialectical nature of the Incarnational process with Marxist dialectical materialism, emphasizing the common revolution-

ary agenda of Christians and Marxists. The book received favourable reviews from Vida Scudder, Conrad Noel, Eric Mascall, Norman Pittenger and Joseph Fletcher but sold few copies.<sup>32</sup>

With the U.S. entry into the war, the number of students at Harvard decreased and many members secular enlisted in the armed forces. Smyth encouraged their participation in the war and faithfully corresponded with them. With worsening financial problems and an empty oratory, Smyth continued his search for a parish. In December 1942, after the bishop of New York vetoed Smyth's appointment to Corpus Christi parish, West 69th Street, New York, Sherrill offered him St. Stephen's, Shawmut Avenue, Boston, for a one-month trial period. Smyth and the oratory began to take services in the parish and make plans to move there. However, after a few weeks, the suffragan bishop, R.A. Heron, refused to allow Smyth to continue.<sup>33</sup> After considering Russian Orthodoxy, a return to England and a move to the diocese of Chicago, Smyth decided to continue with the oratory in Cambridge.<sup>34</sup>

The war years were a period of considerable isolation and discouragement for Smyth. Because of financial problems and the lack of students, he was frequently on the verge of closing the oratory. He was alienated from both the Episcopal church and from other Christian Marxists. Fellow Anglo-Catholics distrusted his leftist politics. Anglo-

Catholic religious communities such as the Society of St. John the Evangelist (Cowley) and the Order of the Holy Cross distrusted his one-person community and high political profile. Although there were many clergy vacancies in the war years, many bishops distrusted both his Anglo-Catholicism and leftist politics. In June 1943, he expressed his frustration to Joseph Fletcher:

. . . I continue to loathe the Episcopal Church more and more, and I really cannot make up my mind that this disastrous bourgeois institution can offer any basis whatever for that redeeming Catholicism which is required by our present developing world situation.<sup>35</sup>

Most of Smyth's fellow Christian Marxists, such as Harry F. Ward or William B. Spofford, were theological liberals. Smyth worked with them in political action but strongly attacked their theological stance as inadequate. Likewise, Smyth eventually rejected the Church League for Industrial Democracy as containing too many theological and political liberals.<sup>36</sup>

Inevitably, Smyth and the oratory were also marginal to the Communist left. Theologically, Smyth argued that Marxism and Incarnational Christianity needed one another. He sought to convert Marxists to Christianity and Christians to Marxism. In the end, he had more success with the latter agenda than the former. The oratory's intellectual and aesthetic ethos did not attract the working class. While the Communist left welcomed Smyth on platforms and letterheads,



only a few Communists became familiar with the life of the oratory.

The Communist left and the working class also perceived Smyth and the oratory as "homosexual". Smyth was sensitive to this perception and took care to behave with propriety in his relations with Harvard students and other visitors to the oratory. Nor did he countenance overt homosexual behaviour among students frequenting the oratory. Indeed, at times he strongly rejected gay students lest the oratory acquire a reputation that would damage its credibility with the working class. Smyth's own friendship with Ethan Allan Brown, now a successful Boston allergist, continued though without its earlier overt eroticism. Smyth dedicated Manhood Into God to Brown -- "A catholic Comrade, In Recognition of a Long and Fruitful Friendship". However, the friendship cooled slightly as Brown distanced himself from Smyth's religious and political views.<sup>37</sup>

Throughout 1943 and 1944, Smyth worked on his book on the Eucharist, Discerning the Lord's Body, published in early 1946. The book developed the Eucharistic theology of Manhood into God, substituting the neologism "Metacosmesis" for Transubstantiation as the name for the Incarnational process. Smyth again emphasized the need for Christians to change the unjust social, political and economic structures (including capitalism) that produce the defects in the Eucharistic offertory. He argued that Marxist dialectical

analysis is essential to bring about these changes. Supporting Marx's critique of religion, Smyth strongly rejected pietist, gnostic and otherworldly forms of Christianity as "extricationalist". Reviews were unfavourable, with the exception of those by Elmer Smith (a member of the S.C.C.) and E.R. Hardy.<sup>38</sup>

The manuscript for the book was the basis of lectures delivered to two Canadian Christian socialist groups in the mid-forties. Smyth lectured to the the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order (a largely United Church of Canada group) in Gananoque, Ontario in July 1943 and the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action in Arundel, Quebec in August 1944. In both groups, Smyth tried to support the Marxist rather than social democratic factions. Privately, he criticized both groups' support of the social democratic Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (C.C.F.). Smyth became a regular visitor to Arundel conferences.<sup>39</sup>

Smyth's Eucharistic theology also required a critique of the liturgy. In late 1944, he published a small tract, An Integration of the General Confession and Absolution with the Liturgical Offertory, putting forward his proposals for liturgical revision. Smyth moved the confession (a mutual act between priest and people) to the beginning of the offertory (as a preparation for it) and put forward a full liturgical offertory, including prothesis

(preparation of the elements), procession, presentation and prayers by the priest and people. Smyth's revision represented practices that had been developing in the oratory chapel all the way back to the Clinton oratory. Smyth sent copies of the tract with a covering letter to all bishops, seminarians and members of the liturgical commission of the Episcopal church. There were few responses, although Massey Shepherd agreed with the placement of the Offertory but not with Smyth's Roman formularies.<sup>40</sup> The complete S.C.C. Eucharistic liturgy was published as The Anámnesis of the Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ in 1947.

Smyth's admiration for the Soviet Union during the war period was great and he strongly supported the war effort. In January 1943, he expressed this admiration to Joseph Fletcher:

Russia has become literally the only hope of the world -- and in the wake of Russia, China and India will follow to help make the world safe for decent people living in the western world.<sup>41</sup>

In March 1943, he corresponded with Earl Browder about a campaign to publicize discrimination against members of the Communist Party in the U.S. armed forces.<sup>42</sup>

However, he was unhappy with the increasing emphasis of the U.S. Communist Party (now the Communist Political Association under Browder) on the compatibility of Marxism and the liberal democratic tradition. He opposed Browder's espousal of "several generations of progressive capitalism"

as an appeasement to capitalism and imperialism. The "Browder line" made the Communists more critical of Smyth; he complained in September 1944 that he was no longer welcome at the Communist-sponsored Sam Adams School in Boston because they feared he would be offensive to Roman Catholics.<sup>43</sup>

Smyth welcomed the reestablishment of the Communist Party in July 1945 under William Z. Foster and Browder's expulsion. At the end of the war, Smyth still considered himself a strong Marxist but wished that the Communist Party had some new leadership. He explained his position to Ann Prosten, a labour organizer friend in Chicago:

I remain just a simple barefoot Marxist and I base my analyses on good old fashioned Marxian doctrines without any fancy rationalizations or compromises. I am, in fact, one of those who indignantly refused to have anything to do with the Browder line of unfortunate memory. I think this was a disaster and the Party has lost enormously in intellectual prestige because of this deviationist junket. I am not at all convinced even now that people who have the taint of this older leadership about them can recapture a following sufficiently vigorous and keen to cope with the future. New leadership, it seems to me, must be made to grow up from out of the rank and file of the labor movement. . . . There is a certain atmosphere of ancient dreariness about the Party leadership even now. . . . But I have every good hope for the future.<sup>44</sup>

Smyth's criticism of the party would increase dramatically in the post-war years.

In the summer of 1945, Smyth began to make plans to publish a quarterly journal entitled Catholic Commonwealth, patterned after the secular Marxist journal, Science and

Society. In a letter to a priest friend, he describes it as as "a journal of scholarly Incarnational Theology". He continues,

In other words it would be a journal of revolutionary Catholicism. We would try to show up Rome on its own ground, together with the pallid pietisms of a washed-out Anglo-Catholicism. And we would also have the tools to go after neo-orthodoxy and Niebuhr with his damned crisis stuff.<sup>45</sup>

Smyth began to solicit articles. However, plans were interrupted by the decision of the owner of the Putnam Avenue oratory to tear it down to build an apartment building.<sup>46</sup>

Smyth again considered a move away from Cambridge but decided it would be too difficult to begin in a new place. With a \$15,000 loan from E.A. Brown, which Brown himself paid off, Smyth bought a large house at 21 Washington Avenue, in a quiet residential area between Massachusetts Avenue and Radcliffe. The oratory moved to the new location in April 1946.<sup>47</sup>

The move to Washington Avenue roughly corresponded with the end of the war. The two events mark a nodal point (to use Smyth's terminology) in the life of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth. With them came a rapid growth in the secular membership. Harvard students who had left to enlist in the armed forces returned and reestablished contact with the Oratory. Mature new students appeared at Harvard and Episcopal Theological School. The publication of Discerning the Lord's Body, considerably more readable than

Manhood Into God, brought Smyth and the S.C.C. more attention. Smyth's connections with A.F.S.A. in Montreal began to bring Canadians into the S.C.C. For the first time, parish priests began to make up much of the secular membership.

The move from a working-class to a middle-class neighbourhood also signalled a subtle change in emphasis in Smyth and the oratory from political action to theological reflection. On one level the move simply recognized reality. Smyth was happy with the move and admitted that he had never been able to do any effective work in the Putnam Avenue neighbourhood. Attempts to explain the oratory's work to the neighbours had been answered by bricks tossed through the oratory's windows. Smyth was now 57 years old and beginning to slow down.<sup>48</sup>

Smyth continued to be active politically but now concentrated much more on the theological and liturgical basis of political action and the building up of the S.C.C. He began to encourage the organization of S.C.C. cells wherever there were groups of members. Cells were formed in New Jersey in 1947 and Montreal in 1948. Younger members secular in the new cells, with Smyth's support, continued the S.C.C. activist tradition. I shall discuss these developments later in this chapter.

One item contributing to the post-war growth of the S.C.C. was the weekly Bulletin of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth which Smyth, aided by a member secular,

David Hecht, inaugurated in April 1946. It began as a way of getting Smyth's weekly homilies to members but soon came to take on the role Smyth had envisioned for the Catholic Commonwealth. It included lucid political, economic and theological analysis and reflection by Smyth, members secular of the S.C.C. and a variety of friends including Scudder, Fletcher, Gilbert Cope, Mary van Kleeck, Paul Sweezy, K.H. Ting, D.I. Struik and James Endicott. Weekly circulation quickly jumped to 250, extending well beyond the small S.C.C. membership, including to Communist Party members. The Bulletin continued until May 1948, when Smyth was forced to discontinue it due to lack of funds and production personnel.<sup>49</sup> Smyth tried to publish his homilies, which emerged out of weekly discussions at the oratory, under the title "Unto Gentiles Foolishness" but was not able to find a publisher.<sup>50</sup>

In 1946 Smyth and Hecht began work on "Dialectics for Christians", an attempt to relate Christian theology and Marxist dialectics. In it, Smyth was able to combine his interest in the physical and biological sciences, Marxist theory and Catholic theology. Smyth used the dialectics material in many lectures, including some to Communist Party groups.<sup>51</sup> Smyth and Hecht published the church history portions of "Dialectics for Christians" in 1948 as Western Christianity's Whence and Whither. Smyth was never satisfied

with the full dialectics manuscript and it was never published.

As the war ended in Europe, Smyth began to fear U.S. reconstruction plans. He expressed his concerns to Philip Bevan, an old Chichester classmate: "I sometimes wonder whether we are not going to insist at having one more good go at capitalist imperialism--and this, of course, means another war in twenty-five or thirty years." Such a war would be directed against the Soviet Union and its allies in eastern Europe and Asia. Smyth is clear whom he would support in such a conflict:

If this terrible thing is to be visited upon us in the United States because of our complacency and arrogance, I can only hope and pray that the Soviet area may be strong enough to defeat us roundly. This alone would bring a decent world.

For Smyth, the cause of war is still clearly capitalism:

. . . it is very hard for me to understand how we can banish international war without a genuine socialist organization spread throughout all the world. You see I still remain a Marxist. I just do not believe that Capitalism, with its economic class tensions, can ever bring us peace--and certainly that it can ever live permanently at peace with a socialist state.<sup>52</sup>

Yet initially Smyth was more optimistic about the political future than after World War I.<sup>53</sup>

However, whatever optimism Smyth had was soon dashed by the policies and actions of the Truman administration. The use of atomic weapons at Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the resurgence of anti-labour business interests, irrational anti-Communism, and anti-Soviet foreign policy turned Smyth



quickly to pessimism. He was particularly disturbed by the use of atomic weapons at Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the implications for the world should there be another war.<sup>54</sup>

Writing Bevan a year later, Smyth is alarmed and frightened: "I feel so disturbed--if not downright frightened--about [our own American situation] that whatever I say runs the risk of sounding exaggerated." Smyth goes on to discuss the economic situation in the U.S. and the resurgence of capitalist interests in the post-war period. He condemns the "strike" by capital producers of necessary goods and their attempt to remove all price controls in the interest of maximized profits. In the age of atomic weapons, Smyth fears the end of human civilization:

Nobody knows just how this is all going to come out, but I fear that we are in for a terrible inflation and a corresponding bust-up of vast proportions. And if this calamity comes, who can tell what will happen then? We are so backward politically--nay, downright illiterate in matters of politics and economics---that it seems to many of us as if the stage was all set for fascism. Then we shall have war with the Soviet Union, and the final blow up and end of all present civilization.<sup>55</sup>

The dismissal of Henry Wallace, Secretary of Commerce, for his criticism of the government's increasingly anti-Soviet policies, the Republican increases in the November 1946 election and the removal of almost all price controls only increased Smyth's pessimism.

The increasingly anti-Soviet direction of Truman's foreign policy greatly alarmed Smyth. On March 12, 1947, the

president presented to Congress the "Truman Doctrine" of economic and military aid to countries facing Communist insurgencies, citing especially Greece and Turkey. The Marshall Plan soon followed. In a letter in late March 1947 to Vanson Ronco, a labour union official and member of the S.C.C., Smyth likens Truman to Hitler:

I cannot bring myself to be very cheerful about the present world outlook, any more than anyone else can--- that is anyone who has a spark of decency left in him. It seems to me that Truman is taking the straight Hitler line and is making "stop Communism" a battle cry for taking over one country after another. The whole Middle Eastern and Far Eastern world now comes under the consideration of our capitalist Führers. It is plainly suggested that all the countries from Greece to the China Sea may need our "attention," within a short time. Korea is the next country booked for intervention.<sup>56</sup>

Smyth saw both the Truman and Marshall Plans as imperialist extensions of U.S. capitalism, blocking popular socialist liberation movements in Europe.

