

T *Speaking of* TOLERANCE

A Fortright Discussion
of Some of the More
Controversial Periods
in Religious History,
including:

Savonarola . . . Galileo . . . Joan of Arc

St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre

Early Days in North America

Catholic Policy in North America

Latin America

Protestantism in Spain

Papal Pronouncements on Tolerance



Spec
Capam

Why the Knights of Columbus Advertise Catholic Faith

The reason is simple. We Catholics want our non-Catholic friends and neighbors to know us as we really are and not as we are some times mistakenly represented.

We are confident that when our religious Faith is better understood by those who do not share it, mutual understanding will promote the good-will which is so necessary in a predominantly Christian country whose government is designed to serve all the people—no matter how much their religious convictions may differ.

American Catholics are convinced that as the teachings of Christ widely and firmly take hold of the hearts and conduct of our people, we shall remain free in the sense that Christ promised (John VIII, 31-38), and in the manner planned by the Founding Fathers of this republic.

Despite the plainly stated will of the Good Shepherd that there be "one fold and one shepherd," the differences in the understanding of Christ's teaching are plainly evident. It has rightfully been called "the scandal of a divided Christianity."

If there is anything which will gather together the scattered flock of Christ, it is the nationwide understanding of the Savior, what He did and how He intended mankind to benefit by the Redemption.

To this end, we wish our fellow-Americans to become acquainted with the teachings of Christ as the Catholic Church has faithfully presented them, since the day the apostles invaded the nations of the world in willing and courageous obedience to Christ's command: "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations..." (Matt. XXVIII, 19).

**SUPREME COUNCIL
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS
Religious Information Bureau
4422 LINDELL BLVD. ST. LOUIS 8, MO.**

SPEAKING OF TOLERANCE

"I'm not so stupid, Jim, as to think that Catholics don't read the Bible. But here's a text I think Catholics should learn by heart."

"What one is that, John?"

"This passage in Luke (9:54): It tells how, when the Samaritans would not receive Christ, James and John asked: 'Lord, wilt Thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them?' Then the Master rebuked them, saying, 'You know not of what spirit you are. The Son of Man came not to destroy souls, but to save.' Now Jim, I've nothing against you personally, and I know a lot of fine people who are Catholics. Yet are you not as intolerant as James and John were? What could other people expect if Catholics ever became a majority in this country? How do we know they wouldn't launch another persecution as they so often did in the past?"

"So you believe that Catholics are regular 'Sons of Thunder,' such as Christ named James and John?"

"Well, Jim, that has been true in the past, has it not?"

"Maybe it seems so to an outsider at first sight, John. But that particular text that you brought up has a lesson for all honest and

thinking followers of Christ. James and John were full of youthful zeal, but a zeal too natural and self-willed: they are more angered at the Samaritans' opposition to their message than concerned about their conversion. Now I would like to contrast this young John with the aged Apostle. Look how differently he speaks in his old age: *'This is the message that you have heard from the beginning, that we should love one another; not like Cain, who was of the evil one, and killed his brother'* (1 John, 3:11). The Catholic Church, like her Founder, Christ, has ever sought men's conversion, not their death. There can be no general condemnation of the Church because some of her over-zealous sons — like James and John — have taken the sword into their own hands, and cut off Malchus' ear."

"Oh, those are fine sentiments, Jim, but twentieth-century American Catholics know they have to behave in a predominantly Protestant country. Things were quite a bit different in other days, though. Your Catholic forbears would never have countenanced the ideas of toleration which you express today."

"Sorry, John, but I must differ with you there. First, don't get me wrong about this business of toleration. According to Webster, to tolerate means to suffer to be done without opposition. It doesn't imply approval of what is being tolerated; in fact, it properly connotes disapproval, or otherwise, what is merely tolerated would be advocated and promoted. Tolerance may be a very reasonable and expedient course of action, but it isn't always a virtue, nor is intolerance of error and sin a vice. And second, you may cite some real Catholic fire-eaters in this matter of persecution, but I will insist that they did not necessarily speak for the Church.

Cannot Condemn

The question of the proper attitude to be taken toward non-Catholics always has been widely discussed in the Church. For instance, Origen, the early Christian sage at Alexandria, Egypt, held: '*Christians cannot slay their enemies, nor condemn them as Moses commanded the contemners of the Law to be put to death by burning or stoning*' (*Against Celsus*, VII, 26). And Lactantius, lay tutor of Emperor Constantine's sons, insisted: '*There is no justification for violence and injury, for religion cannot be imposed by force. It is a matter of will, which must be influenced by words, not by blows ...*'" (*Divine Institutes*, V. 20).

"Wait a minute there, Jim, not so fast. You are quoting the Christians writing during the pagan persecutions; naturally all were against the use of force then. But when

they came out of the catacombs, they turned the table on the pagans."

"Not so, John. The emperors, Christian and pagan, tended to be dictators in religion as in everything else. Emperor Diocletian, for example, condemned the pagan Manichees to be burned about 295 A.D., but also persecuted Christians (Kirsch, *Enchiridion Fontium Historiae Antiquae*, n. 328). And Emperor Constantine deprived the Donatists, both rebels and heretics, of the privileges of the Catholics" (*Ibid.*, n. 833). But why not listen instead to some of the bishops who had a better right to speak for the Church? St. John Chrysostom, Bishop of the eastern capital of Constantiople, is quite emphatic: '*To put a heretic to death is an unpardonable crime*' (Homily XLVI on Matthew (I). And in the West, St. Augustine could speak from the experience of thirty years outside the Church. In writing to his former co-religionists, the Manichees, Augustine argues: 'Let those who have never known the troubles of a mind in search of the truth proceed against you with vigor. It is impossible for me to do so, since for years I was cruelly tossed about by your false doctrines which I advocated and defended to the best of my ability. I ought to bear with you now as men bore with me when I blindly accepted your doctrine' (*Against Letter of Manichean Fundament*, 2-3). Even when the State took the Catholic side against the Donatists, the same St. Augustine was not too pleased: 'We have no intention of forcing

men to enter our communion against their will. I am desirous that the State cease its bitter persecution, but you in turn ought to cease terrorizing us by your band of Circumcelliones' (*On the Schism of Donatists*, vii).

"Now, Jim, are you trying to tell me there were no religious persecutions under Catholic rule? What about the Inquisition?"

"No, I merely wish to say that all such incidents should be viewed against the background of the social, political and religious spirit of the times. A careful study of the historical circumstances will show that misguided zeal, sometimes understandable, was responsible for them; sometimes the alleged persecution has been greatly exaggerated in its retelling; and still other times the accusation should be laid at the door of secular authority. To be absolutely fair we must admit that 'persecution' in some form can be attributed to all religious groups. In our effort to be zealous we can unwittingly become uncharitable Christians. The fault is our own and not that of the Church."

"If our discussion of religious persecution may be the occasion of my mentioning instances in which Catholics were persecuted by non-Catholics, I certainly do not do so as a 'pot calling the kettle black'. But, I almost forgot, you are asking me about the Inquisition."

"The Inquisition, John, arose more from popular violence than from ecclesiastical authority. By the eleventh century, Christians were becoming alarmed by an anti-social

group that was infiltrating Europe from the East. These were the ancient Manichees, augmented and refurbished under the aliases of Bogomiles, Albigenses, and Cathari. Their conduct was quite as exasperating and menacing to the State as that of some Communists today. There are, in fact, many similarities between the medieval Catharist menace and our current Communist problem."

"Go ahead, Jim — but you can't blame everything on the Communists."

"The Perfected"

"The medieval Catharist was a very determined fellow. He belonged to a disciplined organization that had two classes: 'Believers' and the 'Perfected.' Aside from promising to join the 'Perfected' some time before death, the 'Believers' had few moral duties except obedience to the 'Perfected', whom they honored by a triple prostration in their presence. The 'Perfected' on the other hand, were fanatics or racketeers or both. They contended, among other things, that the souls of men's ancestors dwelt in animals, because of which they forbade the eating of meat."

"But that is hardly an excuse for persecuting them."

"Right, John, but that was not the sum total of their offenses. They considered all matter evil and hence condemned marriage. They refused to take oaths of allegiance to the government, or to serve as soldiers — except when defending their own way of life. More than that, they kidnapped children to

train for their organization, and endorsed the 'endura'."

"The 'endura'— what was that?"

"It didn't last long, I assure you. Those Catharists whose ability to persevere in the practices of the sect was doubted were given the choice of being a 'martyr' or a 'confessor': that is, they could commit suicide by suffocating or starvation."

"What a choice! But suppose they wanted neither?"