Smyth was optimistic, however, about developments in China. He wrote K.H. Ting in June 1947, "Don't you still feel that the situation there, in spite of all the suffering the common people have to sustain, remains full of hope for the future?" Yet he feared the extension of the Truman doctrine to China:

There remains the big question mark of our own present [U.S.] policy, and of how far the poisonous "Truman Doctrine" is to be applied there. I notice that Mr. Koo is now pushing for financial support of the Kuomintang. And the United States has become completely hysterical over the "advance of Communism." We seem embarked upon the firm support of the worst kinds of reaction everywhere.<sup>57</sup>

Smyth pursued his criticism of the Truman and Marshall Plans in the S.C.C. Bulletin.<sup>58</sup>

Smyth continued his close relations with the Communist left in the immediate post-war years. He became a trustee of the Sam Adams School in Boston, lectured there on imperialism and entertained its director at the oratory.<sup>59</sup> He corresponded with V.J. Jerome, editor of Political Affairs. In December 1946, he wrote Jerome, ". . . we are convinced that only within a socialist (eventually communist) order can the Christian structure be integrated with life as it is lived here on earth." Smyth offered to make the journal's Marxist analysis available to Christians:

. . . One service which we might render would be to get your opinions and analyses as expressed in Political Affairs before certain Church people, from time to time, who would not otherwise see them.<sup>60</sup>

However, given the increasing anti-Communism in the U.S., Smyth began to be more prudent. In March 1947, he refused to become a sponsor of the Massachusetts Council of American-Soviet Friendship, while indicating that he still fully supported its work.<sup>61</sup>

From mid-1946 onwards, Smyth began to place his hopes on Henry A. Wallace. Smyth saw Wallace as a voice of sanity in an administration moving towards the entrenchment of reactionary capitalism and irrational anti-Communism. In September 1946, Smyth telegraphed Truman urging him to retain Wallace in the cabinet. Smyth supported the organiza-

tion of the Progressive Citizens of America (the Progressive Party) and was an early financial contributor.<sup>62</sup> He attended the PCA convention in February 1948 and became one of the vice-chairpersons. In a letter to David Hecht shortly afterwards, he noted that Communists were very active in the movement. Smyth supported Wallace's candidacy in the 1948 election in the S.C.C. Bulletin. He regarded support for Wallace as a "directive" to S.C.C. members.<sup>63</sup>

In April 1948, Smyth expressed his hope in Wallace as an antidote to U.S. fascism in a letter to Gilbert Cope:

The United States is not a pleasant country to belong to at this moment. We are rapidly consolidating our position as the leader of fascist world-reaction everywhere. It is a simply terrifying prospect. The Wallace movement is the only hope we have. And this, in some of its aspects, is really hopeful.

Although Wallace has gained a significant following, Smyth deeply distrusts capitalist interests in the U.S.:

You can, I think, scarcely imagine the hysteria which has been induced among the people of this country by the utterly unscrupulous tactics of the N.A.M. [National Association of Manufacturers] and the Military. One cannot see at all certainly to what lengths we shall be dragged. One feels as if one were oneself sitting on an A-bomb.<sup>64</sup>

Smyth wrote Wallace that he remembered him daily at the altar and invited him to the oratory. Wallace, an Episcopalian, read and admired the S.C.C. Bulletin.<sup>65</sup>

Smyth felt that the Communist Party played an ambiguous role in the Wallace campaign. In late 1947, Smyth believed that progressive groups in the U.S. needed to keep

their independence from the Soviet Union, given the anti-Communist political climate, but at the same time come out on the same side as the Soviet Union. Smyth came to suspect that the Communist Party's high profile in the Wallace campaign was an attempt to destabilize the non-Communist left rather than to provide honest support for Wallace. This perception encouraged Smyth's increasingly critical view of the Communist Party.<sup>66</sup>

In the spring of 1948, Smyth reprinted Harold Laski's 1947 Webb Memorial Lecture, "The Webbs and Soviet Communism", in three issues of the S.C.C. Bulletin.<sup>67</sup> Smyth's own analysis, "Materialist Dogma as a Creedal Test", followed in the next issue.<sup>68</sup> These articles mark a major turning point in Smyth's and the S.C.C.'s relations with the Soviet Union, the Communist Party in the U.S. and Marxism in general. Smyth's article is critical of the totalitarian nature of Soviet communism under Stalin, the quasi-religious character of dialectical materialism and the subservience of the Communist Party in the U.S. to the Soviet Union. As Smyth's criticisms were deeply rooted in his theological position, I shall delay detailed discussion of this major nodal point in the history of the S.C.C. until later chapters. The overall effect, however, was to cool relations with American Communists. With the outlawing of the Communist Party and the imprisonment of its leadership, Smyth had little further relationship with U.S. Communists after 1949.

His attention shifted to building up local S.C.C. cells and further refining his theology.

If one surveys their relationship with the Communist left from 1939 to 1948, one sees in Smyth and the S.C.C. a consistent commitment to a Marxist analysis of both the domestic and international scene, marked by a very strong criticism of U.S. domestic and foreign policy as fascist (except when in support of the Soviet Union) and by a strong commitment to the Soviet Union as a socialist experiment worth preserving and supporting at great risk. In maintaining this position, Smyth and members of the S.C.C. worked closely with the Communist Party and other organizations and individuals on the Communist left.

As I have indicated in the previous chapter, Smyth came to this position out of religious convictions, exposure to massive poverty and unemployment in both England and U.S. and first-hand experience of European fascism. Despite marginalization in the church, as an independent thinker and creative theologian he pursued his position and sought out allies among students, workers and the political left, both Communist and non-Communist. However, by 1948 much of the creative encounter with Marxism and Communist parties had shifted from Smyth and the Cambridge oratory to the individual S.C.C. cells and the younger S.C.C. membership.

## 2. Revolutionary Cells (1947-1958)

Although the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth handbook set out a description of S.C.C. cells in 1941, until 1947 only the Cambridge oratory functioned as a S.C.C. cell. Associates and members secular scattered after graduating from Harvard or entering the armed forces. Only in Cambridge was Smyth able to gather a small group of sympathetic students, academics, labour activists and priests. Members secular in the forties included John Wild, Thaddeus Clapp, James and Reed Pfeufer, Hugo Munsterberg, Marshall Swan, Peter Ruderman, Herbert Cahoon, Robert C. Martin, Jr. and Elmer Smith. Joseph Fletcher initially supported the Society but never joined.<sup>69</sup>

The first S.C.C. cell outside Cambridge emerged in New Jersey in 1947 but had its roots in the Anglican Fellowship for Social Action in Montreal. Smyth lectured on "The Church as the Organ of Social Redemption" to an enthusiastic audience at the 1944 Arundel Conference. John Peacock reported "a 100% conversion" to the S.C.C. position and strong interest in forming a Montreal S.C.C. cell. Smyth hoped that a cell might be formed. However, A.F.S.A. was itself just beginning and strong tensions developed between the social democratic and Marxist elements in the group. Smyth supported Sam Pollard and the Marxist faction against those favouring a link with the C.C.F.<sup>70</sup>

The division within A.F.S.A. made full integration with the S.C.C. impossible. However, Smyth continued to be friendly with the group. A.F.S.A. groups also formed in Nova Scotia and New Jersey. In October 1946 one representative from each of the three A.F.S.A. groups visited the Oratory to try to work out a relationship between A.F.S.A. and the S.C.C. Little came of the meeting but Smyth continued to try to maintain friendly relations with the group, despite its social democratic and "reformist" (as opposed to revolutionary) tendencies.<sup>71</sup>

Throughout early 1947, Smyth and Pollard strategized about how A.F.S.A. might be led in a more Marxist direction. They agreed with K.H. Ting, who commented that most of the A.F.S.A. members were "politically naive and careless". Smyth complained to Ting that they lacked "objective knowledge of the social process" and advocated the group's working with the [Communist] Labour Progressive Party.<sup>72</sup> In May, Pollard invited Smyth to lecture at the 1947 Arundel Conference on tactics. Smyth accepted but decided to lecture on dialectics. Smyth's lectures, illustrated with chemical experiments showing dialectical change, were well received but Smyth discovered that the group were "unreconstructed optimists" who "found it almost impossible to grasp the notion of revolutionary overturn".<sup>73</sup>

Smyth gave up on immediately converting A.F.S.A. to Marxism and decided that the group could serve as a broad-



based liberal "front", active in a variety of political and church concerns, within which a nucleus of truly revolutionary Catholics, members of the S.C.C., could give leadership.<sup>74</sup> To this end, shortly after returning from Arundel in 1947, Smyth approached three New Jersey priests, William M. Webber (an A.F.S.A. member), Frank V.H. Carthy (an S.C.C. member) and Harris H. Hall (an S.C.C. inquirer), all of whom had contact with the New Jersey A.F.S.A. cell, about forming a New Jersey S.C.C. cell. Carthy and Hall agreed and in November Smyth went to New Jersey to inaugurate the first S.C.C. cell outside Cambridge. It consisted of Carthy (prior), Hall and Russell McKeon, a lay member of the S.C.C. from Bayonne with a working-class Communist Party background. The small cell began meeting monthly for the Anamnesis [Eucharist] and discussion.<sup>75</sup>

The New Jersey cell was less than successful. McKeon soon moved to the Cambridge oratory to test his vocation as a member regular. He was replaced by a young parish priest in Long Island diocese, Frederick Jansen. The members were geographically separated and all deeply involved in parish ministry. Smyth hoped that the New Jersey cell would be the beginning of a New York cell and in December 1948 the cell began meeting at St. Ignatius' church, New York. However, the New York meetings attracted no new members.<sup>76</sup>

A constant difficulty of the cell was the conflict

between the demands of parish ministry and the S.C.C. In the increasing anti-Communist environment, members were reluctant to be open with their parishes about their S.C.C. membership. Smyth was particularly concerned about the "schizophrenic" approach of keeping the parish and the S.C.C. totally separated from one another. Jansen moved to St. James', Somerville, in 1949 where he worked closely with the Cambridge oratory. Harris Hall, who replaced Carthy as prior in August 1949, became a worker priest for a short while but soon moved to Missouri to resume work as a parish priest. Carthy became more and more deeply involved in parish ministry and distanced himself from the S.C.C. By 1950, the cell had dissolved.<sup>77</sup>

However, a strong Montreal S.C.C. cell also emerged out of A.F.S.A. At the end of 1947, two theological student members of the Montreal A.F.S.A., John Rowe and Vince Goring, visited Smyth and the Cambridge oratory. Though distressed by Smyth's bad relations with Joseph Fletcher, who was then trying to start a Cambridge A.F.S.A. group, Rowe and Goring were impressed by Smyth and the oratory. When they returned to Montreal they organized a group to read Discerning the Lord's Body.<sup>78</sup>

In March 1948, Smyth visited Montreal to preach at the consecration of St. Cuthbert's at the invitation of its rector, Rolland Bodger, an A.F.S.A. member. In Montreal Smyth also lectured to a large Student Christian Movement

group. Many of the younger A.F.S.A. members were also deeply involved in the S.C.M. and had been influenced there by Alexander Miller's vision of Christian Marxism. During an S.C.M. work camp in June the Marxist faction of A.F.S.A. thrashed out the relationship between A.F.S.A. and the S.C.C.<sup>79</sup> At the end of June, a young priest from this group, John F. Wagland, travelled to Cambridge to be received as an S.C.C. postulant, the first in Montreal. Wagland returned to Montreal and on July 15 celebrated the Anamnesis and received two more S.C.C. postulants, John Rowe and David Rigby (a member of the S.C.M. and an engineer). This action inaugurated the Montreal cell of the S.C.C. (later named the Oratory of St. John the Baptist with Wagland as prior).<sup>80</sup>

The new S.C.C. cell immediately asked permission from A.F.S.A. to stay within that group but was refused. A.F.S.A. noted that if the S.C.C. cell were allowed to stay, it would have a "divided loyalty". Expelled from A.F.S.A., the small Montreal cell consolidated itself and began bringing in other A.F.S.A. members sympathetic to their Marxist position.<sup>81</sup> Cyril and Marjorie Powles, A.F.S.A. members who had frequently visited Smyth while living in Cambridge in 1947-48, left A.F.S.A. and joined the S.C.C. in late 1948. The departure of the S.C.C. members deprived A.F.S.A. of its most creative thinkers.<sup>82</sup>

The split between A.F.S.A. and the S.C.C. in Montreal was not surprising, given the theological and political differences between the two groups. Nor was either group willing to be controlled by the other. Smyth, in particular, demanded absolute loyalty to S.C.C. theology, revolutionary politics and the Anamnesis. He was willing to be flexible on the political issue -- regarding A.F.S.A. as a front -- but when A.F.S.A. began liturgical experimentation on a protestant basis, withdrawal of S.C.C. members was inevitable.

Groups of Canadian students began visiting the Cambridge oratory regularly and the Montreal S.C.C. cell grew quickly. S.C.C. and A.F.S.A. members remained personal friends but the S.C.C. maintained its critique of A.F.S.A.'s "romanticism" and lack of social analysis. As A.F.S.A. members joined the S.C.C., they ceased to belong to A.F.S.A. Other early members of the Montreal S.C.C. cell were Mary Wagland, Isabel Powles and Margaret and Edgar Assels. They were later joined by Jack and Margaret Adam, Don (Dan) and Alice Heap, Robert and Barbara Wild, Bruce and Anne Mutch and Archie and Barbara Malloch. Smyth began making regular visits to Montreal.<sup>83</sup>

The Montreal cell was the largest and most dynamic of the S.C.C. cells that were established in the late forties and early fifties. The cell's strength owed much both to the members themselves and to the Canadian context. Many of the members already knew one another in the S.C.M. and

A.F.S.A. They had already come to a common commitment to Marxism before they joined the S.C.C. and the decision to join was a group one. They lived together in one city, often under one roof, and they eventually inter-married. Women members took an active part in the life of the cell. Several members were converts from the dominant Barthian theology of the United Church of Canada. Several came to Montreal from other cultures (the Powleses from Japan, John Rowe from Guyana) and were not limited by the conservatism of the Anglican church in Montreal. All were young -- largely theological students, newly ordained clergy and their spouses -- and they had the boldness and commitment of youth to action in the world.<sup>84</sup>

The Canadian context also contributed to the growth of the cell. While anti-Communism was strong in Canada in the late forties, it lacked the hysterical and irrational quality of that in the U.S. and did not become a popular movement. Nor was Canadian foreign policy deeply involved in trying to contain Communism internationally. Canada's socialist political party, the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, elected members to Parliament. Canada's ambivalent relationship with the U.S. made it much easier to criticize U.S. imperialism from a Marxist perspective. Montreal, a bi-cultural city in which at least some tolerance was a virtue, had a freedom that was lacking in the U.S.

Montreal cell members immediately sought to put their vision of a just social order into practice in their own living arrangements. In September 1948 they established a financial "commonwealth", in which the income of cell members was pooled and spent as decided by the group as a whole. The model was the Iona Community in the Church of Scotland and the S.C.M. Work Camp Fellowship. A.F.S.A. had also considered such a scheme but split on the question of common ownership of bank accounts. Smyth supported the experiment. John Wagland explained the scheme in his 1949 report to S.C.C. chapter. First the cell estimated its monthly income and expenses. Then each member submitted a budget of his or her expenditures for the month. The cell approved or altered these budgets. Above basic expenses, members were provided with a \$10 per month personal allowance. The effect, of course, was that wealthier members of the cell subsidized poorer members.<sup>85</sup>

A June 11, 1949 cell homily on "The Solidarity of a Cell of the Incarnation" outlined the theological justification of the commonwealth:

Our Commonwealth is a practical expression on the economic level of our solidarity. It is not so much that we are accomplishing or even producing an economic solidarity. It is rather that we are recognizing the true nature of material things as they are in the mind of God. Here we recognize the truth that my money (material possessions) are not mine but belong to God.<sup>86</sup>

The commonwealth continued for several years. It met monthly and grappled with questions such as the personal accumula-

tion of money for future major expenses. Building cell solidarity and sessions of self-criticism were an important part of the group's life.<sup>87</sup>

The Montreal cell also immediately entered into relations with the Labour Progressive Party, the Communist party in Canada. They began meeting with Harry Binder, Quebec organizer of the L.P.P. on a variety of theoretical and practical issues. In October 1948, Smyth visited Montreal and met with Binder to discuss dialectics. Relations between the S.C.C. and L.P.P. members were warm. Binder helped in the organization of study groups on Marxist economic theory.<sup>88</sup> In September 1949, Irving Layton proposed that the S.C.C. withdraw from its relations with the L.P.P. and join him in the organization of a "truly Marxist" independent party but Smyth urged the cell to stay close to Binder and the L.P.P. The cell followed Smyth's advice.<sup>89</sup>

Smyth was very happy with the growth and creativity of the Montreal cell. In a letter in February 1949 to Elmer Smith, he complained of the secretive style of U.S. cell members and praised the Canadians:

I often wonder why it is that the Canadian cell has caught the basic notion of this Society better, and as if it were "instinctively" than some of our American members. They always report and share all their plans and thinking, even down to the smallest details. I have a great sense of happy vigour as developing among them.<sup>90</sup>

Canadians began participating in the annual S.C.C. chapters

and influencing the development of S.C.C. policy.

Partly as a recognition of the growth and vitality of the cell, the 1950 annual S.C.C. chapter was held in Montreal. To Frank Carthy of the moribund New Jersey cell, Smyth wrote,

And since I believe that the Montreal Cell has turned out to be by far the most vigorous and successful group among us, I plan to turn the Chapter pretty much over to them, so that they can give their report and also criticize the rest of us--for I think we need this too!<sup>91</sup>

Smyth hoped that the Montreal cell would produce at least one regular member to provide stability for the group.

Wagland informed the bishop of Montreal, John Dixon, of the cell's existence in May 1949. The bishop was open but warned Wagland not to let the S.C.C. come between himself and his parishioners. However, the S.C.C. was not without opposition. The tension with A.F.S.A. continued. As the relations with the L.P.P. became more widely known, the R.C.M.P. began investigations and put pressure on Montreal Diocesan Theological College to limit the participation of students in the cell.<sup>92</sup>

As the Montreal cell developed in the late forties and early fifties, tensions did eventually emerge between the cell and the Cambridge oratory. Most of the Canadians were attracted to the S.C.C. by its positive view of Marxism, particularly as put forward in Manhood Into God, Discerning the Lord's Body, the 1945 edition of The Society of the Catholic Commonwealth and the 1949 Allocution, "Cath-



olic Sacramentalism and Marxist Materialism". They also had good relations with the L.P.P. As Smyth after 1948 became more critical of the Soviet Union, the Communist Party in the U.S. and Marxist-Leninist theory, the Canadians became concerned about the strength of his commitment to Marxism. Smyth, in turn, became concerned about the anti-authoritarian and activist bent of the Canadian cell.

The tension came to a head at the annual general chapter meeting on August 21-24, 1951 in Cambridge. Smyth had suffered a serious heart attack earlier in the month and was not present. Canadians went to the chapter fearing that some renunciation of Marxism or the Communist Party was impending. Shortly before the meeting, John Rowe wrote Smyth, urging that at chapter there be no "melodramatic break" with the Communists.<sup>93</sup>

On the day before chapter, the planning group circulated (with Smyth's permission) a memorandum containing excerpts from Smyth's recent correspondence on the S.C.C.'s relations with the Communist Party. Included was an excerpt from a recent letter to K.H. Ting in Geneva in which Smyth expressed his disillusionment with the party in the U.S.:

One final note about the Communist Party in this country. As you must remember I have been most doubtful about this group for a good many years now past. I began getting sceptical of them even before the outbreak of the World War. I have not altered my belief that the CP is a mere organ of Russian foreign policy. I do not believe that Russia has the slightest wish for the growth of a genuinely progressive movement in this

country which would be independent of her direct orders -- let alone her remote control.

Smyth comments on the Communist Party's power to disrupt any progressive movement or democratic institution and concludes, "But this too may be a part of the Communist scheme for wrecking even liberal thinking in America while waiting for the growing strength of Russian military power to make a world conquest practicable or at least thinkable."<sup>94</sup>

Also excerpted in the memorandum was a recent letter from David Hecht advocating that the S.C.C. break all relations with the Communist Party. Hecht wrote,

. . . the Oratory should dissociate itself with anything having to do with the various Communist parties and with Soviet Russia. . . . The regime in Russia has (for various reasons inherent in Russian history and in Leninist ideology) evolved into a monstrous dictatorship whose main aim at present seems to be -- and in the name of the masses -- to exercise, tighten and expand the power of a relatively small group of dictatorial leaders over the various Russian peoples first, the peoples of Eastern Europe and Asia next and then the rest of the world afterwards.

Hecht concludes, "the people in the Oratory should now take stock to see how efforts for Christian redemption of the world on a democratic and non-communist (and anti-Stalinist) basis can fruitfully proceed".<sup>95</sup> According to the S.C.C. memorandum of August 20, 1951, Smyth's response from his hospital bed to the excerpted portions of Hecht's letter was "Amen and Amen to every single word and you may quote me."<sup>96</sup>

Also included in the memorandum were excerpts from Smyth's reply to Rowe's plea for no "melodramatic break"

with the Communist Party:

. . . we ought to make a positive affirmative statement that we have to seek a really progressive political and economic movement along SCC lines, and this must definitely exclude Communist Party members. We cannot have any CP members in any movement whatsoever which we try to forward or with which we cooperate. . . . The Kremlin Communists seek national power. We seek democratic socialism.<sup>97</sup>

One can see how far Smyth has moved from his earlier view of the Communist Party. Needless to say, Canadian S.C.C. members went to the chapter with the strong agenda of preventing any break with the Communist Party and any renunciation of Marxism.

Hecht, who was no longer an active member of the S.C.C., did not attend the chapter. In the absence of Smyth and Hecht, the Canadian and U.S. members agreed on a compromise in which the difficulty of cooperation with Communist groups was recognized but such cooperation not entirely excluded. The Canadian view dominated and there was no "melodramatic break" with the party. Smyth was happy with the compromise and that a potential split in the S.C.C. had been avoided. Hecht broke off all relations and withdrew from the Society. The Canadians, who had long distrusted his influence on Smyth, welcomed his departure.<sup>98</sup>

The Montreal cell reverted from the status of "cell" to "group" in 1952. With the departure of the Rowes, Waglands, Heaps, Adams and Mutches from Montreal, numbers were seriously depleted and there was no priest to celebrate the

Anamnesis. S.C.C. members in Toronto began celebrating the Anamnesis there and sending a priest monthly to Montreal. Since many of the Montreal S.C.C. members moved to Ontario, small parish cells also eventually developed in London, St. Catharines and Glanworth. The Toronto cell continued the close Montreal connection with the L.P.P.<sup>99</sup>

A second early Canadian S.C.C. cell formed in Halifax in 1951. Robert Crouse, a King's College theological student, began corresponding with Smyth in late 1950 and was made a postulant in the secular membership on a visit to the Cambridge oratory in May 1951. Crouse rejected the theological and political perspective of the Nova Scotia A.F.S.A. group and promoted the S.C.C. among King's College students as a more politically and theologically sound alternative. Crouse and four other King's students held an organizational meeting in October 1951. Though often called a cell, the Halifax group was not officially constituted as a cell because it lacked a priest. Smyth visited Halifax a month later and received the four students as postulants and Crouse as a novice in the secular membership. He also met with Karl Tufts of the Nova Scotia A.F.S.A. in an attempt to persuade them to join the S.C.C.<sup>100</sup>

The establishment of the S.C.C. group at King's College did not meet with the approval of the bishop of Nova Scotia, R.H. Waterman. Jealous of Smyth's authority over his theological students and alarmed at the S.C.C.'s theologi-

cal, liturgical and political views, Waterman tried to suppress the group, threatening to refuse ordination to theological students who participated. Smyth and the new S.C.C. members took up the bishop's challenge and went ahead anyway. Smyth and Waterman entered into a long and sometimes hostile correspondence which Smyth, to the bishop's annoyance, eventually published.<sup>101</sup>

Smyth visited Halifax for a week in May 1952 and lectured to a group of 15 students on dialectics at the cathedral hall. When Smyth celebrated the Anamnesis in the hall, the bishop forced him to leave and the lectures continued in a private home. Smyth tried unsuccessfully to meet with Waterman. In the fall of 1952, Crouse moved to the Cambridge oratory to study at Harvard and try his vocation as a member regular of the S.C.C.<sup>102</sup>

The Halifax group continued without Crouse. Controversy continued around the celebration of the Anamnesis in the diocese. In March 1953, Smyth and Henry Veatch, an American member secular and a Thomist philosopher, visited the Halifax group. Smyth celebrated the Anamnesis in a private home and received six postulants into full secular membership. Smyth and Veatch met with 25 students and faculty in two evening sessions and with one of George Grant's philosophy classes. They also met with the bishop who finally gave permission for his candidates to be members of the S.C.C.<sup>103</sup>

The Halifax group, however, soon disintegrated. At the end of 1953, Crouse broke with Smyth and the S.C.C. on theological grounds and declined to take vows as a regular member. Crouse's departure destabilized the group. Also, as they were ordained, members left Halifax. Some members, such as George Parker, continued to persevere in very isolated circumstances. Carman Carson briefly tried his vocation to the regular life at the oratory in 1954.<sup>104</sup>

It is difficult to regard the Halifax "cell" as either Marxist or revolutionary. Crouse was attracted by Smyth's Thomist and Anglo-Catholic critique of conventional Anglicanism and the Nova Scotia A.F.S.A. group. Others simply followed. All the participants were students and there was no involvement in political action. There was some contact between the Halifax and Montreal-Toronto S.C.C. groups. Crouse attended a Canadian S.C.C. retreat and conference in Montreal in August 1953. But in the end, Crouse's interests were in medieval theology rather than Christian Marxism.<sup>105</sup>

However, two strongly Christian-Marxist S.C.C. cells developed in Japan and England, both related to the Montreal S.C.C. cell and the experience with A.F.S.A. Cyril and Marjorie Powles left for Japan in early 1949 as Anglican Church of Canada missionaries. They also went with a commitment to establish the S.C.C. in Japan. They comprised a cell of two members and first celebrated the Anamnesis privately.