"Then they probably would be visited by some of the 'Perfecteds' to help them make a decision. For you see the Catharists or Albigenses got control of whole towns and districts, especially around Albi in southern France. They not only took over or paralyzed the government, but they often had a corner on employment possibilities. For instance, in Languedoc at the opening of the thirteenth century the entire weaving industry was controlled by them. Sometimes a whole region was terrorized and fleeced by gangsters. Under the guise of physicians and peddlers they forced themselves into households. Even babies were given the 'endura.'"

"That sort of thing makes a man's blood boil. We would never have stood for things like that."

"Neither did decent Europeans during the Middle Ages, John. The common people became angry. But then there was little organized government, and no police department at all. As a result, things went pretty much as they did in our own Wild West! Vigilantes got together and sometimes resorted to 'lynch law.' I'm not spinning some

fine theory, John. Look at some cases. In 1022 at Orleans, the people induced King Robert 'the Pious' to put thirteen men suspected of Catharism to death. Then at Milan Archbishop Ariberto (1018-45) tried to argue with the Cathari, but the city officials, ignoring episcopal protests, seized the accused and burned them. The populace at Soissons waited until the bishop was out of town before they executed a suspect. At Liege, the bishop was able to save a few Cathari from the mob, but at Cologne the citizens defied their archbishop and put suspects to death without so much as a trial."

"Do you mean to say, Jim, that these bishops tried to stop this mob violence?"

Persuade Them

"I do indeed, John, Listen to Bishop Wazo of Liege (d. 1048): 'To use the sword of civil authority against the Manicheans is *contrary to the spirit of the Church and the teaching of her Divine Founder*... They should be allowed to live. The only penalty we should use against them is that of excommunication' (Life of Wazo: Migne, *Patres Latini*, CXLIII, 753). And during the twelfth century, St. Bernard declared: 'While I may approve of the zeal of the people for the Faith, I cannot at all approve their excessive cruelty, for *faith is a matter of persuasion, not of force*'" (Sermon LXIV on Canticles).

"Are you trying to explain away the Inquisition as merely 'medieval lynch law?'"

"No, John, but I do say that the

Inquisition was first occasioned by the *anti-social* menace of Catharism, and second by the need of checking *mob violence*. For neither the Church nor the State could permit the people to continue to take the law into their own hands; that would have led to anarchy and the end of all society. Therefore the kings in their nervous alarm began to go back to the stern old Roman laws against these very Manichees — I said before that Diocletian had decreed death for them back in the third century. Thus in 1160 King Henry II of England commanded a number of suspects to be branded and flogged and then outlawed. The penalties were inflicted with such rigor that many died. In 1183 the German Emperor Frederick I placed the Cathari under the ban of the Empire. Pedro II of Aragon decreed banishment in 1197. Finally in 1224 the free-thinking, anti-clerical Emperor Frederick II, so often extolled for his 'modern' views, took the final step by imposing the extreme penalty of burning at the stake. The first instance reported of an execution under this drastic law was at Brescia in 1230."

"But where did the Church come in?"

"In the same way she has always come in to public life, John. She entered the picture to support and help the State, and not to oppose it as some Liberals would have us believe. Whether or not the prelates may have liked these stern civil penalties, they had to choose between support of the existing law or yield to anarchy. As it turned out, conscientious inquisitors served

as a check on the primitive and barbarous civil courts by ensuring a fair trial. They could even save repentant heretics entirely from the secular power, and even for those who were handed over to the secular arm they asked mitigation of the penalties."

"Not so fast there, Jim. I'll admit the need of punishing criminals; but you said heretics. In the eyes of the Catholic Church, that includes people like me. We're not criminals."

Church and Society

"Of course not, John. But don't you think either that you can read history through twentieth-century glasses. Here is what Jean Guiraud, the great authority on the medieval inquisition, has to say: 'In the Middle Ages heresy was nearly always connected with some *anti-social* sect. In a period when the human mind usually expressed itself in a theological form, socialism, communism, and anarchy appeared under the form of heresy. By the very nature of things, therefore, the interests of both Church and State were identical.' (Questions d'Archeologie et d'Histoire, 44, cited by Vacandard, *Inquisition*, p. 253). Why, even the honest but unconsciously prejudiced non-Catholic historian, H. C. Lea declared that 'we cannot but admit that the cause of orthodoxy was in this case the cause of progress and civilization. Had Catharism become dominant, or even had it been allowed to exist on equal terms, its influence could not have failed to prove disastrous' (History of the

Inquisition, I, 106, cited by Vacandard, *Inquisition*, 233-234). Perhaps I could sum this all up by saying that in medieval times 'religion was the last refuge for a scoundrel.'

"But, Jim, according to the Catholic Church, I'm still a heretic. All that saves me from persecution on this account is our guarantee of religious freedom. How long would this freedom last if Catholics were in the majority?"

Ex-Catholics

"Now, John, you ought to understand that the average medieval dissenter was what we call a formal heretic. He was an *ex-Catholic* once properly instructed in the Faith, who had personally rebelled against the 'City of God,' to which he had pledged allegiance. As for you, John, I'm sure that you are only a *material* heretic."

"And what, pray, is that?"

"A material heretic dissents in good faith from Catholic truths. You are non-Catholic, not because you yourself left the Catholic Church, but because your father and grandfather and many before them were non-Catholic. And what is most important, you are probably convinced that you are in the right."

"Of course I'm right."

"We'll leave that to God, John. The point I'm making now is that we Catholics, even if we were in a majority, wouldn't challenge the honest convictions of one who had never been instructed in the Catholic Faith and had never betrayed it as did the medieval heretic. Unlike the modern non-Catholic, he claimed

to be a Catholic and insisted on expounding his own views as *Catholic* teaching. As St. Thomas says, this medieval formal heretic was one who obstinately maintained his errors even after they had been pointed out to him by ecclesiastical authority. Against the solid weight of public opinion, such men insisted on subverting all society. Therefore, as St. Thomas somewhat bluntly, but I think truly, says: 'It is much more wicked to corrupt the faith on which the life of the soul depends, than to debase the coinage which merely provides for temporal life; wherefore if coiners and other malefactors are justly doomed to death, much more may heretics be justly slain once they are convicted' (St. Thomas, *Summa Theologica*, II-II, xi, 3).

The Natural Law

"That's a hard saying, Jim."

"To modern ears, yes — but those men in the Middle Ages were not weaklings. They were men of conviction, who were willing to give up their lives for their beliefs. I sometimes wonder if our high-prized modern toleration does not spring from carelessness about questions of truth and error, and right or wrong. I think that all religious men could profitably listen to Pope Pius XII in his reminder of the truths of the natural law. He has said: 'No human authority, no state, no community of states... can give a positive command or positive authorization to teach or to do that which would be contrary to religious truth or moral good... because it is contrary to nature to

oblige the spirit and the will of man to error and evil or to consider one or the other as indifferent" (Address on Tolerance: Ci Riesce, 1953 A. D.).

"I don't think, Jim, that the Church should always butt into other people's business."

Members of Church

"Let me put my answer in the words of the late Father Walter Farrell: 'The Church is not a busybody in a neighbor's house to spank children who are nothing to her but nuisances. These heretics are her own children; by baptism they entered the Church, and by that sacrament the Church has over them the same power it has over all the rest of its subjects' (*Companion to the Summa*, III, 2).

"Oh, it's all right with me if the Catholic Church disciplines Catholics, but what right had the Catholic Inquisition to persecute Jews, Mohammedans, pagans, etc?"

"The Medieval Inquisition had no jurisdiction over such people, John—and the type of individual against whom the Inquisition was directed is indicated in the following words of Father Farrell: 'No one seriously questions the sensibleness of compulsion, even physical compulsion against a man plotting the overthrow of a legally constituted and properly functioning government; against the man who undermines the health of the community by spreading a dangerous disease; or against the traitor in war who attempts to betray his country' (*Ibid.*, III, 2).

"I'll grant you your analogies, Jim. If the medieval formal heretic was such a social misfit, I can understand that some sort of police action may have been necessary against him. But why all this gruesome apparatus of the Inquisition to keep a minority in its place? Nowadays we don't have to use the electric chair on every crackpot."

"A medieval government's methods are no more pleasant to me than to you, John. But remember that the medieval state did not have at its disposal the same means as a modern one. Hoffman Nicker-son has pointed this out: 'It is well enough for a modern civilized government, strong in the perfection of communications and of all public powers, to safeguard elaborately those accused of crime. Medieval conditions were in many ways like those of frontier regions where the criminal can easily slip away. When this is so, justice must make herself swift and terrible by rough and ready methods. Otherwise she does not exist' (*Inquisition*, 210).

"Medieval man was rough, John, not because he was Catholic but because he was medieval. He was harsh and 'trigger-happy' because he was on the defensive and afraid. As Vacandard puts it, 'The Inquisition established to judge heretics is therefore an institution whose severity and cruelty are explained by the ideas and manners of the age... Severe penalties, like the stake and confiscation, were the legacy which a pagan legislation bequeathed to the Christian State; they were alien to the spirit of the

Gospel. The Church in a measure felt this, for to enforce these laws she always had recourse to the secular arm' (*Inquisition*, 254).