At a student work camp in the summer of 1950, they invited David Tsukada, a student at Rikkyo (St. Paul's) University, Tokyo, to take part in the Anamnesis. From the fall of 1950 onwards, they began convening small Arundel-like summer conferences for students at their summer cottage in Nojiri. Tsukada, James Ugawa, Reiko (Catherine) Shimada and Megumi Ohta became active members of the group and joined the Society. Powles' curate, Christopher Yazawa, also joined the cell. The group spent much time discussing basic S.C.C. literature and the political and economic situation in post-war Japan. Tsukada, Yazawa and Shimada translated several S.C.C. publications, including Discerning the Lord's Body, into Japanese. The Japanese S.C.C. published its own bulletin in Japanese, Metacosmesis.<sup>106</sup>

The Anamnesis was first celebrated in Japanese in September 1955 at an S.C.C. cell conference at Nojiri. With the arrival of Bruce and Anne Mutch as Anglican Church of Canada missionaries in 1955, three S.C.C. groups formed -- one around Tsukada in Tokyo, another around the Powles in Nagoya and a third around the Mutches in Kyoto. The Mutches moved to the Nagoya Student Centre in 1957 and continued a cell there that lasted into the late sixties. The Tokyo group began to meet twice a month but lapsed when Tsukada became ill. When the Powles moved to Tokyo in 1958, they revived the Tokyo cell which continued into the sixties,

though less disciplined than the Nagoya group. By October 1958, the Japanese S.C.C. had 19 members, including novices and postulants. Smyth always hoped to visit the Japanese S.C.C. but was not healthy enough to make the trip.<sup>107</sup>

Another strong S.C.C. cell developed in England in the early fifties. The first English S.C.C. members were John Tunncliffe, an English parish priest steeped in the Christian socialist tradition, and his wife Monica. After several years of correspondence with Smyth, they became S.C.C. postulants in 1950. However, no growth took place in England until John and Isabel (Powles) Rowe moved from Montreal to Cambridge in 1951.<sup>108</sup>

With Smyth's approval, the Rowes planned to spread the S.C.C. by building a community of families. They began inviting friends to celebrations of the Anamnesis and discussion, bringing in both S.C.C. theology and Marxist social analysis. A few people decided to join. Through Tunncliffe, Rowe got in touch with Stanley Evans and the Society of Socialist Clergy and Ministers, a strongly pro-Soviet Christian-Marxist group. Relations with SSCM, however, were poor because of Smyth's criticisms of their Stalinist perspective. After Rowe celebrated the Anamnesis at his parish church, the bishop of Ely limited its use to the Franciscan chapel at Cambridge.<sup>109</sup>

The Rowes continued to be in close touch with the Canadian S.C.C. and shared the Canadian perspective that



Smyth and the Cambridge oratory were wrongly moving from action to reflection and backing away from Marxism. Rowe attended the 1953 S.C.C. chapter in Bement Center, Mass. and strongly attacked Smyth's "intellectualism". Rowe was increasingly unhappy with his work in England as a parish priest -- "a social worker dressed up in funny clothes" -- and sought a model of ministry that could better integrate theology and action.<sup>110</sup>

In October 1954, Rowe announced to Smyth his plan to become a worker priest and establish a small house community. Smyth was initially unenthusiastic, doubting the viability of relating with two communities (cell and parish) simultaneously. At this point, Smyth was promoting the organization of S.C.C. cells within parishes. Rowe persisted, arguing that his loyalties were divided as a parish priest and that he wanted to live and work in a situation where he could be "the antithesis in its fullest sense" in the dialectical overturn of capitalism. Rowe outlined his community plan to S.C.C. chapter in 1955.<sup>111</sup>

At the end of 1955, Rowe put forward concrete plans to buy a house in London, set up a small community and begin work as a dockworker. Smyth finally approved and negotiations began with the bishop of London. Rowe prepared a rule for the community and in September 1956 the Rowes and Tom and Sherry (Rowe) Waldon moved into a small house on Pigott

Street in the east end of London. John Rowe and Tom Waldon (a lay person) both took up work in industry. The two families lived deliberately as an S.C.C. cell with a daily Anamnesis, study, discussion and political action. They sought to include others in the group and the cell grew. It continued into the sixties.<sup>112</sup>

The London cell was probably the most creative activity in the S.C.C. in the late fifties. The community was deeply committed to integrating theory and practice in daily living. Rowe was a creative theologian who reflected and wrote on a variety of theological themes, including the worker priest movement, revolution, sacraments and ministry. He engaged in extensive correspondence with Smyth and other members of the S.C.C. The cell was very active in a great variety of political and labour activities, particularly the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. The cell's weakness was an authoritarian and narrow theological vision.<sup>113</sup>

While no cell developed, there was also interest in the S.C.C. in the People's Republic of China. Smyth had become friends with K.H. Ting in Montreal and strongly supported the Chinese revolution. A Chinese Anglican priest visiting the oratory in 1950, Yung-ch'un Ts'ai, suggested that Smyth move the oratory to mainland China. He proposed that Smyth travel to Hong Kong to give a course on dialectics for Chinese Anglican clergy. Smyth began corresponding with the bishop, Ronald O. Hall, who invited him to come to

Hong Kong. However, Smyth's declining health made the plan impossible.<sup>114</sup>

The growth of S.C.C. cells in the U.S. in the fifties was much less successful than in Canada, Japan or England. Members were scattered across the country. The much more intensely anti-Communist political climate and the lack of secular Marxist groups and individuals to relate with made the development of cohesive and strongly motivated S.C.C. cells very difficult. Only Frank Carthy at Christ Church cathedral, Indianapolis, and Elmer Smith at St. Peter's, Portland, Maine, were able to organize small cells. Most U.S. members were individuals or couples who had a personal relation with Smyth and the Cambridge oratory. Some had little commitment to Marxism but continued in the S.C.C. only because of their friendship with Smyth.

As I have indicated, after 1948, the focus of S.C.C. activities shifted from the Cambridge oratory to the cells. About this time, Smyth's health also began to fail. In January 1949, he had a serious heart attack and was forced to cancel testifying at the Grand Jury trial in support of the "New York Eleven" Communist Party leaders.<sup>115</sup> The heart attack left him with severe high blood pressure. He had a second heart attack in August 1951 and serious abdominal surgery in April 1953. While he was still able to travel in the U.S. and Canada, he was never able to visit England or

Japan.

However, the activities of the Cambridge oratory continued. Encouraged by the growth of the secular membership, Smyth began to hope that the regular membership might also revive at the Cambridge oratory. He began to emphasize the members regular as being at the core of the spiritual and theological life of the Society, crucial for its continued existence. Smyth was also concerned about the problem of a successor, as the S.C.C. rule required a member regular. From the late forties to the early sixties, a variety of members secular and others tried their vocations to the regular religious life at the oratory.<sup>116</sup>

Only one, Don Porter Johnston, jr. (1917-67), ever made his vows as a full member regular of the S.C.C. Johnston came to the oratory in June 1948 under emotional strain from his recent divorce. A native of Wake Forest, N.C. and graduate of Princeton, his experience was primarily in business. His religious background was Baptist and Unitarian but he had had a sudden conversion to the Episcopal church. Johnston had little interest in Smyth's Christian Marxism but simply wished to pursue the religious life. Smyth, now more critical of Marxism and trying hard to develop the regular life, accommodated himself to Johnston and they soon became close friends.<sup>117</sup>

Johnston made his first vows in 1950. After training at Harvard Divinity School, he was ordained a priest in the

diocese of Massachusetts in 1952. He also studied psychiatric social work at Boston College, where he obtained a M.S. in social work in 1953. He worked briefly at Boston State Hospital as a worker-priest psychiatric social worker.<sup>118</sup>

In the early fifties, Smyth clearly saw the Cambridge oratory moving away from active political involvement. In 1950, Smyth wrote to his cousin, Helen Pope,

We are canvassing the notion that we may be called upon to withdraw more completely from active work and begin to give intensive attention to our own inner spiritual and intellectual foundations, while we look forward to a future which may hold great difficulties for Christians.<sup>119</sup>

Theological reflection and support of the S.C.C. cells took up more and more of Smyth's time.

In later chapters, I shall trace the development of Smyth's Christian-Marxist theology in the fifties. In most general terms, in the forties Smyth saw Metacosmesis, the revolutionary process of the Incarnation, as including (indeed, requiring) Marxist dialectical materialism. In the fifties, he moved to seeing it as an independent dialectical and materialist process, sui generis, not fundamentally related to dialectical materialism (indeed, its enemy) but still able to utilize Marxist analysis. The focus of Smyth's theological reflection shifted to the Anamnesis (Eucharist) as the centre of the revolutionary Christian cell and to differentiating Incarnational theology and Marxist theory. Sacrifice, published in 1953, "Allocutions" delivered at

annual chapters from 1948 to 1959 and articles in the Bulletin and Newsletter of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth, revived in 1953, put forward Smyth's views in these years.

One must emphasize, however, that by the early fifties the S.C.C. was an international religious community, with members in the U.S., Canada, England, Japan and Europe. Despite Smyth's failing health and more critical stance towards Marxism, a high level of creative theology and action was taking place in the S.C.C. internationally. Smyth, who never renounced Marxist dialectical analysis, encouraged these developments. There was occasional conflict between Smyth and members whom he thought were too activist or too uncritical of Stalinism but Smyth never renounced the S.C.C.'s commitment to bringing together in a creative way Incarnational theology and Marxism.

### 3. Decline and Disappearance (1955-1967)

One cannot in a short summary cover all the factors in the decline and disappearance of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth. Nor can one put an exact date on the beginning of the decline. However, 1955, the year that Smyth moved the Oratory from Cambridge to Gloucester, Mass., undoubtedly marked a withdrawal from active political involvement. I shall come back to some of the deeper theological and political reasons for the decline in my concluding chap-

ter and here only note the outline of the story.

In the early fifties, Smyth increasingly saw the S.C.C. as a revolutionary liturgical group with the regular membership at the centre of its theological and liturgical life. In 1954, he wrote Carman Carson, "if we are ever in future history to have a truly Christian Revolution, this must, I am convinced, revolve around a great revival of the Religious Life".<sup>120</sup> Smyth moved away from an oratorian model of the religious life towards a more Benedictine model, including life vows. More and more of Smyth's work and writing focussed on developing a regular religious life for the S.C.C. Some S.C.C. members supported this development, others, especially the Canadians, opposed it.<sup>121</sup>

This new perspective made the oratory's location in the centre of the city much less crucial. Indeed, Smyth felt that the urban setting made training people for the religious life difficult and that he needed a quieter place. In November 1954, a banker in Warsaw, Illinois (where Harris Hall was parish priest) offered a free parcel of land overlooking the Mississippi River if the oratory would relocate there. Smyth and Johnston visited the site but the bishop of Quincy's political conservatism and the lack of a tax exemption in Illinois scuttled the plan.<sup>122</sup>

However, shortly afterwards, Smyth and Johnston found a large granite Ralph Adams Cram house on Ledge Road

in Gloucester, on a rocky hill overlooking the harbour. Smyth sold the Washington Avenue property and bought the Gloucester house, taking on a heavy mortgage. He, Johnston and Carman Carson, then a novice in the regular membership, moved to the new oratory in September 1955. Smyth wrote a friend that the new setting gave a "much more retired environment and more quietness everyway".<sup>123</sup> Their Gloucester neighbours welcomed the new community and Smyth and Johnston began making friends in the town. Both assisted at the local Episcopal parish, St. John's.<sup>124</sup>

If the Washington Avenue oratory was associated with the growth of the S.C.C. and theological reflection, the Gloucester oratory was associated with retreat, retirement and, ultimately, decline. While continuing to be cheered by the growth of the S.C.C., Smyth's last years at Gloucester were also marked by tragedy. The regular religious life did not develop and the question of a successor loomed heavily. Nor did Smyth's theology gain any increased recognition outside the S.C.C. Johnston, encouraged by Smyth, led the Society into dubious financial dealings that undermined its credibility and growth. It also became clear that Johnston, with whom Smyth had become very intimate, was a deeply disturbed person. His behaviour became increasingly bizarre. In 1958, a serious fire destroyed or damaged the oratory's library and furniture.<sup>125</sup> Much of Smyth's last five years was spent agonizing over the uncertain future of the S.C.C.



and his friend's personal tragedy.

Since they became a major element in the decline of the S.C.C., I shall briefly outline the oratory's financial activities in the late fifties. They were entangled with Johnston's tragic personal life. Johnston brought financial resources to the Society and continued to manage them. After initial caution, Smyth decided to trust Johnston's financial acumen. In late 1952, he turned all his personal investments over to the S.C.C. and appointed Johnston to manage them. Johnston sold them for \$74,000 and reinvested them in high-yield stocks. For the first time in many years, the oratory was able to live on investment income.<sup>126</sup>

As he managed the portfolio, Johnston became more and more interested in the stock market. In early 1956, Smyth and Johnston approached Norman B. Nash, bishop of Massachusetts, about Johnston's working as a broker on the stock exchange. Nash approved and Smyth and Johnston worked out an arrangement for Johnston to become a registered representative of the New York Stock Exchange, working as a "customer's man" with Hutchins and Parkinson of Boston, looking after the oratory's holdings. The N.Y.S.E. approved Johnston's qualifications in August 1956 and he began work as a full-time stockbroker, though handling only S.C.C. holdings.<sup>127</sup>

In March 1957, Smyth wrote the new bishop, Anson P.

Stokes, Jr., to ask permission for Johnston to move to another firm, Hill Darlington, where he would organize and manage an office, supervise the selling of bonds, sell to tax-paying organizations, continue the S.C.C. investment work but not sell investment advice. Smyth argued that working on the stock market was Johnston's vocation:

. . . it seems to me that Don has a vocation to continue to carry the work of the priesthood into the business world (just as some priests pursue their vocations within the framework of the medical profession or in teaching or in scientific work or as worker-priests in industry).<sup>128</sup>

Unenthusiastically, the bishop gave his permission and Johnston moved to Hill Darlington. He hired a group of young assistants and began pursuing his investment theories.<sup>129</sup>

At about the same time, despite intensive psychoanalysis, Johnston's manic-depressive behaviour intensified. In mid-July 1957, he angrily denounced the S.C.C. and the religious life and moved out of the oratory. However, he continued to work on the stock market, though also exhibiting manic behaviour there. He began making highly speculative (and sometimes illegal) investments and extended the oratory's commitments beyond the resources available. However, some of Johnston's methods were brilliant and the value of the S.C.C.'s portfolio increased dramatically though cash to run the oratory was often not available. Because of Johnston's erratic behaviour complete financial ruin was always a possibility.<sup>130</sup>

Smyth was uncertain how to handle the crisis. It was also a personal crisis for himself. His friendship with Johnston, which grew very intimate after E.A. Brown married in 1949, seems to have been an attempt to deal with his loneliness by reproducing his earlier friendship with Brown. The years of living alone in the oratory took their toll. Despite their mutual affection, because of Johnston's instability and basic ideological differences, the friendship was mutually destructive.<sup>131</sup>

Once Smyth realized the depth of Johnston's disorder, he remained loyal to him, supported his psychotherapy and was reluctant to dismiss him from the Society lest it worsen Johnston's condition. Johnston lived periodically at the oratory from mid-1957 until Smyth's death in 1960. Relations between the two were frequently strained. Their friendship, the Society's financial dealings and Johnston's bizarre behaviour, alcoholism and liaisons with the young men he employed at high salaries as financial helpers eroded the oratory's credibility in the church and community. Very few members of the S.C.C. realized the seriousness of the problem.<sup>132</sup>

The 1959 chapter granted Johnston a leave of absence from the S.C.C. but agreed that his relationship with the Society remain the same "legally" and "materially". This arrangement enabled Johnston to spend time away from the oratory but continue to manage the oratory's finances. Smyth

was well aware of Johnston's stock market activities and never renounced them. Since he deeply disliked the capitalist system Johnston was exploiting, Smyth believed that Johnston was simply "spoiling the Egyptian" before the eventual collapse of capitalism. He also regarded Johnston's stock market work as therapeutic. However, the irony of a Marxist religious community playing the stock market was not lost on some members and they periodically complained at chapter and in the Bulletin. Smyth dismissed these complaints.<sup>133</sup>

Despite his movement away from political action, in his final years Smyth continued to be concerned with Marxism and Christianity. He was "encouraged" by Krushchev's denunciation of Stalin at the 20th Party Congress in 1956, having already come to a similar position several years earlier. However, more pro-Soviet S.C.C. members in Canada and England found the revelations difficult.<sup>134</sup>

The question of whether the S.C.C. was still a "Marxist" society was raised at the 1957 chapter. There was a wide range of opinion but the term was retained, as re-defined in Smyth's "Some Latter Thoughts on Marxian Dogma".<sup>135</sup> However, the question re-emerged in 1958 when Smyth began revising the 1945 edition of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth handbook in light of his disillusionment with the Soviet Union and his new emphasis on catholic

revolution as an end in itself. Again, on largely apologetic grounds, some members urged Smyth to remove all references to Marxism from the booklet. Members in Canada, England and Japan strenuously objected and at the 1958 chapter the references were retained.<sup>136</sup> The new edition was, however, much more critical of secular Marxism:

Penetration of Christianity into the Marxian world is a present job for the Catholic Church; but Christians must balk at becoming tools in the hands of Marxists for un-Christian ends.<sup>137</sup>

It also minimized the importance of secular revolutionary movements:

At the same time we must guard against the false notion that any alteration in a presently non-Christian economic or political structure, however radical or however desirable from a Christian (or even a humanist) point of view, will of itself alone induce Christian motivation of social behavior. These can be induced only as, and in so far as, people become converted to the Religion of the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ and participate in the Sacramental Life of the Catholic Church.<sup>138</sup>

Most Canadian, English and Japanese S.C.C. members never really accepted the new book.