"Your distinction between the secular and ecclesiastical arms looks pretty thin, Jim. The poor victim was railroaded by the reverend inquisitor and automatically handed over to the stake by a law policeman who did the dirty work."

Fair Trial

"You must be under the impression that the Inquisition was something like the French Revolutionary courts or the "off with his head" decrees of the Duchess in *Alice in Wonderland*. As a matter of fact, it was quite possible for the accused to go scot free by producing enough character witnesses. If convicted by the reverend inquisitor, his sentence was reviewed by a jury of lay experts who often took special delight in picking flaws in the clerical case. Even in the event of a 'guilty' verdict, the expected thing was that the accused would confess and then receive some ecclesiastical penance such as prayers, or fasting, or going on a pilgrimage to some shrine. For example, of 278 sentences pronounced at Carcassonne between 1249 and 1258 only a few were capital. At Pamiers between 1318 and 1324 but five of the seventy-five persons condemned were executed. We have the record of the famous inquisitor Bernard Gui. During his fifteen year career, out of 930 sentences, but 42 were put to death. Even the hostile historian Lea grants that 'the stake consumed comparatively

few victims'" (*History*, I, 480, cited by Vacandard, *Inquisition*, 207).

"That's not quite the way I heard it, Jim, but maybe the system of the Inquisition was not so bad as it has been made out to be. Suppose that I grant you that good inquisitors tried to be fair. What still bothers me is the way the whole thing worked out in practice. I know a whole series of cases in which the system was abused."

"Abuses do not necessarily prove a system bad, John. But all right, let's come to cases."

Joan of Arc

"But, Jim—let's hear you explain away the scandalous trial of the Catholic Saint, Joan of Arc."

"Scandalous is the word for it, John, but it is a scandal of churchmen rather than of the Church, or even of the Inquisition. For remember that I said that from the beginning of the fourteenth century the Inquisition increasingly came under secular control. That's why Joan's trial in 1431 was really a political arraignment. Bishop Jean Cauchon of Beauvais, an English partisan, usurped jurisdiction over Joan of Arc, who already had been cited to the French Inquisition in May, 1430. Though Cauchon invited the vice-inquisitor, Friar Jean LeMaistre, to participate in Joan's trial at Rouen, the inquisitorial officials played but a subordinate role. Cauchon himself named the personnel of the tribunal and gave away the political intent of the process when he told Joan: 'The King has ordered me to try you,

and I will do so.' He referred to the English child King; the latter's regent in France, the Duke of Bedford, already had declared in January, 1431: 'It is our intention to review and have brought before us the said Joan, if she is not convicted and found guilty of the above offences' (Guiraud, *Medieval Inquisition*, 204).

"The University of Paris, biased toward the Anglo-Burgundian cause, seems to have concurred in the Rouen sentence, but not un-animously. Two of its members, the Archbishop of Embrun and the Chancellor, Jean Gerson, declared Joan innocent. The case was never referred to Rome until after her death. In 1455 Pope Calixtus III authorized an investigation of the trial, and Joan was finally vindicated with her canonization by Pope Benedict XV in 1919."

Spanish Inquisition

"Have it your way, Jim. I can afford to concede a point or two, for I am about to bring up the persecution to end all persecutions, that Spanish Inquisition which is a by-word for heartless tyranny."

"Those are harsh and dogmatic statements, John, and you will have to come up with something better than Llorente's biased 'Critical History' which is so often used to support such criticisms. This distorted history was built up in the nineteenth century from stolen records from the secret archives of the tribunal. Llorente burned many favorable documents before he published his jaundiced indictment. Even so conscientious an historian

as Dr. Lea has been led astray by some of the exaggerations. But I'm not trying to whitewash the Spanish Inquisition, even if I do think that it has been unduly maligned. At its worst it was no different than the Henrician-Elizabethan persecution of Catholics in England."

"But Queen Elizabeth I executed for treason and not at the behest of clerical prosecutors."

"Good Queen Bess"

"Yes, 'Good Queen Bess' was clever enough for that. But nicknames aren't necessarily true, as we both know from school days. Catholic Mary Tudor executed some 200 of her political foes and is called 'Bloody Mary'; Protestant Elizabeth Tudor does the same and becomes 'Good Queen Bess.' But I am digressing. I was going to question your assumption that the Spanish Inquisition was 'priest-ridden.' If it was, it was not managed by the Catholic High Priest. For though Pope Sixtus IV reluctantly allowed Ferdinand and Isabella to revive a dormant inquisition in 1478, he tried to safeguard it from political exploitation.

"Unfortunately, though, he soon had to write the Spanish sovereigns, as on January 29, 1482: 'Accusation is made that hasty action and disregard of legal procedure on the part of these inquisitors have brought about the unjust imprisonment and even severe torturing of many innocent persons who have been unjustly condemned as heretics, dispoiled of their possessions, and made to pay the extreme penalty' (Walsh, *Characters of the*

Inquisition, 154-161). When this warning proved ineffective, the Pope protested more sharply on February 23, 1483: 'Your officials having put aside the fear of God, do not shrink from laying the scythe to an unseemly harvest, from breaking our provisions and the apostolic mandates... without being hindered or retarded, as is obvious, by any regard for censures... We urge and demand, therefore, that you carefully avoid censures of this kind.'

Pope's Rebuke

"On August 2, 1483, Sixtus IV again rebuked Ferdinand and Isabella because their inquisitors 'exceeded the moderation of the law' (Walsh, *Ibid.*, 159). So I think, John, that if there is anything that you don't like about the Spanish Inquisition, you will have to blame the Spanish Crown and not the Holy See."

"But I heard that it was this very Pope Sixtus IV who named the infamous Torquemada inquisitor-general."

"Pope Sixtus did accept the royal nomination of Torquemada in 1483. But Torquemada proved more loyal to the Spanish rulers than to Rome, for he instructed his officials that: 'since there emanated from the Roman Court certain orders and bulls and excessive rules for penitence against equity to the detriment of the Inquisition and its ministers, their Highnesses command that letters and provisions be read... by which is prevented and can justly be prevented the execution of the said

orders and bulls' (Walsh, *Ibid.*, 161). In other words, the papal instructions were to be ignored and suppressed in Spain. You may exaggerate in calling Torquemada infamous—he sentenced less than 10% of those tried during his term and many of these were genuine criminals. But, in any case, he was not acting for the Church but was, on the contrary, disobedient to the Holy See."

"I thought you said that the Inquisition did not bother Jews. Yet Ferdinand and Isabella exiled 160,000 Jews in 1492."

"The medieval papal inquisition did not prosecute Jews. The Spanish Inquisition, I have just proved, was not papal; it was a law unto itself. But of the Jews exiled from Spain in 1492, many found refuge with Pope Alexander VI in the Papal State."

Alexander VI and Savonarola

"Alexander VI! — wasn't he the one that used the Inquisition on Friar Savonarola who told him off for his enormous crimes?"

"Alexander VI may have been providentially permitted to verify the remark of Pope St. Leo the Great that 'Peter's dignity is not diminished in his unworthy successor.' It's not my aim to exonerate Alexander VI any more than did the Catholic historian, Ludwig von Pastor. Pastor, whose honesty is beyond dispute, has frankly accepted the truth of certain immoralities in Alexander's career, while disproving some mythical un-

natural crimes among the Borgias. Yet Pastor has observed: 'Just as the intrinsic worth of a jewel is not lessened by an inferior setting, so the sins of a priest cannot essentially affect his power of offering sacrifice, administering the sacraments, or transmitting doctrine ... Even the supreme high priest can in no way diminish the value of that heavenly treasure which he controls and dispenses, but only as a steward. The gold remains pure in impure hands... An evil life cannot deprive the Pope or any other ecclesiastical authority of his lawful jurisdiction' (Pastor, *History of the Popes*, VI, 14, 53).

"Now, Jim — I think you are trying to dodge my question. Didn't Alexander VI treat Savonarola harshly?"

Papal Leniency

"On the contrary, John, Alexander VI was exceedingly lenient and long-suffering in regard to the captious Friar. Though Savonarola began to preach in Florence in 1489 and waxed politically prophetic as early as 1491, Alexander VI did not demand an accounting of him until July 25, 1495. Even then despite Savonarola's unmeasured, exaggerated, and highly disrespectful criticism of the Pope and the Roman Curia, Alexander VI did not make use of his powerful weapon of excommunication until May 12, 1497. As late as March 9, 1498 the Pope assured the Florentine ambassador that he wished not the Friar's death but his amendment: 'I do not object to his

doctrine, but only to his preaching without having received absolution, and to his contempt of myself and of my censures.'"

Savonarola

"While Alexander ordered Savonarola's arrest as a disturber of the peace of all Italy, the Florentine city council ignored the Pope's demand for extradition to the papal tribunal at Rome. Florence conducted its own trial, fully equipped with torture, and the evidence was well nigh complete by the time the papal commissioners arrived on May 19. It was, therefore, Florence and not Rome that burned Savonarola on May 23, 1498. Pastor has remarked: 'No doubt Alexander VI was urgent in his demands that the rebel who had intended to call in the help of the secular powers to achieve his dethronement, should be punished. Nevertheless the responsibility for the severity with which he was treated must rest on the rulers of Florence' (History, VI, 48).

"So that's what happened! Just the same, Jim, I'm glad that we have escaped from the murky depths of the Dark Ages into the clear air of modern times. And in this matter of more tolerant behavior, even you will have to grant that a lot of good came from the Protestant Reformation. The Reformers were the champions of religious liberty that ushered in a better day."

"Don't you believe it, John. The last thing that Luther and Calvin and Tudor wanted was tolerance.

I'm surprised that you should still think this way in twentieth-century America. Why, over a century ago a flat denial of this assumption was made on the floor of the United States House of Representatives by Andrew Johnson, later President of the United States. Let me quote for you a few passages from a contemporary pamphlet which he incorporated into his speech during the Know-Nothing persecution of Catholics: 'I am a member of a Protestant church and a citizen of Greenville, where there are few Catholics and where the citizens are somewhat prejudiced against them ... The Catholics of this country had the right secured to them by the Constitution of worshipping the God of their fathers in the manner dictated by their own consciences ... Is the guillotine to be erected in this republican form of government and all who differ with the Whig party brought to the block? Is then a crusade to be commenced against the Church to satiate disappointed party vengeance? ... From whence or how obtained the idea that Catholicism is hostile to liberty, political and religious? During the Reformation did not the demon of persecution rage as fiercely among Protestants? ... During our colonial state when Protestants, Puritans, and Quakers were disfranchising and waging a relentless war of persecution against each other through Pennsylvania and the New England colonies, did not Catholic Maryland open her free bosom to all, and declare in her domain that no man should be persecuted for opinion's sake? And was

she not from this fact the sanctuary of the oppressed and persecuted, not only of America, but of Europe? And is Catholicism a foe to liberty? Is Ireland's Catholic Isle the nursery of slaves? ... Was Catholic Poland the birthplace of slaves? ... Were LaFayette, Pulaski, McNeill, DeKalb, and O'Brien foes to liberty? Was Charles Carroll of Carrollton, the last survivor of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, a friend of despotism?'" (Cited from Stryker, *Andrew Johnson*, 17-19).

Luther Intolerant

"Quite a remarkable speech, indeed, Jim. But is there anything back of all that rhetoric? Can history really convict the leaders of the Protestant Reformation of intolerance?"

"Let's look into the record, John. Suppose that we examine Luther's career first. I grant you that in his earlier days there are some expressions in favor of toleration. But that was only until he was himself contradicted, until others defied his teaching as he had rejected that of Rome. In particular, during the Peasants' Revolt of 1525 Luther at first expressed sympathy with the peasants; in fact he addressed to them some rather inflammatory appeals. But when the revolt got under way and the usual excesses appeared—(mind you, I'm not blaming the rebellion entirely on Luther)—why, then, Luther found it prudent to side with those princes whose protection he needed to establish and maintain his new religion. Then it was that he issued his pamphlet, *Against the Murder-*

ous Peasants. In this he exhorted as follows: 'Let all who are able hew them down, slaughter and stab them, openly or in secret, and remember that there is nothing more poisonous, noxious, and utterly devilish than a rebel. You must kill him as you would a mad dog; if you do not fall upon him, he will fall upon you and the whole land. They serve the devil under the appearance of the Evangel.' When he was requested to moderate the tone of his invective, Luther, who never did anything by halves, flatly refused: 'I will not listen to any talk of mercy, but will give heed to what God's way demands' (Luther's *Werke*, 358, cited by Grisar, *Luther*, II, 2-1-203). And for his Anabaptist opponents, Luther retorted, 'Let the rulers of the land do what they please with them.'

"Luther, far from being a champion of political liberty, practically delivered subjects to their rulers, right or wrong: 'I would rather suffer a prince doing wrong than a people doing right... It is in no wise proper for anyone who would be a Christian to set himself against his government, whether it act justly or unjustly'" (Luther's *Werke*, cited by Sabine, *History of Political Theory*, 361).

"But, Jim, all this isn't precisely religious intolerance."

"Even on that score Luther is scarcely an improvement over your medievalist. When he heard of King Henry VIII's execution of Sts. John Fisher and Thomas More, Luther exclaimed: 'Oh that our right reverend cardinals, popes, and

Roman legates had more kings of England to put them to death' (Table Talk, II, 324, cited by Grisar, *Luther*, VI 246). Another time he complained: 'If I had all the Franciscan friars in one house I would set fire to it, for in the monks the good seed is gone and only the chaff is left; to the fire with them' (Table Talk, 180 cited by Grisar, *Luther*, VI, 247). To be sure, Luther often spoke in an exaggerated and impulsive way, so that we may take such explosions with a grain of salt. But he cannot be excused from deliberate intolerance in such directives as the following:

"One Kind of Preaching"

"Writing to Elector John of Saxony on February 9, 1526, Luther said: 'A secular ruler must not permit his underlings to be led into strife or discord by contumacious preaching, for this may issue in uproar and sedition, but in each locality there must be but one kind of preaching' (Cited by Grisar, *Luther*, VI, 241). Again, Luther told Margrave George of Brandenburg on September 14, 1531: 'It would be grand if Your Serene Highness on the strength of your secular authority enjoined in both parsons and parishioners under pain of penalties the teaching and learning of the catechism' (Cited in Grisar, *Luther*, VI, 244). Finally, about 1533 in his 'Home Postils', Luther asserted that 'the worldly authorities bear the sword with orders to prevent all scandal so that it may not intrude and do harm. But the most dangerous and

formidable scandal is where false doctrine and worship finds its way in . . . They must resist it stoutly and realize that nothing else will do save they make use of the sword, and of the full extent of their power in order to preserve the doctrine pure and the worship clean. . . ." (Cited in Grisar, *Luther*, VI, 253).

Calvinism

"All this is news to me, Jim. However, my own religious leader was not Luther but Calvin. I'm sure that you will find in him a champion of both democracy and tolerance."

"No, John, you are merely jumping from the frying pan into the fire when you bring up Calvin. For him the secular government was by no means free in regard to religious practices. He said: 'It is the purpose of temporal rule, so long as we live among men, to foster and support the external worship of God, to defend pure doctrine and the standing of the church, to conform our lives to human society, to mold our conduct to civil justice, to harmonize us with each other, and to preserve the common peace and tranquility' (Institutes, IV, 20-2, cited by Sabine, *History of Political Theory*, 364). There is Calvin's program for his 'welfare church.'"

"But you can't accuse Calvin of intolerance on that remark, Jim."

"Right, John. The case against Calvin must not be painted too black. His latest (1954) defender, John T. McNeill, also makes your point. But even he admits: 'The sway Calvin exercised in Geneva

was very real and at some points unduly harsh. . . . The restrictive and disciplinary element of the theocracy were by no means relaxed when it became more secure. Rather they were enhanced. The consistory came to enjoy an autonomy over against the magistracy that it had been denied before 1555 . . . In Calvin's later years and under his influence the laws of Geneva became more detailed and more stringent. . . . Calvin imposed the death penalty for incorrigible adulteries and in one or two instance it was inflicted. . . . A man had his tongue pierced for 'blasphemy against the ministry.' A student who consigned the ministers to the devil was whipped at the college as an example. The death penalty was too frequently inflicted (eleven instances in 1561), often for offenses that are not capital in modern civilized nations'" (John T. McNeill, *History and Character of Calvinism*, 186ff).

"But Calvin actually imposed the death penalty for what you call heresy?"

"Alas, John, this is going to dispel a cherished illusion. For Michael Servetus, who denied the Trinity of God, escaped from the Spanish Inquisition only to be put to death by Calvin at Geneva in 1553. Between 1546 and 1564 in a town of 20,000, there were 58 executions, 73 sentences of exile, and 900 of imprisonment. And Calvin's colleague Farel defended this policy in a letter to Calvin: 'Some people do not wish us to prosecute heretics. But because the Pope condemns the faithful (Huguenots) for the crime

of heresy, it is absurd to conclude that we must not put heretics to death, in order to strengthen the faithful'” (Cited by Bertrand Conway, *Question Box*, 193).