The 1958 chapter also saw an attempt to align the S.C.C. with a non-Marxist radical political group, the Socialist Party. Two U.S. members, F. Forrest Powers, Jr. and Thomas Stone, proposed that in lieu of the Communist Party, the S.C.C. needed a socialist political group with which it could work. They proposed that the S.C.C. join the Socialist Party en bloc. Smyth and Johnston initially gave support to the proposal but strong opposition developed

among members concerned about the anti-Marxist tradition of the Socialist Party. The motion was defeated at chapter and Powers resigned from the S.C.C.<sup>139</sup>

The last large gathering of the S.C.C. before Smyth's death was the annual chapter held at the Gloucester oratory in August 1959. John Wild presented a paper seeking to recast S.C.C. theology in an existential mode, "The S.C.C. and Freedom", which caused much comment. Wild, moving from Thomism to existentialism, argued that human freedom was a more basic starting point for philosophy and theology than human reason. Smyth's reaction to Wild's attempt was ambivalent. To Henry Johnson and Christ the King Foundation, he wrote,

I feel that there lurk here certain dangerous trends towards a radical humanism. However, I am sure that Wild does not intend this in the least and that he is feeling his way towards a surer Catholic ground within the Existentialist movement of this time.<sup>140</sup>

However, to trusted members of the S.C.C., he was very critical of the paper, complaining of its "individualism" and "abandonment of reason".<sup>141</sup>

In early 1960 Johnston was somewhat improved but living in New York managing the oratory's now very complicated finances. Basically, Johnston seems to have been using the oratory's tax-exempt status as a front for a variety of business enterprises. Smyth hoped that money would be available from the investments to further S.C.C. aims. Smyth and Johnston began to make plans to visit the English S.C.C.

cell in April.<sup>142</sup>

On April 13, 1960, Smyth fainted at the oratory and was hospitalized in Gloucester, diagnosed as having a pulmonary embolism. He died on Easter Even, April 16, 1960. of heart failure. He spent his last day visiting with Johnston, cheerfully planning the London trip and listening to the opera on the radio. His final words were a reminder to Johnston not to forget the Alleluias on the Easter antiphons.<sup>143</sup>

Smyth's death brought an enormous outpouring of grief from the S.C.C. The funeral on April 22 brought together S.C.C. members from the U.S., Canada, Japan and England. The bishop of Massachusetts read the burial office and members of the S.C.C. celebrated a solemn Anamnesis. Smyth's body was cremated and placed under the oratory altar.<sup>144</sup>

The Society's most immediate problem was replacing Smyth as superior. Johnston, although on leave of absence, was the only person eligible according to the S.C.C. rule. A conference of S.C.C. members met immediately after the funeral to consider the possibilities. Johnston, in great grief, reluctantly agreed to become acting superior. He announced that he would begin celebrating the daily Anamnesis at the oratory altar.<sup>145</sup>

Johnston immediately began visiting S.C.C. members in the U.S., Canada and England. He hired a business manager

to handle the investments, appointed Elmer Smith of St. Peter's, Portland, as priest visitor of the Society, appointed a Council of Eleven to advise the superior and called a "representative chapter", with delegates from each cell, for August.<sup>146</sup> Johnston sought a less political gathering than past chapters:

This Chapter will be Altar-centered rather than lobby-centered. By this, I mean that we will gather to worship, meditate, and hope to be inspired of the Holy Ghost in what we attempt to do. At this Chapter we shall not be primarily concerned with promoting individually attractive matters, but will seek within God's Holy Trinity that unity without which we should perish.<sup>147</sup>

Free of Smyth's influence, Johnston sought to impose his own vision on the Society.

However, the chapter made it clear that it would not accept a radical revision of S.C.C. theology or politics. Johnston proposed a radically revised Society of the Catholic Commonwealth handbook which replaced Metacosmesis with "Transubstantione", removed all of Smyth's strictures against extricationist religion and eliminated all references to Marxism. The Chapter rejected the revision. Members also criticized the oratory's financial dealings and demanded an accounting from Johnston. Johnston maintained that the oratory was worth millions of dollars but that there was no money available for running the oratory. He urged members to begin making financial contributions.<sup>148</sup>

E.A. Brown, long a nominal member of the S.C.C., also appeared at the chapter. He urged the S.C.C. to return



to being "a group of humanisticly [sic] oriented intellectuals" and termed Smyth's religious interests an "aberration" and the S.C.C. tracts, Bulletin and rule "expressions of Fr. Smyth's sickness rather than an expression of the witness Father Smyth brought."<sup>149</sup> Brown was never comfortable with Smyth's return to Christianity and disliked most of the S.C.C. members, particularly Johnston. However, he was quite out of touch with the S.C.C. and his views were also rejected.

Johnston could not take the strain of the situation and in September 1960 was hospitalized. Following plans made at the chapter, Elmer J. Smith, one of Smyth's most faithful interpreters, an unmarried parish priest at St. Peter's, Portland, moved to the Oratory to become "Priest-Visitor-in-Residence", doing the work of superior but not holding the title. He began visiting S.C.C. cells and members in the U.S., Canada and England. Smith deliberately pursued a diffident style of leadership, with the hope that the secular membership would take over more of the responsibilities of the Society.<sup>150</sup>

Smith also faced the difficult problem of what to do about the Society's financial involvements. Though unable to function as superior, Johnston continued his very complex manipulation of the oratory's tax-exempt trusts and increased the value of the Society, at least on paper, to

over six million dollars. Johnston's financial activities caused great concern among S.C.C. members and took up time that should have been devoted to theological and political activities.<sup>151</sup>

Smith's attitude towards Johnston's financial empire was simple enough. Reflecting the views of members of the S.C.C. generally, he believed that the trusts' wealth was "dirty money" and that the S.C.C. should not be involved with it. Rather than trying to gain control of the trusts, he refused to control Johnston and simply let him pursue his manic plans and spend the money as quickly as possible. Enervated by high finance, Johnston continued to expand the trusts' holdings. He also took up psychiatric social work again and began to lose contact with reality.<sup>152</sup>

Smith continued to observe Johnston's financial involvements and in January 1962 discovered that they had become even more complicated and that the oratory was now operating illegally.<sup>153</sup> Under pressure from Smith, Johnston finally resigned as superior of the S.C.C. in the beginning of February but continued on as a member, so that his legal status vis-à-vis the trusts and oratory would not be affected. Johnston had also become deeply involved in a land development scheme in Spain and made frequent visits there. Eventually the whole scheme collapsed, Johnston attempted suicide, and was again institutionalized.<sup>154</sup>

In consultation with Bishop Stokes, Johnston re-

nounced his orders in the Episcopal church in September 1962 and was received as a Roman Catholic, with the hope of becoming a lay brother. He continued on good terms with Smith and helped untangle the oratory's finances. He returned to Spain where worked as a financial advisor to the Roman Catholic church. He died in December 1967.<sup>155</sup>

With two mortgages on the Gloucester property and the loss of all investment income, it became clear that the oratory would have to move to simpler quarters. Smith, now the superior, canvassed members for suggestions. He hoped it would be possible to move to an industrial or university area but no possibilities emerged. With Smith's approval, the bank foreclosed its mortgage on the Gloucester property and in May 1963 Smith and the oratory moved to a smaller house at 52 Olive Street, Newburyport, north of Gloucester, purchased for \$18,500. Smith continued to hope that it would be possible to pay the new mortgage and oratory expenses from members' contributions. However, after years of dependence on the oratory's endowment, the members were unable to provide enough support. Chapter meetings from 1962 onwards centred on self-support of the Society.<sup>156</sup>

In the Newburyport oratory period, cells continued to be active in Portland, Indianapolis, Montreal, London-St. Thomas (Ontario), London (England), Tokyo, Nagoya and Seoul. Families or individual members were also scattered across

the U.S. and Canada. Smith re-incorporated the oratory under Massachusetts law as the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth. Members hoped that the new start at Newburyport, free from the immoral financial involvements, would finally enable the regular religious life to develop. No such thing happened. Smith spent most of his time alone in the oratory or travelling to visit secular members.

In the S.C.C. Bulletin in the early sixties, members reflected on Smyth's theology in light of the theological developments of the sixties. Dan Heap, David Tsukada, John Rowe and others urged revision of S.C.C. theological positions. Other members resisted.<sup>157</sup> Argument centred on what was essential to Smyth's thought and what could be discarded. Members reported on their political involvements, including in the civil rights and peace movements, the Quiet Revolution in Quebec and the labour movement. In 1964 discussion began on revising the Anamnesis to incorporate some of the insights of Vatican II.

Paralleling all of the discussions was the difficult problem of the future of the S.C.C. The minutes of the 1965 chapter put forward the problem:

Fr. Smith then repeated the two primary matters of consideration before Chapter: Our consideration of the whole matter of the S.C.C. as a religious order, and our consideration of the specific problem of whether the Oratory of St. Mary and St. Michael shall continue, or can continue."<sup>158</sup>

Some members proposed that an annual pledge be required as a

part of the rule of the Society but others disagreed. Shortly after the chapter, Smith polled the membership about continuing the oratory. A large majority of members favoured it. Yet the money was not forthcoming.<sup>159</sup>

Underlying the financial problem was the loss of a common vision. Smith explained the problem in a letter printed in the September 1966 Bulletin:

Within our small present membership we have a most interesting potpourri. Theologically, there are Victorian Catholics, Smythian Catholics, simple Anglicans, "God is Dead" advocates, agnostics, and atheists. Philosophically, we run the whole gamut from Aristotelianism to logical positivism. There is much individualism and great variation in our political convictions. We are made up of a number of agglomerations and the note of agglomeration seems to apply to almost all areas of our thought and activity.

With such diversity, Smith questions whether the S.C.C. can continue to exist:

Now it is from this context that the question has been raised, "What is our purpose and what are our common goals?" Isn't this a tidy question to answer? Groups do exist in the midst of great diversity and individualism, but there is always some sort of basic commitment. For the greater part, the S.C.C. has lost even this.<sup>160</sup>

Members continued the discussion among themselves in the Bulletin.

Smith and ten other S.C.C. members from the U.S., Canada, England and Japan had a final discussion of the Society's future on August 5, 1967 at the Varennes, Quebec farm of two Canadian members, Basil and Joy Smith. John Rowe urged the dissolution of the Society. Smith pointed out that only he as superior had the right to dissolve the S.C.C.

Other members suggested a referendum to advise Smith. Rowe prepared a referendum.<sup>161</sup>

Immediately after Smith returned to Newburyport, a real estate agent offered to buy the house and Smith accepted. Harris T. Hall celebrated the last Anamnesis at the oratory on August 13, 1967 on the feast of the Assumption. With the sale of the Newburyport house, the Oratory of St. Mary and St. Michael ceased to exist. With the loss of the oratory, as Smith had often predicted, the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth also ceased to exist as a formal organization, although groups continued to meet in Japan. Elmer Smith moved to Canada and returned to the parish priesthood, carrying Smyth's papers, vestments and ashes with him. After a long stay in Canada, Smyth's ashes were interred in the Smyth family plot in Clinton, N.Y. in 1981.<sup>162</sup>

From beginning to end, despite pressure from within and without, Smyth and the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth never renounced their commitment to Christian Marxism. When Smyth's own commitment wavered in the later years, members of the Society called him back to his own earlier Christian-Marxist vision. In the following chapters I shall trace the development of this theology. But the Society was not able to survive its founder's death or the turbulent political and theological climate of the sixties.

I shall return to the disappearance of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth in my final chapter.

#### Notes

<sup>1</sup>"Found New Order: Society of the Catholic Commonwealth Instituted in Episcopal Church", Boston Evening Transcript, Oct. 21, 1939, and "Religious Society Established here by Episcopalians", Boston Globe, Oct. 23, 1939; see also Christ Church archives, FHS file.

<sup>2</sup>Christ Church archives, FHS file, Carl Balliett, Jr. to C. Leslie Glenn, Oct. 26, 1939, telegram; Glenn to Balliett, n.d., [reply to above telegram]; Glenn to Henry K. Sherrill, Nov. 23, 1939.

<sup>3</sup>SCC papers, A-12-185, James DeWolf Perry to FHS, April 1, 1940 and FHS to Perry, April 2, 1940; E-5-23, 24, FHS licenses.

<sup>4</sup>John Forbes Russell, "The Society of the Catholic Commonwealth", course paper, Weston Theological Seminary, 1977, copy in possession of TMB; taped interview with Brs. Paul and Francis, O.I.W., Cambridge, Mass., Nov. 2, 1981; E. Sinclair Hertell, "Chaplain to Labour", Christian Century, LVII (1940), 667-9; SCC papers, J-3-2, "Rule of Life for the Oratory".