St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre

“Calvinists may have resorted to stern measures in their own defense, Jim, but at least on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572, they were the victims and not the assassins. Their leader Coligny and 50,000 of his followers were massacred by murderers hired by Pope Pius V. And Pope Gregory XIII, successor to Pope Pius V., exulted over their miserable triumph by having a 'Te Deum' sung at Rome.”

“I'm surprised, John, that you should fall for such an old falsehood. The number of victims did not exceed 5000, and some historians put the figure as low as 2000. That is 2000 too many, of course, but the responsibility lies chiefly with the Queen-Regent of France, Catherine de' Medici. Her son, King Charles IX, was barely of age. Catherine was a Machiavellian politician who cared little for religion and sought merely to maintain herself in power by playing off Catholics against the Calvinist Huguenots in France. Most of the eight civil wars during her reign were fomented or provoked by her callous 'divide and conquer' policy. By 1572 she felt that the Huguenots under Coligny had become influential and she hoped to even the balance by a blood-letting, with the possible connivance of Coligny's

partisan rival, the Catholic Duke of Guise. Pope St. Pius V not only had not approved Catherine's plot, but was not aware of it. Indeed, he had on another occasion expressly denounced assassination as an instrument of religious war. It is in this connection that the Protestant scholar Kruger has remarked: 'I do not know if it is necessary to refute once more the accusation that the Popes had anything to do with the preparation for the Massacre of St. Bartholomew' (Cited by Pastor, *History*, XVIII, 154-155).

Pope Deceived

“As for Pope Gregory XIII, he first received a doctored report about the massacre in which it was intimated that the Catholics had won a glorious victory and had foiled a plot on the King's life. It was for this reason that the Pope ordered the celebration which involved the 'Te Deum.' But when Gregory XIII heard the gory details, the Spanish ambassador who was present reported that 'he was struck with horror.' Coligny's assassin, Maureval, was designed as 'murderer.' Brantome also reported that the Pope had remarked to one of the cardinals, 'I am weeping for the conduct of the King, which is unlawful and forbidden by God' (Pastor, *History*, XIX, 508)

“Well, the Vatican may have been misinformed about Coligny's fate in distant Paris, but it could scarcely have been unaware of Bruno's execution in Rome itself in 1600. There perished a martyr for conscience.”

That's strange, John, for none of his contemporaries seems to have mourned Bruno's passing. For them he was nothing but a fanatic and moral pervert. The Protestant Brucker, moreover, has expressed the view of many historians of philosophy on the value of Bruno's teaching: 'I defy the most acute genius to understand it, and the most patient of men to read it. Everything is wrapped in clouds and in mysterious expressions the meaning of which probably Bruno himself did not know' (*Critical History of Philosophy*, V, 12, cited by Parsons, *Studies in Church History*, III, 582). On the contrary, it would seem that the adulation of Giordano Bruno as a 'martyr to conscience under papal tyranny' was deliberately fostered by Rationalists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries as anti-papal propaganda.

Giordano Bruno

"Fra Giordano, nee Filippo Bruno, was an ex-Catholic; in 1580 he was excommunicated at Calvinist Geneva. He went to England but presently wore out his welcome at Anglican Oxford. After a short stay in France, he went to Lutheran Wittenberg where he was the object of still another excommunication in 1590. Not until 1592 was he arrested by the Inquisition at Venice, and the following year was extradited to Rome.

"The charges against him were not his alleged defense of the Copernican scientific hypotheses, as often suggested, but definite theological errors. Among these views were the following: 'all religions

are false'; 'Christ was a wretch and worker of evil deeds'; 'there is no punishment for sin'; 'the soul, work of nature and not of God, passes from one animal into another'. Indeed, Bruno contended that the souls of men, of flies, and of oysters were all alike.

Grossly Immoral

"Turner sums up Bruno's philosophy as an 'incoherent materialistic pantheism' (*Catholic Encyclopedia*, III, 17). Besides these speculative aberrations, Bruno was grossly immoral in theory and practice. He publicly boasted of his amours, avidly sought publicity, and scoffed at religion. Despite his braggadoccio, Bruno repeatedly made abject recantations during his examinations by the Inquisition. Of these, Pastor justly observes: 'If these attempts of the philosopher to escape the terrible penalties which threatened him are humanly speaking easy to understand, they do not show the smallest shadow of the courage of his opinions' (*History*, XXIV, 211). The Inquisition seems to have labored over his muddled subject for seven years without being able to elicit a sincere repentance. Finally his execution was ordered in February, 1600 and was carried out. Today Bruno would probably have been recognized as mentally unbalanced; we can only regret that psychology had not made enough progress by the turn of the seventeenth century to provide for Bruno's confinement in an asylum."

"Your Holy Office may have been right in Bruno's case, Jim, but it certainly missed the boat on Galileo."

"I suppose that to a degree you are right, John. Yet this almost unique mistake of the tribunal rather proves its record for careful and prudent decisions."

"Oh, that's perfectly all right with me, Jim. I'm satisfied if you have admitted just a single error in your supposedly infallible papacy."

"Don't jump to conclusions, John. I said that the Holy Office may have made a rash decision, but that's not the same as stating that the Papacy erred in faith or morals. The Holy Office is not the Pope. And the Pope of course can make a mistake in policy like any other ruler. He is infallible only when he teaches a doctrine of faith or morals to the universal Church and in virtue of his office, that is, when he speaks 'ex cathedra', from Peter's chair. Now this is quite different from giving a more or less routine signature to a decree by subordinates. Such a disciplinary act, it is true, is authoritative and must be obeyed. But as Father Conway has put it, such a decree prescribes 'what one must do and not what one must believe.' As a matter of fact, the contemporary St. Robert Bellarmine, later declared a Doctor of the Church, did not consider the decree of the Holy Office in Galileo's case as infallible. Indeed, 'off the record' he doubted the wisdom of the official decision and advised a patient awaiting of the facts."

"Now if you'll pardon my saying so, Jim, all this sounds like double

talk. Could you explain more definitely how all this worked out in Galileo's case?"

Galileo

"Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) was a professor of science at Pisa and Padua universities. Before 1600 he adopted the Copernican theory that the earth, instead of being a stationary planet as formerly believed, revolves around the sun. Galileo was brilliant enough, though he was more of a popularizer than an inventor or discoverer. In any event he would never have gotten into trouble with the Holy Office if he had remained within his own field. As proof of this, he was cordially received at Rome by Pope Paul V and the papal curia in 1611, and in 1623 he was permitted to dedicate *Il Saggiatore*, a veiled defense of the Copernican theory, to Pope Urban VIII.

"But like so many brilliant scientists in their efforts to bring their theories to the attention of ordinary folk, Galileo was tempted to pontificate outside the boundaries of his specialty. Presently he began to express himself arrogantly and foolishly in regard to the supposed effect that his scientific hypothesis would have on Biblical theology. Forgetting that the Scriptures do not expressly intend to teach science, Galileo insinuated that Biblical inerrancy was strained by such popular expressions as 'the sun rises', and that no reliance could be placed on the Scriptures save in a narrow field of theology. In his mode of argument, moreover, Galileo mani-

fested a certain supercilious condescension toward theologians and Biblical scholars that quite nettled them. Personality clashes provoked sweeping statements on both sides and led to Galileo's censure in 1616.

Copernicus

"Galileo's theories were then pronounced 'stupid and absurd in philosophy' and at least 'erroneous in faith.' Galileo was forbidden in the future to teach a theory which, at least as he rashly expounded it, seemed to contradict the teaching of Scripture. At the same time the works of Copernicus were put on the Index. The more judicious Copernican scientist, Johan Kepler (1571-1630), attributed this action to the 'ill-advised importunity of some persons who propounded the teaching of astronomy in the wrong places and in the wrong way'; in other words, he intimated that Galileo was not censured for the scientific content of his theories but for his mode of proposing them (Pastor, *History*, XXV, 298). Today the action of the Holy Office might seem rash stupidity, but it must be remembered that at the time the position of the Holy Office was that of the majority of contemporary scientists, including the renowned Tycho Brahe. Neither did the Protestant leaders think otherwise. Luther thought Copernicus somewhat foolish, while his aide, Melancthon, feared that the new theory would undermine all science. During the middle of the seventeenth century the Lutheran

theologians were still standing by their founders' verdict.