<sup>5</sup>SCC papers, D-1-90, EAB loan; A-12-75, agreement with Round Table Press, Aug. 24, 1940; A-12-190, FHS to C.C. Carroll, June 14, 1940; A-3-10, FHS to John Wild, July 10, 1940.

<sup>6</sup>SCC papers, A-3-6, FHS to John Wild, June 13, 1940; B-21-45, FHS to J.F. Russell, Sept. 27, 1941; B-21-56, Br. Paul, B.S.P. to FHS, Jan. 7, 1941; Russell, "The Society of the Catholic Commonwealth", op. cit.; Brs. Paul and Francis interview, op. cit.

<sup>7</sup>SCC papers, A-3-10, FHS to John Wild, July 20, 1940. See also SCC papers, J-11-162, FHS to R.L. Roy, Jan. 30, 1956, reported in Roy, Communism and the Churches, pp. 158-59.

<sup>8</sup>SCC papers, A-2-6, John Wild to FHS, Dec. 5, 1940.

<sup>9</sup>SCC papers, D-2-15, Radcliffe forum speech notes.

<sup>10</sup>SCC papers, G-18-1, Quincy CIO housing meeting

speech notes.

<sup>11</sup>SCC papers, B-21-24, FHS to Don [Feick], June 7, 1941; B-21-27, FHS to Richard Young, April 8, 1941; D-2-3, FHS A.P.M. speech notes; "Boston Sends 400 Delegates to Peace Rally", Daily Worker, April 4, 1941, p. 2; "No Convoys, No A.E.F. . . . National Response to American Peace Mobilization Campaign Proves Growing Resistance to War", Daily Worker, May 24, 1941, p. 2; E.S. Seldon to TMB, Oct. 12, 1982; Swarthmore College, Peace Collection, A.P.M. papers, National Religious Committee correspondence; FHS FBI file, N.Y. Office report, June 4, 1951. Smyth's A.P.M. involvements are reported numerous times in the F.B.I. file.

<sup>12</sup>E.S. Seldon to TMB, Oct. 12, 1982.

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.

<sup>14</sup>SCC papers, D-2-11, FHS Frankfeld speech notes.

<sup>15</sup>SCC papers, B-1-33, Philip Frankfeld to FHS, Dec. 19, 1940.

<sup>16</sup>E.S. Seldon to TMB, Oct. 12, 1982. Smyth's cousin, C.P. Smyth, recalls having once asked Smyth directly if he was a member of the Communist Party and receiving an "evasive" answer (C.P. Smyth interview, Princeton, N.J., Nov. 6, 1981).

<sup>17</sup>SCC papers, B-21-66, FHS to Russell McKeon, Nov. 3, 1941.

<sup>18</sup>SCC papers, B-21-27, FHS to Richard Young, Mar. 3, 1941.

<sup>19</sup>Interview with Richard Young, Chicago, Ill., April 25, 1982.

<sup>20</sup>Swarthmore College, Peace Collection, A.P.M. papers, FHS to F.D. Roosevelt, June 22, 1941, press release, and A.P.M. confidential memorandum dated July 17, 1941; SCC papers, B-21-41, FHS to Don Feick, July 31, 1941.

<sup>21</sup>SCC papers, B-4-11, Marian Rubins Davis (Russian War Relief) to FHS, Oct. 4, 1941; H-2-124, Mass. Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder letterhead; B-5-31, "Free Earl Browder" FHS radio broadcast text; Smyth's F.B.I file also documents his involvement in both campaigns.

<sup>22</sup>SCC papers, B-1-60, FHS form letter and petitions, July 30, 1942; H-2-258, FHS to Mrs. Honore Armstrong (Citi-



zens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges), Aug. 14, 1942.

<sup>23</sup>SCC papers, H-2-51, FHS to William [Spofford?], June 12, 1942.

<sup>24</sup>SCC papers, D-10-12, FHS to Joseph Fletcher, Nov. 26, 1941; B-21-74, FHS to Russell McKeon, Dec. 14, 1941; H-2-277, FHS to Thomas Logan, July 25, 1942; Herbert Cahoon SCC papers, copies in possession of TMB, FHS to Cahoon, Dec. 22, 1941.

<sup>25</sup>FHS FBI file, "Custodial Detention Memorandum", Nov. 24, 1941. The F.B.I. files of both Smyth and the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth have been obtained under the Freedom of Information Act. Large portions of the files have been blacked out.

<sup>26</sup>FHS FBI file, "Custodial Detention" memoranda and "Key Figure Summary Reports" and other reports, 1942-54. For Smyth's account of the F.B.I. agent's visit to the Oratory, see SCC papers, A-2-128, FHS to Elmer Smith, July 20, 1945.

<sup>27</sup>FHS FBI file, J. Edgar Hoover to Lawrence M.C. Smith (Chief, Special War Policies Unit), July 17, 1943; Boston Office, "Key Figure Summary Report", Nov. 1, 1943.

<sup>28</sup>The final F.B.I. report was prepared in Oct. 1954. See Philbrick, I Led 3 Lives, p. 20.

<sup>29</sup>SCC papers, A-2-6, FHS to Robert [ ], Dec. 19, 1940.

<sup>30</sup>[Smyth], Society of the Catholic Commonwealth, 1941 and 1945 editions.

<sup>31</sup>SCC papers, B-12-12, FHS to William B. Spofford, Feb 7, 1941; B-12-17, FHS marginalia on CLID copy of Malvern Declaration; B-12-26, Spofford to FHS, Aug. 26, [1941]; D-10-12, FHS to Joseph Fletcher, Nov. 26, 1941; I-4-1, FHS, "A Theological Primer for Malvern Cells", mss.

<sup>32</sup>Vida D. Scudder, "F. Hastings Smyth Writes Excellent Book on Theology", Witness, XXV, No. 15 (June 19, 1941), 8ff.; Conrad Noel, "By Taking of the Manhood Into God", Church Militant, No. 50 (April 1941), 3-5; E.L. Mascall, Christendom, XI (1941), 194-5; W. Norman Pittenger, Living Church, CII, No. 7 (Feb. 19, 1941), 13; Joseph F. Fletcher, "A Theological Note: On Religious Cynicism", Anglican Theological Review, XXIV (1942), 71-76.

<sup>33</sup>SCC papers, H-2, contain extensive documentation

of the abortive Corpus Christi move, including correspondence with the parish, Bishops Manning and Sherrill, Norman Pittenger and E.R. Hardy. For St. Stephen's, see SCC papers, H-2-136, FHS to Russell [McKeon], Dec. 22, 1942; B-25-6, FHS to H.K. Sherrill, Jan. 7, 1943; D-10-16, FHS to Joseph Fletcher, Jan. 6, 1943; see also interview with Paul Halde- man, Brookline, Mass., July 23, 1983.

<sup>34</sup> SCC papers, H-14-7, FHS to Felix Cirlot, June 7, 1943, on Russian Orthodox possibility; F-12-2, FHS to Philip Bevan, May 31, 1944, on returning to England; D-10-21, FHS to Joseph Fletcher, June 17, 1943 on Chicago.

<sup>35</sup> SCC papers, D-10-21, FHS to Joseph Fletcher, June 17, 1943. See also SCC papers, B-12-37, FHS to William B. Spofford, March 18, 1942, on hostility of bishops; E-4-7, FHS to Dorothy Rankin, Sept. 16, 1946, on hostility of S.S.J.E.

<sup>36</sup> SCC papers, FHS to William B. Spofford, Jan. 23, 1942; F-20-65, FHS to Gordon Graham, Jan. 30, 1945. The condemnation extended to C.L.I.D.'s successor, the Episcopal League for Social Action, in the fifties. See Archives of the Episcopal Church, Austin, Texas, William B. Spofford papers, FHS to Spofford, Jan. 27, 1953.

<sup>37</sup> SCC papers, A-2-33, FHS to Robert C. Martin, June 1, 1943; D-10-21, FHS to Joseph Fletcher, June 17, 1943; taped interview with Joseph and Forrest Fletcher, Belmont, Mass., Nov. 4, 1981; taped interview with James and Reed Pfeufer, Brewster, Mass., July 15, 1982; John R. Watt to TMB, Dec. 31, 1979; E.S. Seldon to TMB, Oct. 12, 1982.

<sup>38</sup> Elmer J. Smith, "Liturgy and Social Action", Living Church, CXIII, No. 22 (Dec. 1, 1946), 20-22; E.R. Hardy, Jr., Review of Religion, March 1947, 310-13.

<sup>39</sup> SCC papers, D-2-20, 21, FHS FCSO [probably also AFSA] lecture notes; D-10-22, FHS to Joseph Fletcher, July 13, 1943; A-2-42, FHS to Russell McKeon, July 15, 1943; A-2-43, FHS to Robert [Martin?], July 15, 1943; B-29-11, FHS to Melvin Abson, Corpus Christi, 1944; A-11-66, AFSA 1944 programme.

<sup>40</sup> SCC papers, A-2-103, FHS to Robert Martin, Feb. 22, 1945; A-2-106, FHS to J.F. Russell, Feb. 24, 1945; F-20-28, Massey Shepherd, Jr. to FHS, Oct. 29, 1944.

<sup>41</sup> SCC papers, D-10-16, FHS to Joseph Fletcher, Jan. 6, [1943].

<sup>42</sup>SCC papers, B-1-64, Earl Browder to FHS, Mar. 19, 1943 and FHS to Browder, March 27, 1943; see also Syracuse University, George Arents Research Library, Earl Browder Collection, FHS file.

<sup>43</sup>SCC papers, K-4-57, FHS notebook, June 21, 1944, "Note on present Communist International Line"; A-2-79, FHS to Peter Ruderman, Sept. 11, 1944; A-2-82, FHS to Ruderman, Sept. 22, 1944.

<sup>44</sup>SCC papers, F-20-146, FHS to Ann Prosten, Dec. 28, 1945.

<sup>45</sup>SCC papers, B-20-12, FHS to [F.H.O. Bowman], July 11, 1945.

<sup>46</sup>SCC papers, K-4-60, FHS list of suggested articles; A-2-121, FHS to Elmer Smith, July 4, 1945; A-2-136, FHS to David Hecht, July 31, 1945; F-20-109, FHS to F.H.O. Bowman, Oct. 1, 1945; F-20-106, FHS to Bowman, Sept. 30, 1945.

<sup>47</sup>SCC papers, B-29-32, FHS to Wallace E. Conkling (Bishop of Chicago), Nov. 20, 1945; B-29-45, Washington Avenue oratory deed; C-2-1, promissory note for EAB \$12,000 loan to FHS. At the same time, Smyth apparently invested \$5,000 from a stock redemption in Brown's research institute, Asthma Research Foundation, Inc. Brown named Smyth president of the foundation. (SCC papers, F-20-152, FHS to C.C. Carroll, Dec. 21, 1945; N.J. Olds [EAB's secretary] to FHS, April 3, 1946.)

<sup>48</sup>SCC papers, E-3-28, FHS to John [Russell], Dec. 25, 1945; Hertell, "Chaplain to Labor", op. cit., p. 669.

<sup>49</sup>SCC papers, F-12-9, FHS to Philip Bevan, June 6, 1946; F-20-185, FHS to L.H. Bristol, Jr., July 22, 1946; B-5 contains many positive responses to Bulletin. It was the publication of the Bulletin that convinced James DeWolf Perry to become episcopal visitor of the Society. (SCC papers, E-19-9, Perry to Smyth, June 21, 1946.)

<sup>50</sup>SCC papers, A-7-192, FHS to Westminster Press, Mar. 6, 1947; I-18-28, Macmillan to FHS, April 3, 1951.

<sup>51</sup>SCC papers, J-7, Dialectics mss.; B-13-12, 1947 AFSA Arundel programme; F-20-259, FHS to R.H. Thomas, Oct. 11, 1947 (Revere group); E-4-57, FHS to David [Cochran], Feb. 24, 1948 (Harvard John Reed club); B-31-26, FHS to John Wagland, Nov. 4, 1949 (E.T.S. and Harvard students).

- <sup>52</sup> SCC papers, F-12-5, FHS to Philip Bevan, June 22, 1945.
- <sup>53</sup> SCC papers, F-20-82, FHS to Col. Bradley Dewey, Jul. 31, 1945.
- <sup>54</sup> SCC papers, F-20-84, FHS to [Lou Smyth], Aug. 14, 1945; F-20-86, FHS to Harry [Henry De Wolf Smyth], Aug. 17, 1945; interview with Rose Mazzone, Revere, Mass., Mar. 23, 1984.
- <sup>55</sup> SCC papers, F-12-9, FHS to Philip Bevan, June 6, 1946.
- <sup>56</sup> SCC papers, E-4-43, FHS to Vanson Ronco, Mar. 21, 1947.
- <sup>57</sup> SCC papers, B-29-3, FHS to K.H. Ting, June 19, 1947.
- <sup>58</sup> See, for example, [Smyth], "The Monroe-Truman Doctrine", Bulletin, II, No. 29 (Low Sunday, 1947), 1-2, and Paul M. Sweezy, "Notes on the Marshall Plan", Bulletin, III, No. 2 (Nov. 2, 1947), 1-3.
- <sup>59</sup> SCC papers, F-20-320, Leslie Arnold (Sam Adams School) to FHS, June 24, 1947; E-4-50, FHS to Vanson [Ronco], Sept. 9, 1947; A-11-108, Sam Adams School Catalogue, Fall 1946; FHS FBI file, July 19, 1954 report.
- <sup>60</sup> SCC papers, E-4-27, FHS to V.J. Jerome, Dec. 9, 1946.
- <sup>61</sup> SCC papers, F-20-239, FHS to Dirk Struik, March 1, 1947.
- <sup>62</sup> SCC papers, F-20-199, FHS to Harry Truman, Sept. 17, 1946, telegram; F-20-2, P.C.A. receipts for FHS donations; [Smyth], "The Wallace Candidacy", Bulletin, III, No. 13 (Jan. 18, 1948), 1-3.
- <sup>63</sup> SCC papers, B-28-29, FHS to David Hecht, Feb. 9, 1948; B-29-179, FHS to David Cochran, Mar. 25, 1948.
- <sup>64</sup> SCC papers, C-13-7, FHS to Gilbert Cope, April 3, 1948.
- <sup>65</sup> SCC papers, B-29-105, FHS to Henry Wallace, April 6, 1948; B-28-4, FHS to David Hecht, June 7, 1948.
- <sup>66</sup> SCC papers, F-20-264, FHS to David Hecht, Dec. 16,

1947; F-23-14, FHS to K.H. Ting, July 23, 1951, also quoted in "Memorandum to those Attending Chapter, 21-24 August [1951]".