Mild Restrictions

"But Galileo himself was not even required to recant in 1616. Pope Paul X walked up and down with him arm in arm, explaining to him the reason for the condemnation and assuring him of his friendship (Pastor, *History*, XXV, 299). The scientist remained on intimate terms with many of the cardinals, including Barberini who was elected Pope Urban VIII in 1623. All this deference and condescension by the ecclesiastical authorities seems to have gone to Galileo's head. He presumed on his friendship with Pope Urban VIII to violate the 1616 decree of the Holy Office through a public defense of the Copernican theory in his *Dialogo*. Besides this he ignored the conditions on which the Roman censor, Monsignor Riccardi, had given approval to the publication. Galileo's disobedience this time was flagrant and could not be overlooked. Yet during his subsequent trial in 1633 he was kept in easy detention at the Villa Medici. He was not tortured and accepted his condemnation by the Inquisition for 'suspicion of heresy.' As a penance he was assigned the recitation of the seven penitential psalms once a week for three years. He was, indeed, sentenced to imprisonment, but this sentence was practically suspended by designating as his places of detention the villas of friends, and later even his own

home. Under these comparatively mild restrictions he continued faithful to the performance of his religious duties until his death in 1642. Pope Urban granted him a pension of 100 crowns and sent him the papal blessing at his death" (Conway, *Studies in Church History*).

The Index

"Maybe Galileo was not persecuted, Jim, but his views were suppressed. And isn't the same kind of suppression going on today through the Catholic Index of Forbidden Books? Is it not a form of persecution to suppress the truth?"

"John, the Index has no intention of suppressing truth; it aims only to destroy errors which can poison the mind."

"I'm of age, Jim. Let me take care of my own mind. Let me be the judge of what's going to poison it. How can error hurt an alert and well-instructed person?"

"Not every mind is properly instructed, John. That goes for us all—not merely for uneducated and ignorant people. Nowadays there is such a vast fund of knowledge that no one can learn it all in a lifetime. The best we can do is to be experts in our own profession or trade; if we wander out of it, we may reveal our inexperience and ignorance quite as badly as Galileo. The science of theology which treats of the vital matters of religious doctrine and morals is profound and extensive and few of us have the time, aptitude or training to be experts in it. That's why the Catholic Church provides her faithful

with guides whom they can trust and handy check-lists like the Index which they can consult."

"But why not let me and fellows like me experiment for ourselves? Why cramp our style?"

"Pure Faith Act"

"For the same reason that the Government doesn't let everybody choose between good and bad foods by bitter experiment. Even if most of us had the time and skill to detect all the possible merits and defects of food products, we would soon become tired of turning our kitchens into research laboratories three times a day to find out. The United States Pure Food Laws and Federal certificates of inspection relieve us of a lot of anxiety and trouble. Similarly, the Catholic Index of Prohibited Books is not trying to keep any man from the truth; it merely ensures him the protection of a 'Pure Faith Act' in his reading. And a Catholic is furnished with certificates of expert clerical inspection when he sees a 'nihil obstat' or an 'imprimatur' on a book pertaining to faith or morals."

"Nihil obstat and imprimatur sound nice, Jim—but just what do they mean?"

"'Nihil obstat' merely means that there is nothing objectionable to faith or morals in the book. It is not a guarantee that you are going to like what is said in the book or that you will find it useful. 'Imprimatur' is the bishop's permission to have the book printed. This doesn't make the book official, nor

does it oblige Catholics to read it. This supervision merely protects the faithful from error and harm in their reading without taking away their own judgment as to what is good and useful; and it leaves them freedom to follow their own tastes."

"Suppose your censors make a mistake about a book as they did about that Copernican theory?"

Good Books Available

"So what, John? It's better to err on the side of caution about once every three hundred years than to be exposed daily to bad books. There is even less reason to take a chance on the life of the soul than that of the body. Besides, there are so many good books coming out nowadays that no one can read them all. To have an occasional one put out of bounds necessarily will be no great loss."

"Well, you are welcome to your 'Pure Faith Laws', but I'm glad that our Government isn't enacting any."

"Of course, John, we have always had regulations barring obscene literature from the mails. And recent investigations have shown that sometimes Communist and criminal forces are back of the flood of 'comic'—it would be better to call them 'tragic'—books that are poisoning young minds and contributing to juvenile delinquency. Not only Catholics but all decent American citizens are worried about this problem, and are trying to do something about it. Only the other day, Attorney-General Barber of Vermont saw fit to ask a law banning literature or pictures which 'by

over-emphasis of improper and illegal conduct or of an unnatural situation would have a tendency to corrupt the morals, standards of conduct, or stability of character in youth.'"

"Oh, we are all agreed on such basic moral issues, but all too often what the Catholic Church wants is restraint of religious liberty. The Spanish Inquisition shows what happens to dissenters when the Catholic Church has influence in the government."

"Monita Secreta"

"Did you know, John, that the Spanish Inquisition arrested St. Ignatius Loyola? That sort of contradicts your argument, does it not?"

"Well, Jim, if the Inquisition arrested the founder of the Jesuits, I'll say that is one thing to its credit. And I'll tell you why I think so.

"Let me quote for you from the 'Monita Secreta', the confidential directives of the Jesuits: 'How to win and keep the friendship of princes and important persons... How to act with people who wield political influence, or those who, if not rich, may be serviceable... How to win over wealthy widows... To achieve all this Jesuits are to wear outwardly an appearance of poverty... Vices of prominent personages are to be indulged; quarrels are to be entered so as to get the credit of reconciliation; servants of the rich are to be bribed...' But why go on? Even you can't defend that sort of thing."

"Of course not, John—nor would any Jesuit. Someone has palmed off on you a hoary old forgery by the ex-Jesuit Zahrowski. Early in the seventeenth century he calumniated the Society by a clever imitation of the external appearance of the authentic *Monita Generalia* of the Jesuits. The work first appeared about 1612 at Notabirga (that means, 'no-town'), Poland. Blaise Pascal made use of the thing in his attacks on Jesuits. But Zahrowski eventually confessed the forgery and non-Catholic scholars have long since conceded that the *Monita Secreta* were a fraud."

"Well, if you ask me, Jim, the reason why so many fell for the *Monita Secreta* hoax probably is because it hit so close to the mark. In the seventeenth century when the *Monita* were circulating, more than 50,000 Huguenots were forced into exile and those that remained had troops quartered on them—the notorious 'dragonnates'. This persecution was the result of the revocation of the Edict of Toleration by King Louis XIV, in which the King acted upon the advice of his Jesuit Confessor, Pere La Chaise."

Revocation of Edict of Nantes

"Far be it from me to defend King Louis XIV, John. As for Pere LaChaise, Father Harney has examined the charge of Jesuit responsibility for the revocation of the Edict of Nantes and concludes that you can prove nothing against the Society. But he is generous enough to say of Pere LaChaise

that 'no doubt he approved of it as did most Frenchmen of his day' (*Jesuits in History*, 279). Pere LaChaise was not a bad man, but his fault lay not in 'Jesuit masterfulness' but rather in weak acquiescence in the ideas of the opinionated monarch. But even if Pere LaChaise was guilty, which is doubtful, it is unreasonable to blame the Jesuits for the conduct of one man and much more so to blame the Catholic Church."

"Didn't Louis XIV get his instructions about the Nantes Edict from Catholic headquarters in Rome?"

Not Pope's Instructions

"If you mean from Pope Innocent XI, he certainly did not. At the time the Pope and King were barely on speaking terms, and not long afterward the Pope excommunicated Louis XIV for tending toward a national French church, a move in which all too many French bishops supported the King rather than the Holy See. Two years before the Revocation, in 1683, Cardinal Sacchetti had told the Pope of the conversion of some Huguenots by the royal measures. Innocent XI rejoined: 'What is the good of it, if all the bishops are schismatics?' So cool was the Pope toward the King's designs that the latter circulated the story that Innocent favored the Huguenots. After the Revocation actually took place, the Pope bluntly condemned Louis' tactics. The Venetian ambassador, Girolamo Venier, reports that Innocent XI 'explicitly condemned Louis XIV's despotism

and his use of brute force. Conversions, he observed, were not made by armed apostles; this was a new missionary method of which Christ our Lord had made no use. Moreover, the moment for combating Calvinism had been badly chosen by Louis since he was at the same time fighting against the Holy See' (Pastor, *History of the Popes*, XXXII, 331, 341). Bertrand concurs in this estimate of Louis' motives, for he says of the French King: 'He judged religious questions from a purely political point of view—as King of France, not as a theologian... If he considered Protestants enemies of the State it was because, under cover of religion, they were sowing dissension throughout the nation, and weakening it in the face of the enemy' (*Louis XIV*, 346, cited by Conway, *Question Box*, 202)

Anglican Repression

"Once again you seem to have a reasonable explanation for a mighty suspicious incident, Jim. But where there is smoke, there is usually fire. Even if Rome was not back of these outbursts of fanaticism and persecution, they always seem to take place in Catholic countries."

"Aside from Holy Ireland, I'd be hard put to find a truly Catholic country in modern times, John. But you seem to think that these so-called Catholic countries have had a monopoly on religious persecution. Let's see if that is true. What about King Henry VIII who broke with Rome? His 'Six Articles' of 1539 were called by Protestants the

'whip with six cords.' Often the King hanged Catholics and Lutherans from the same gallows: the former for loyalty to Rome, the latter for not accepting Canterbury. And were Queen Elizabeth's 'Thirty-Nine Articles' of 1563 much better? In 1593 her 'Act Against Puritans' forbade them 'to deny, withstand, and impugn her majesty's power and authority in causes ecclesiastical', and this 'by printing, writing, or express words or speeches' (35 Elizabeth, cap. 1, cited by Bettenson, *Documents of Christian Church*, 343). But if a Catholic were arrested, he was forced to 'humbly confess and acknowledge that I have grievously offended God in condemning her Majesty's godly and lawful government and authority, by absenting myself from church, and from hearing divine service, contrary to the godly laws and statutes of this realm...' (35 Elizabeth, cap. 2, in Bettenson, *Documents*, 346).

"Where is your vaunted Protestant tolerance there, John? And do you suppose that a Catholic could run for office to change these laws? He could not, for before he could hold 'any office or offices, civil or military', he would have to do violence to his Catholic conscience by subscribing to the 'Test Act': 'I, A.B., do declare that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever' (25 Charles II, cap. 2, in Bettenson, *Documents*, 408). Right down to August 3, 1910, every

British monarch had to say that in his or her 'Protestant Declaration', plus the following tolerant addendum: 'The invocation of the virgin Mary, or any Saint and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome are superstitious and idolatrous...' (30 Charles II, cap. 2, cf. Taswell-Langmead, *English Constitutional History*, 627-628).

"You're right, Jim — but all that was in another age and another world. It was to escape such religious oppression that the first colonists came to the new world."

"Oath of Supremacy"

"But they didn't escape, John. Intolerance and even persecution were prepared for them even before they sailed. Take the Second Charter issued for Virginia in May-June, 1609. Its closing warning is: 'We should be loath that any person should be permitted to pass that we suspected to affect the superstitions of the Church of Rome; we do hereby declare that it is our will and pleasure that none be permitted to pass in any voyage, from time to time to be made into the said country, but such, as first shall have taken the Oath of Supremacy. For which purpose we do by these presents give full power and authority to the treasurer for the time being and any three of the council to tender and exhibit the said Oath to all such persons as shall at any time be sent and employed in the said voyage...' (Second Virginia Charter, xxix, cited by MacDonald,

Documentary Source Book of American History, n. 2, p. 14).

"What was the 'Oath of Supremacy'?"

"It required every English subject to accept that 'the queen's highness is the only supreme governor of this realm, and of all other her highness's dominions and countries, as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes, as temporal' (1 Elizabeth, cap 1, cited by Bettenson, *Documents*, 333).

"But we've been through all that; we're talking of America now."

"Papish Recusants"

"Old England had echoes in America, for the Virginian colonists reenacted on their own authority all of the English penal laws against Catholics. In 1699 all 'papish recusants' were deprived of the right to vote under penalty of five hundred pounds of tobacco. In 1705 Catholics were declared incompetent as witnesses. The same act was repeated in 1753 for all cases whatsoever. And in 1756 the Oath of Supremacy and the Test Act were again required. According to this penal code, no Catholic could own arms under penalty of three months in jail, confiscation of the arms, and a fine of three times their value. All Protestants who failed to denounce such Catholics were subject to the same penalties. A Catholic owning a horse worth more than five pounds sterling received three months in jail and a fine of three times its value" (Hening, *Statutes at Large*, I, 268; II, 48; III, 172, 238, 299; VI, 338; VII, 39).

"Didn't Virginia also adopt the English Toleration Act of 1689?"

"Yes, she did, John, in 1699. But you should recall that that Act excluded not only Catholics, but also Unitarians, Jews, and others from the limited toleration accorded. Both the English and the Virginian statutes left Anglicanism the established religion, to be supported by the contributions of all citizens without exception. Besides outlawing Catholics and 'religious radicals', they placed all dissenting denominations in a position of tutelage and supervision. Everybody had to attend church on Sundays and all meetings and ministers of the dissenting sects had to be licensed."

"Perhaps the Virginians smiled when they said that."

Virginia Intolerant

"I didn't catch their facial expression, John, but they were in earnest, I assure you. For instance, in 1629 Lord Baltimore, the Catholic Proprietor of Maryland, was expelled from Virginia for not taking the Oath of Supremacy even during a short visit. In 1632 settlers from Maryland were ordered to take the same Oath under penalty of prison. In 1641 Sir William Berkely received and enforced instructions to compel religious uniformity at the expense of the Puritans. As late as 1745 Lieutenant-governor Gooch issued the following: 'Several Roman Catholic priests are lately come from Maryland to Fairfax County in this Colony...I have therefore thought fit...to issue this

proclamation requiring all magistrates, sheriffs, constables, and other His Majesty's liege people within this Colony to be diligent in apprehending and bringing to justice the said Romish priests or any of them so that they may be prosecuted according to the law'" (Shea, *History of Catholic Church*, I, 408).

"Do you notice, Jim, how Catholics were persistently singled out? Maybe the American Colonies couldn't admit them to equal rights because the Catholics themselves refused to tolerate others when they had the whip hand."

Maryland Toleration

"In Maryland, John, they did have control. And it was precisely in this Catholic colony that the first Act of Toleration in America was passed. This was in 1649, a half century before the Virginian so-called Toleration Statute. The Maryland Act said: 'Whereas the inforcing of the conscience in matter of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in these commonwealthes where it hath been practised, and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province, and the better to preserve mutual love and amity amongst the inhabitants thereof, be it therefore...enacted that noe person or persons whatsoever within this province or the islands, ports, harbors, creekes, or havens thereunto belonging professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth bee any waies troubled, molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or

her religion nor in the free exercise thereof within this province or the islands thereunto belonging nor any way compelled to the beleife or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent, soe as they be not unfaithful to the Lord Proprietary, or molest or conspire against the Civil Government established or to bee established in this province under him or his heirs” (Browne’s *Archives of Maryland*, I, 244-247 cited by MacDonald, *Documentary History*, no. 14, p. 54).

Jews in Maryland

“I don’t see how a Jew could get into Maryland under that statute.”

“According to the letter of the law, you are right, John. Most legislators in those days almost automatically took ‘Christian belief’ as synonymous with religion itself. But fortunately we have information that in practice there was no anti-Semitism. For the records of the Colony show that the Jew, Jacob Lombrozo, served as juryman without challenge. In 1658, indeed, he was indicted by certain bigots, but the Catholic governor, Philip Calvert, dismissed the case.”

“I’ll bet that behind that high-sounding Toleration Act Catholics usually winked at persecution.”

“I can cite cases to the contrary, John. First of all, I should say that toleration existed in practice from the beginning of the Colony of Maryland in 1633. It was only in 1649 when the Puritans were beginning to question that unwritten

law, that it was thought necessary to enact it formally. Now in 1638 the Catholic, William Lewis, was fined 500 pounds of tobacco for using offensive speech toward two of his Protestant indentured servants. Again in 1642 the Catholic Thomas Gerard was given similar punishment for taking away the key and books from the Protestant chapel. Thus there was genuine religious toleration in Maryland until 1654 when the Puritan rump assembly took control and excluded from it popery, prelacy, or licentiousness of opinion.’ After that date the usual anti-Catholic laws multiplied: in 1704 priests were forbidden to exercise their functions; in 1716 a twenty-shilling tax was placed on ‘Irish papist’ servants; in July 1746 a gubernatorial proclamation in the Virginian style raised the hue and cry against ‘Jesuits and other popish priests.’ In 1758 Catholics who failed to take the Test Oath were subjected to double taxation—and so it went down to the eve of the American Revolution” (Ives, *Ark and Dove*).

“The Catholics seem to be in the clear in Maryland, all right, but heroic New England refugees for conscience’ sake anticipated them in this business of religious liberty, and sort of shamed them into it.”

“You may have heard that, John—but it is not true. The first Massachusetts Charter of 1629 would seem to imply that in the phrase: ‘that the Christian faith...in our royall intention and the adventurers’ free profession is the principall ende of this plantation’ (Cited by MacDonald, *History*,

26). But in 1631 the General Court enacted that 'no man shall be admitted to the freedom of his body politic but such as are members of some of the churches within the limits of the same.' Now in practise this meant the Congregational Church established by law and supported by taxes collected from all the inhabitants. And don't think that they did not carefully watch over church membership, John. Just listen to what you would call the 'medieval overtones' of the excommunication of Mrs. Hutchinson in Massachusetts in 1637: 'Forasmuch as you, Mrs. Hutchinson, have highly transgressed and offended, and forasmuch as you have so many ways troubled the church with your errors and have drawn away many a poor soul, and have upheld your revelations and forasmuch as you have made a lie, etc. Therefore in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the name of the Church I do not only pronounce you worthy to be cast out, but I do cast you out and in the name of Christ I do deliver you up to Satan...' (Cited by William Sweet, *Story of Religions in America*, 106). We may owe Thanksgiving Day to your New England founding fathers, but in 1659 the celebration of Christmas was abolished as savoring of 'popery.' Priests were to be banished on first detection, and executed on their return."