<sup>67</sup>Bulletin, III, Nos. 25-27 (April 11, 18 and 25, 1948).

<sup>68</sup>Bulletin, III, No. 28 (May 2, 1948).

<sup>69</sup>SCC papers, K-16, SCC members index.

<sup>70</sup>SCC papers, A-2-86, FHS to David Hecht, Oct. 18, 1944; A-11-66, Arundel programme, 1944; F-20-60. FHS to [John Peacock], July 10, 1945; B-13-3, S.L. Pollard to FHS, Jan. 22, 1947 and FHS to Pollard, Jan. 24, [1947].

<sup>71</sup>SCC papers, B-13-1, FHS to Ray Corbett, Oct. 18, 1946; B-28-1, FHS to David Hecht, Oct. 18, 1946; Frank Carthy SCC papers, in possession of TMB, CY-1-41, FHS to Carthy, Oct. 16, 1946.

<sup>72</sup>SCC papers, D-9-20, S.L. Pollard to FHS, Jan. 28, 1947; D-9-17, K.H. Ting to FHS, [March 1947], and FHS to Ting, Mar. 14, 1947.

<sup>73</sup>SCC papers, B-24-15, FHS to John Tunnicliffe, Sept. 8, 1947; B-13-19, FHS to S.L. Pollard, July 31, 1947. The SCC papers contain extensive documentation on the 1947 Arundel conference.

<sup>74</sup>SCC papers, B-13-16, FHS to S.L. Pollard, Sept. 2, 1947; B-13-14, FHS to Thaddeus Clapp, Sept. 13, 1947.

<sup>75</sup>SCC papers, C-26-21, FHS to Carthy, Hall and Webber, Aug. 30, 1947; B-28-6, FHS to David Hecht, Sept. 10, 1947; C-26-18, FHS to F.V. Carthy, Sept. 11, 1947; C-26-23, FHS to Carthy, Nov. 15, 1947; C-27-7, FHS to Henry Veatch, Nov. 21, 1947.

<sup>76</sup>SCC papers, F-34-5, FHS to Elmer Smith, May 12, 1948; F-34-10, FHS to Smith, Oct. 25, 1948; C-23-16, FHS to Henry Veatch, Dec. 17, 1949.

<sup>77</sup>SCC papers, F-34-12, FHS to Elmer Smith, Dec. 3, 1948; F-34-16, FHS to Smith, Feb. 18, 1949; F-34-19, FHS to Smith, June 26, 1949; C-23-16, FHS to Henry Veatch, Dec. 17, 1949; C-26-79, F.V. Carthy to FHS Feb. 20, 1950.

<sup>78</sup>SCC papers, B-27-10, John Rowe to FHS, Feb. 13, [1948] and FHS to Rowe, Feb. 20, 1948; B-11-17, Rowe to FHS, March 9, [1948].

<sup>79</sup> SCC papers, B-11-16, FHS to John Rowe, Mar. 9, 1948; B-31-50, John [Wagland] to FHS, June 15, 1948; William and Jane Van Meter SCC papers, in possession of TMB, VM-3-17, FHS to William Van Meter, April 2, 1948; taped interview with former members of Montreal cell, Toronto, July 5, 1978.

<sup>80</sup> SCC papers, F-34-5, FHS to Elmer Smith, May 12, 1948; B-31-50, FHS to John Wagland, June 17, 1948; B-29-116, FHS to Marshall Swan, July 22, 1948; B-31-48, John [Wagland] to FHS, July 16, 1948; taped interview with John and Mary Wagland, Barrie, Ont., July 3, 1982.

<sup>81</sup> SCC papers, B-31-48, John Wagland to FHS, July 16, 1948 and FHS to Wagland, July 20, 1948; D-5-9, John Rowe to FHS, July 24, [1948].

<sup>82</sup> SCC papers, F-34-11, FHS to Elmer Smith, Oct. 25, 1948; D-5-11, FHS to John [Rowe], Sept. 12, 1948.

<sup>83</sup> SCC papers, B-31-24, John Wagland to FHS, [Sept. 1949] and FHS to Wagland, Sept. 19, 1949; B-31-26, Wagland to FHS, Sept. 26, 1949 and FHS to John Wagland, Nov. 4, 1949; J-14-29, FHS to Vince Goring, Nov. 8, 1949. The SCC papers include extensive documentation of the Montreal cell.

<sup>84</sup> Margaret Assels to TMB, Feb. 19, 1979; Montreal cell members interview, op. cit.; interview with Jack Adam, Toronto, June 21, 1980; taped interview with Dan and Alice Heap, Toronto, April 11, 1982; interview with David Rigby, Toronto, Feb. 29, 1984.

<sup>85</sup> SCC papers, D-5-13, John Rowe to FHS, Oct. 1, 1948; B-31-30, S.C.C. Montreal Cell Annual Report, 1949.

<sup>86</sup> SCC papers, B-31-31, 38, John Wagland, "The Solidarity of a Cell of the Incarnation", June 11, 1949.

<sup>87</sup> SCC papers, D-5-18, John Rowe to FHS, Jan. 9, [1949]; B-31-34, John Wagland to FHS, May 13, 1949; B-31-35, Wagland to FHS, June 26, 1949.

<sup>88</sup> SCC papers, F-34-11, FHS to Elmer Smith, Oct. 25, 1948; B-24-38, FHS to John Tunnicliffe, Dec. 5, 1948; B-31-19, John Wagland to FHS, Nov. 8, 1949; Heap interview, op. cit.

<sup>89</sup> SCC papers, D-5-13, John Rowe to FHS, Oct. 1, 1948 and FHS to Rowe, Oct. 11, 1949; F-34-22, FHS to Elmer Smith, Sept. 21, 1949; B-31-24, John Wagland to FHS, [Sept. 1949] and FHS to Wagland, Sept. 19, 1949; D-5-22, John Rowe to

FHS, Oct. 4, [1949] and FHS to Rowe, Nov. 11, 1949.

<sup>90</sup> SCC papers, F-34-16, FHS to Elmer Smith, Feb. 18, 1949.

<sup>91</sup> SCC papers, C-26-60, FHS to Frank Carthy, May 16, 1950. See also Van Meter papers, VM-8-8, FHS to William and Jane Van Meter, May 11, 1950.

<sup>92</sup> SCC papers, B-31-36, John Wagland to FHS, June 14, 1949; B-31-26, John Wagland to FHS, Sept. 26, 1949 and FHS to Wagland, Nov. 4, 1949; Carthy SCC papers, in possession of TMB, CY-1-34, John Wagland to FHS, June 17, 1950.

<sup>93</sup> Cited in mimeographed "Memorandum to those Attending Chapter, 12-24 August", dated Aug. 20, 1951, p. 4, in possession of TMB. (Hereafter cited as "Memorandum".)

<sup>94</sup> "Memorandum", p. 2, and SCC papers, F-23-14, FHS to K.H. Ting, July 23, 1951.

<sup>95</sup> "Memorandum", pp. 4-5, and B-28-50, David Hecht to Br. David, S.C.C. [Don P. Johnston, jr.], Aug. 14, 1951. See also B-28-53, Hecht to FHS, Jan. 21, 1951, earlier memorandum.

<sup>96</sup> "Memorandum", p. 5, and B-28-50, Br. David to David Hecht, Aug. 17, 1951.

<sup>97</sup> "Memorandum", p. 4, FHS comments from hospital.

<sup>98</sup> SCC papers, K-11, 1951 chapter minutes file; C-7-11, 1951 chapter minutes typescript; B-28-56, David Hecht to E.A. Brown, Aug. 29, 1951; B-28-57, Hecht to Br. David, Aug. 29, 1951; C-26-90, FHS to F.V. Carthy, [Sept.] 1951; "The Acts of the Fourth General Chapter of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth Held in Cambridge, Mass., August 22, 1951", mimeographed; interview with Dieter Goetze, Santa Barbara, Calif., Sept. 2, 1984.

<sup>99</sup> SCC papers, F-39-2, FHS to John Wagland, June 3, 1951; Montreal cell interview, op. cit.; Heap interview, op. cit. The S.C.C. papers contain extensive documentation of this period.

<sup>100</sup> John and Mary Wagland SCC papers, in possession of TMB, WA-1-76, Robert Crouse to FHS, June 21, 1950, and FHS to Crouse, July 3, 1950; SCC papers, F-39-2, FHS to John Wagland, June 3, 1951; F-39-3, FHS to John Wagland, July 13, 1951; C-11-19, Robert Crouse to FHS, Oct. 10, 1951; C-11-23, FHS to Crouse, Nov. 11, 1951; taped interview with Robert

Crouse, Halifax, May 19, 1982; taped interview with Peter and Betty MacDonald, Dartmouth, N.S., May 19, 1981; taped interview with Carman Carson, Windsor, N.S., May 20, 1982; taped interview with George Parker, Digby, N.S., May 21, 1982; telephone interview with Garth Embree, Nov. 22, 1982.

<sup>101</sup>SCC papers, F-31-8, R.H. Waterman to FHS, April 23, 1952 and FHS to Waterman, April 29, 1952. See also mimeographed copy of FHS-Waterman correspondence, untitled.

<sup>102</sup>SCC papers, F-31-7, FHS to R.H. Waterman, May 11, 1952; D-5-57, FHS to John Rowe, May 18, 1952; Waterman to FHS, June 25, 1952; F-31-13, FHS to Waterman, Aug. 9, 1952.

<sup>103</sup>SCC papers, F-29-5, FHS to John Liebler, Mar. 29, 1953; F-40-46, FHS to Norman Nash, April 6, 1953; C-24-44, FHS to Harris Hall, April 6, 1953.

<sup>104</sup>SCC papers, F-31-29, FHS to R.H. Waterman, Nov. 16, 1953; F-41-63, FHS to Archie Malloch, Nov. 23, 1953; E-8-5, FHS to John Rowe, Dec. 4, 1953.

<sup>105</sup>SCC papers, J-14-55, Report of Canadian S.C.C. retreat, August 26-28, 1953. The other Canadian S.C.C. members briefly defended Crouse's decision to leave the oratory, provoking a conflict with Smyth. However, in the end, they sided with Smyth. See Wagland papers, WA-1-79, Canadian SCC to FHS, [Dec. 31, 1953].

<sup>106</sup>"Letter written to the Montreal Cell by the Rev. Cyril Powles and his wife Marjorie, members and representatives of the SCC in Japan", August 7, 1950, mimeographed; interview with Christopher Yazawa, Tokyo, May 17, 1978; interview with David Tsukada, Tokyo, May 21, 1978; telephone interview with Cyril Powles, Jan. 14, 1987.

<sup>107</sup>Cyril and Marjorie Powles SCC papers, in possession of TMB, PO-2-33, [Cyril and Marjorie Powles] to FHS, Sept. 17, 1955; Powles papers, PO-1-19, D.O. Tsukada to Cyril Powles, Nov. 18, 1956; Metacosmesis, Oct. 3, 1958, list of Japanese S.C.C. members; Powles interview, op. cit.

<sup>108</sup>SCC papers, B-24-57, FHS to John Tunnicliffe, Dec. 19, 1949; C-20-3, FHS to Tunnicliffe, April 25, 1950.

<sup>109</sup>SCC papers, D-5-47, John and Isabel [Rowe] to FHS, Jan. 1, 1952 and FHS to John [Rowe], Jan. 8, 1952; D-5-54, Rowe to FHS, Mar. 18, [1952]; D-5-58, Rowe to FHS, June 13, 1952; D-5-70, Rowe to FHS, Oct. 6, 1952; D-5-79, Rowe to FHS, Nov. 17, 1952.



110 SCC papers, C-16-21, FHS to Carman Carson, Oct. 30, 1953; C-27-36, FHS to Henry Veatch, Oct. 21, 1953; E-8-16, John Rowe to FHS, [Spring 1954]; E-8-29, Rowe to FHS, Mar. 4, 1955.

111 SCC papers, E-8-20, [English cell] to FHS, Oct. 5, 1954 and FHS to John Rowe, Oct. 24, 1954; Wagland papers, WA-1-9, Rowe to John Wagland, Aug. 11, 1955; SCC papers, E-8-39, "Letter to Chapter" from English cell, 1955.

112 SCC papers, E-8-45, John [Rowe] to FHS, Dec. 11, 1955 and FHS to Rowe, Dec. 17, 1955; E-8-47, FHS to John Rowe, Jan. 1, 1956; E-8-61, John [Rowe] to FHS, July 31, 1956; E-8-62, John [Rowe] to FHS, Aug. 3, 1956; E-8-68, John [Rowe], Oct. 10, 1956; Powles papers, PO-2-46, English cell to Cyril and Marjorie Powles, Jan. 1, 1956; John and Isabel Rowe SCC papers, copies in possession of TMB, RO-1-121, English cell annual report, 1956; John Rowe, "Letter and Statement from England", Bulletin and Newsletter, III, No. 5 (July 1956), pp. 11-13.

113 Interview with John and Isabel Rowe, London, Aug. 30, 1982; interview with Tom and Sherry Waldon, Swindon, Sept. 1, 1982; interview with Laurence Gillam, London, Aug. 29, 1982; interview with Valerie Richards, London, Aug. 30, 1982. See also John Rowe, "A Call to Christian Sacrificial Revolution", Theology, LVIII (1955), 189-9, and Priests and Workers: A Rejoinder; and Tom Waldon et al., Statement of a Group of Churchmen, Priests and Lay, Who have Chosen to be Wage-Workers in Industry as an Expression of their Faith. The SCC and Rowe papers include extensive documentation of the English S.C.C. cell.

114 SCC papers, F-12-11, FHS to Philip Bevan, April 12, 1950; F-23-8, Y.C. Ts'ai to FHS, July 20, 1950 and FHS to Ts'ai, [Jul. 1950]; F-23-12, R.O. Hall to FHS, Oct. 12, 1950.

115 SCC papers, B-24-38, FHS to John Tunnicliffe, Dec. 5, 1948; B-24-42, FHS to Tunnicliffe, Jan. 19, 1949.

116 SCC papers, C-24-19, FHS to F.V. Carthy, Feb. 3, 1951; C-22-13, FHS to Jack Adam, July 19, 1952; FHS, "Religious Life in the S.C.C.", 1954 Allocution, mimeographed. An important element in the failure of the religious life to develop was clearly Smyth's personality. He placed the political demands of the S.C.C. above personal relationships; as a result, he was authoritarian and compulsive in community life. While Smyth presented his friendly and open side to secular members visiting the oratory, those living there found him difficult to live with. (Interview with Elmer

Smith, Prince William, N.B., June 1978.)

<sup>117</sup> SCC papers, C-23-22, FHS to Henry Veatch, June 21, 1948; B-28-4, FHS to David Hecht, June 16, 1948; B-29-118, DPJ to H.S. Cobey, July 26, 1948; F-37-4, FHS to Mabel Tidball, May 24, 1957; B-29-116, FHS to Marshall Swan, July 22, 1948.

<sup>118</sup> SCC papers, F-40-8, FHS to N.B. Nash, Mar. 27, 1949; E-4-109, FHS to John [Liebler], May 20, 1950; FHS to John Rowe, D-5-48, Feb. 23, 1952; F-40-48, FHS to Nash, May 20, 1953; F-10-23, DPJ to W.E. Barton (Boston State Hospital), Feb. 17, 1954.

<sup>119</sup> SCC papers, C-4-42, FHS to Helen [Popel], Dec. 18, 1950.

<sup>120</sup> SCC papers, C-16-23, FHS to Carman Carson, Feb. 19, 1954.

<sup>121</sup> SCC papers, E-22-55, FHS to Andrew F. Muir, Aug. 16, 1954; E-23-12, FHS to Robert H. Fisher, May 10, 1955; E-23-27, FHS to Robert Roseijka, Oct. 14, 1955; Powles papers, PO-2-7, Bruce Mutch to Powleses and Rows, June 25, 1954.

<sup>122</sup> SCC papers, E-7-53, FHS to J.K. Putt, Nov. 8, 1954; E-7-57, DPJ to FHS, Jan. 27, 1955; E-7-62, FHS to Putt, Mar. 25, 1955; F-31-44, FHS to Garth Embree, April 3, 1955; "The Location of the Oratory of S. Mary and S. Michael: Proposed Site", Bulletin and Newsletter, II (1955), 32-33; articles in Warsaw Bulletin, Mar. 24, 1955.

<sup>123</sup> SCC papers, E-7-64, FHS to J.K. Putt, April 2, 1955; I-1-53, "Notes for Oratory Directors", 1955; Bulletin and Newsletter, II (1955), p. 63.

<sup>124</sup> H. Robert Smith to TMB, Sept. 1, 1978.

<sup>125</sup> "Fire Sweeps Ward 1 Monastery; Priest Escapes by Window", Gloucester Times, Feb. 24, 1958, p. 1. The SCC papers also contain extensive documentation of the fire.

<sup>126</sup> SCC papers, B-29-116, FHS to Marshall Swan, July 22, 1948; F-9, DPJ file on Marvel Carter Delicacies, Inc., Raleigh, N.C., 1950-52; D-21-1, DPJ financial summary, 1952; interview with Elmer Smith, Prince William, N.B., June 1978.

<sup>127</sup> SCC papers, H-5-5, N.B. Nash to DPJ, Jan. 31, 1956; F-40-72, FHS to Nash, Feb. 18, 1956; F-40-73, Nash to FHS, Feb. 23, 1956; F-40-74, FHS to Nash, Sept. 15, 1956; E-11-2, Constantine Hutchins to FHS, Sept. 11, 1956; E-18-2,

Nash to FHS, Sept. 19, 1956.

<sup>128</sup> SCC papers, E-18-6, FHS to Anson P. Stokes, Jr., Mar. 11, 1957.

<sup>129</sup> SCC papers, E-18-7, A.P. Stokes, Jr., to FHS, Mar. 14, 1957; Stokes to TMB, [Jan. 1979]; Robert A. Mamis to TMB, Mar. 13, 1979. Mamis reports that at the age of 22 he was given authority to buy and sell stocks without consulting Smyth or Johnston.

<sup>130</sup> SCC papers, J-11-217, FHS to Elmer Smith, May 28, 1957; Robert Wild SCC papers, in possession of TMB, WI-1-14, FHS to Wild, May 15, 1957; Wagland papers, WA-1-17, FHS to John Wagland, July 28, 1957; WA-1-16, FHS to Wagland, Aug. 7, 1957; SCC papers, E-8-91, FHS to John Rowe, Aug. 2, 1957; F-17-280, FHS to Archer Torrey, Aug. 21, 1958; F-17-269, FHS to Tom Stone, Oct. 30, 1958; F-17-173, FHS to Robert Wild, Dec. 12, 1958; interview with Roger and Helen Ray, Cape Elizabeth, Me., Mar. 25, 1985.

<sup>131</sup> Interview with Elmer Smith, Prince William, N.B., June 27, 1980; FHS-DPJ correspondence in possession of Smith; Smyth's agonizing about Johnston's situation is very apparent in the letters cited in the previous note.

<sup>132</sup> SCC papers, F-16-53, FHS to Robert Wild, June 23, 1959; F-16-54, FHS to Garth Embree, June 29, 1959; E-8-95, FHS to John Rowe, Nov. 5, 1959; Elmer Smith interviews, June 1978, June 1980, Nov. 1981; Young interview, op. cit.; R.L. Jacoby to TMB, June 20, 1979.

<sup>133</sup> SCC papers, F-18-128, FHS-DPJ petition and response, Aug. 24, 1959; E-8-95, FHS to John Rowe, Nov. 5, 1959; Van Meter papers, VM-2-18, FHS to Jane Van Meter, Nov. 6, 1959; "Minutes of the Annual Chapter of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth", 1958, p. 10; Smith interviews, op. cit.; Ray interview, op. cit.; Heap interview, op. cit.

<sup>134</sup> SCC papers, F-33-2, FHS to Mrs. R.B. Ray, Feb. 20, 1956; E-8-50, FHS to John Rowe, Mar. 27, 1956; F-27-4, FHS to David Hecht, July 17, 1956; Wagland papers, WA-1-15, FHS to [John Wagland], Sept. 11, 1956; Rowe and Heap interviews, op. cit.

<sup>135</sup> "Minutes of the 9th General Chapter SCC, Aug. 27-29, 1957" in Bulletin and Newsletter V (1957-58), 20-21, 50-51 (including Alice Heap letter).

<sup>136</sup> SCC papers, F-15-213, FHS to Nadine Pendleton, July 23, 1958; F-15-226, FHS to Frank Carthy, July 30, 1958;

Pendleton to FHS, July 20, 1958; F-16-25, Don [Dan] Heap to FHS, July 28, 1958; F-15-249, FHS to Archer Torrey, Aug. 21, 1958.

<sup>137</sup>[Smyth], Society of the Catholic Commonwealth, 1958, pp. 10-11.

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., p. 12.

<sup>139</sup> SCC papers, F-15-211, Tom Stone to FHS, July 14, 1958; F-15-212, FHS to Stone, July 20, 1958; F-15-227, FHS to Forrest Powers, July 30, 1958; F-17-260, Powers to FHS, Sept. 26, 1958; "Political Economic Items from the Oratory", Bulletin and Newsletter, V (1957-58), 89-91, 94-96; "Minutes of the Annual Chapter of the Society of the Catholic Commonwealth", 1958, pp. 8, 14; F.F. Powers to TMB, Nov. 11, 1982.

<sup>140</sup> SCC papers, F-18-29, FHS to Christ the King Foundation, Dec. 29, 1959.

<sup>141</sup> Wild papers, WI-1-30, FHS to John and Barbara Wild, Dec. 22, 1959; FHS taped letter to Archer Torrey, Jan. 1960, copy in possession of TMB; SCC papers, F-16-59, FHS to Don Heap, Nov. 16, 1959; F-18-18, FHS to John Rowe, Dec. 29, 1959. Smyth wrote many S.C.C. members about Wild's paper.

<sup>142</sup> SCC papers, F-16-56, FHS to Don and Alice Heap, Jan. 5, 1960; F-18-154, FHS to Archer Torrey, Feb. 2, 1960 (not sent); F-16-73, FHS to Alice Heap, Mar. 26, 1960; Smith interviews, op. cit.

<sup>143</sup> Jane Van Meter, "The Death of the Father Founder", Bulletin and Newsletter, VII, No. 2 (Corpus Christi 1960), pp. 1-4; SCC papers, K-3, FHS postmortem report; Smith interviews, op. cit.

<sup>144</sup> Jane Van Meter, "The Death of the Father Founder", op. cit.; Archer Torrey SCC papers, in possession of TMB, TO-1-48, Cyril Powles to Torrey, [April 1960]; Smith interviews, op. cit.

<sup>145</sup> Torrey papers, TO-1-48, Cyril Powles to Archer Torrey, [April 1960]; DPJ to SCC, mimeographed official letter, April 25, 1960; Peter Maupin to TMB, Sept. 7, 1984.

<sup>146</sup> DPJ to SCC, mimeographed official letters, June 7, June 21, Sept. 14, 1960.

<sup>147</sup> DPJ to SCC, mimeographed official letter, June 21, 1960.

<sup>148</sup>DPJ, proposed revision of Society of the Catholic Commonwealth handbook, Bulletin and Newsletter, VII, No. 3 (Dormition BVM 1960); "Memoranda agreed upon to present to the Father Superior following the Oratory Conference 1960", Bulletin and Newsletter, VII, No. 4 (Oct.-Nov. 1960), 9-12;

<sup>149</sup>Ray papers, RA-1-57, SCC members' comments on future of Society for 1960 chapter.

<sup>150</sup>DPJ to SCC, mimeographed official letters, Sept. 14 and Sept. 23, 1960; Archer Torrey to SCC, mimeographed official letter, Sept. 29, 1960; Oratory of St. Mary and St. Michael, mimeographed official letter, Dec. 1960.

<sup>151</sup>According to Helen Ray, a member of the Portland S.C.C. cell, who recorded the information after a conversation with Johnston, there were three legal entities, the F. Hastings Smyth Fund for the S.C.C., the St. James Trust and the Oratory. Total assets were projected at six and one-half to seven million dollars. The F. Hastings Smyth Fund's assets were cash and negotiable securities and originally derived from Smyth's personal investments. The St. James Trust held (but did not own) Capital Realty, which was developing a large industrial site south of New Castle, Delaware and property outside of Montreal. Trustees of the two funds and the Oratory and officials of Capital Realty included Johnston, Brown, and Brown's (and formerly Smyth's) lawyers, Lloyd Ritvo and Elliott Rosenberg, and their family members, in various combinations. The St. James Fund had outstanding bank loans for capital to develop Capital Realty. The Oratory had two mortgages, including a \$70,000 one held by Johnston's parents.

The two trusts and the Oratory were legally and financially separate from one another. Johnston was the sole common denominator. Neither of the trusts was subject to taxation since their proceeds were for religious purposes; they also were to be self-perpetuating. Because so much money was borrowed and invested, little cash was actually available to the oratory. Much of what income they generated went to Johnston's expenses, which were considerable (Ray papers, RA-1-62, Helen Ray notes on conversation with DPJ, undated).

Johnston also reported to Jane Van Meter in a telephone conversation in May 1961 that money from the F. Hastings Smyth Fund for the S.C.C. was being used for research on multiple sclerosis by Harvard Medical School at Boston State Hospital and was unavaiable for Oratory priorities (Van Meter papers, VM-5-9, Jane Van Meter notes, May 9, [1961]).

<sup>152</sup>"Notes from the Canadian Conference", Bulletin

and Newsletter, VIII, No. 9 (Oct. 1961), 1-3; Torrey papers, TO-1-59, DPJ to Archer Torrey, June 2, 1961; Smith interviews, op. cit.

153 The St. James Trust had turned over \$150,000 of Capital Realty money to the F. Hastings Smyth Fund to hold while Capital Realty faced a lawsuit. The F. Hastings Smyth Fund disposed of the money. Capital Realty was demanding \$61,000 from the F. Hastings Smyth Fund, more than the fund contained. Since the latter fund had in the past largely supported the Oratory, the Oratory's use of the fund's money was now illegal. In addition, Johnston had organized without legal counsel two more corporations both of which were complete financial losses (Van Meter papers, VM-4-23, [Elmer Smith?] letter, Feb. 5, 1962).

154 Van Meter papers, VM-4-21, "Minutes of Chapter, 1962"; Smith interviews, op. cit.

155 "Statement from Fr. Johnston dated 4 January, 1963", Bulletin and Newsletter, VIII, No. 23 (Feb. 1963), 3; Frederick L. Redpath, ed., '39 in '64, 25th Year Book: Princeton University Class of 1939, DPJ entry; "Notes from Fr. Smith to the S.C.C. Membership", Bulletin and Newsletter, XV, No. 1 (Feb. 1969), 2; Smith interviews, op. cit. Johnston was officially deposed from the ministry of the Episcopal church by the bishop of Massachusetts on Jan. 14, 1963 (Episcopal Church Annual, 1964).

156 "News from the Oratory", Bulletin and Newsletter, VIII, No. 26 (June 1963), 2-5; Smith interviews, op. cit.

157 See, for example, David Tsukada, "A Critique of S.C.C. Theology", 1961, and responses in Bulletin and Newsletter, VIII, No. 17 (July 1962).

158 "Minutes of Chapter, August 20, 21, and 22, 1965", Bulletin and Newsletter, XI, No. 7 (Oct. 1965), p.3.

159 "The Poll", Bulletin and Newsletter, XII, No. 1 (Jan. 1966), 1-3.

160 Elmer Smith to SCC, Bulletin and Newsletter, XII, No. 9, (Sept. 1966), 5.

161 "August Gathering at Montreal", Bulletin and Newsletter, XV, No. 1 (Feb. 1968), 2-3.

162 "Notes from Fr. Smith to the S.C.C. Membership", Bulletin and Newsletter, XV, No. 1 (Feb. 1968), 1-2; St. James', Clinton, Burial Register, 1981.