"Oh, those early Yankees were just trying to scare your priests away; such laws were never enforced."

"Fortunately they didn't catch many priests, but in 1724 the Jesuit

Father Sebastian Rale was killed and his scalp was exhibited in Boston. His church was burnt to the ground after the Blessed Sacrament had been desecrated."

"Well, Catholics certainly found asylum in Rhode Island. Its 1663 charter declared that 'no person within the said colony, at any time hereafter, shall be any wise molested, punished, disquieted, or called in question for any differences of opinion in matters of religion' (MacDonald, *History*, 69). That looks pretty tolerant to me."

"Catholics Accepted"

"Right, John. Now if I wanted to be real mean I might bring up the 1719 Rhode Island statute which qualifies that concession with the phrase, 'Roman Catholics alone excepted' (Phelan, *Catholics in Colonial Days*, 133). But historians are not entirely certain on the matter, and I won't press the point. At least Pennsylvania's Quakers always treated their fellow outcasts, the Catholics, well so long as they were able to control their legislation. Only in the absence of William Penn and under English pressure did their assembly introduce the Test Act in the beginning of the eighteenth century. As for the rest of the Colonies, their record is consistently anti-Catholic. The one exception may embarrass your fixed idea about Catholic persecution."

"Go ahead, I can take it."

"It's this. New York under the Dutch banned all religions but the Reformed Calvinist; under the Eng-

lish, the Anglican body was given a privileged tax-supported position. The exception is found in the enactment by the Catholic Duke of York that 'none should be molested, fined, or imprisoned for differing in judgment in matters of religion, who professes Christianity.' His Catholic governor, Dongan (1682-88) in 1683 passed a 'Charter of Libertys and Privileges' which granted 'freedom to all persons which profess faith in God through Jesus Christ.' This was not complete religious liberty, but it was better than that conceded under the English Toleration Act of 1689, the provisions of which were applied to New York in 1693 after the exile of the duke of York, later King James II, and the removal of his governor, Dongan."

Narrow Views

"I guess I'll have to agree that the English Colonies in America were generally 'chips off the old block' when it comes to religious tolerance. It must have taken those pioneers a longer time than I had thought to shake off those narrow views your inquisitors had instilled into them for generations. Now don't rush to the defense, Jim—I was just joking. Judging from the record as we have examined it together, we can both be glad that the 'spirit of 1776' at last ushered in complete religious toleration."

"Sorry to disagree again, John, but neither 1776 nor the Federal Constitution of 1787 nor the Bill of Rights in 1791 quite saw the

end of religious discrimination in the United States."

"What do you mean?"

"What the recognized historian Charles Beard points out in his *Republic*, on page 170: 'Before the Fourteenth Amendment was adopted in 1868, any State was constitutionally free to establish a church, impose religious tests on voters and office-holders, turn education over to parsons and priests, require everybody to attend church, and in fact to set up a religious monopoly about as strict as that which obtained in Western Europe during the Middle Ages. That is, as far as the Federal Constitution was concerned a State could do all this.'"

"That's all right on paper, but what state would think of acting on such legal loopholes?"

State Churches

"As a matter of fact, John, Massachusetts retained her established Congregationalism until 1833. Until 1821 an objectionable oath barred Catholics from office. Connecticut had established Congregationalism until 1818 and Vermont required taxes for the same body until 1807. New Hampshire by its Constitution to this day may legislate for 'adequate provision...for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion, and morality...' The presently existing Constitutions of Arkansas, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas still require the acknowledgment or lack of denial of the existence of God

or of the Supreme Being as a test for some offices. Pennsylvania and Tennessee also require a belief in a future state of rewards and punishments. Of course, since the Cantwell case (1940), when the Fourteenth Amendment was declared by the Supreme Court to have extended to the States the same prohibitions concerning legislation restricting religious liberty that exist in the Federal Constitution, these provisions would undoubtedly be declared unconstitutional if challenged... It was not, then, a doctrine or 'principle' of separation of church and state that motivated those who proposed the First Amendment. It was a policy to be adopted'" (Wilfrid Parsons, *First Freedom*, 23-28).

The "Kluxers"

"But all this wasn't actually persecution, Jim."

"Just because the discrimination was 'legal' didn't make it any easier to bear, John. But there has been real persecution of Catholics since 1776—even after you have deducted the Know-Nothing, A.P.A., and Ku Klux Klan terrorism and propaganda. In July, 1834 a convent in Boston was burned about the time that a series of bogus nun stories appeared. This spate of absolutely fictitious 'convent horrors' included Sherwood's *Nun*, Rebecca Reed's *Six Months in a Convent*, and that all-time hit, *Awful Disclosures of Maria Monk*. Of this last the New York editor, William L. Stone, made this statement: 'Maria Monk is an out-and-out impostor and her

book in all its essential features a tissue of calumies. However guilty the Catholics may be in other respects, or in other countries, as a man of honor and professor of the Protestant faith, I most solemnly believe that the priests and nuns are innocent in this matter'" (Gustavus Myers, *History of Bigotry in the United States*, 158).

"There always will be crackpots, of course, and those are not fair samples of Protestant bigotry in America."

Samuel Morse, Bigot

"Perhaps not, John. But some rather respectable citizens who should have known better joined in the Catholic-baiting. One of them was the famous Samuel Morse, inventor of the telegraph. In 1835 he issued his *Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States*. This book, widely circulated in public, school, and catechetical libraries, falsely charged that Austria had 'her Jesuit missionaries traveling through the land; she has supplied them with money, and has furnished a fountain for a regular supply.'" Though as Myers says, (op. cit., 163) 'in all of these assertions Morse drew heavily on conjecture or imagination', Representative Levin retailed these charges in the U. S. House of Representatives on March 2, 1848. There he denounced the 'priest-politician' Pope Pius IX who supposedly 'was not bound to keep faith with heretics,' and viewed the future with alarm, for 'how many Jesuit Senators shall we have in the

course of the next twenty years!"

"That's good, Jim, the House must have had a hearty laugh over that."

Catholics Persecuted

"Well, Levin was convicted to his face of error by Representative Maclay of New York on the floor of the House, March 8, 1848. But Levin and his type of alarmist, honest or otherwise, were not always so funny. In 1844 a Nativist riot traceable to such inflammable accusations had claimed the lives of thirteen. Fifty were wounded, two churches and a seminary burned, and the houses of Catholics looted. And this bloody Philadelphia Story was but one of such incidents. Please understand, John, that I'm not raking up these old injuries received by Catholics to accuse you or any other decent law-abiding Protestant. I'm merely trying to show you that you are mistaken when you make persecution a failing peculiar to Catholics. Perhaps you would agree with the Catholic Bishop England of Charleston in his address to the U. S. Congress on January 8, 1826. He then said: 'My friends in this country...labor under those mistakes not through their own fault in several instances and if the Roman Catholic Church were, in her doctrine and practices, what they have been taught she is, I would not be a Roman Catholic. They imagine her to be what she is not; and when they oppose what they believe her to be, it is not to her their opposition is really given. To God and to Him alone belongs ultimately to

discriminate between those who are criminal and those who are innocent in their error...It is no doctrine of any church calling itself Christian; but unfortunately, I know it has been practised by some Roman Catholics and it has been practised in every church which accuses her of having had recourse thereto. It has been taught by no church; it has been practised in all. One great temptation to its exercise is the union of any church with the state; and religion has more frequently been but a pretext with statesmen for a political purpose than the cause of persecution from zeal on its own behalf'" (Guilday, *Life of John England*, II, 62-63).

Catholic Policy in America

"I do like that summary of the case very much, Jim, and it seems that I must agree that the fetters of persecution fit Protestant as well as Catholic feet. But I'm afraid that your Bishop England was exceptionally broad-minded. Let Catholics once get in power in this country and you'll see such conciliatory types over-borne by zealots."

"On that point, John, you ought to accept the repeated, explicit, and solemn statements of representatives of the American Catholic hierarchy. In 1916 Cardinal Gibbons, dean of the American bishops, and beloved by Catholics and non-Catholics alike, emphatically asserted from the wealth of his long experience: 'Separation of church and state in this country seems to

Catholics the natural, the inevitable, the best conceivable plan, the one that would work best among us, both for the good of religion and of the state . . . American Catholics rejoice in our separation of church and state and I can conceive of no combination of circumstances likely to arise which would make a union desirable either to church or state' (Retrospect, I, 211). And when another generation of Americans had been alarmed by the same accusations against Catholics, Archbishop McNicholas, chairman of the Administrative Board of the NCWC stated emphatically in January, 1948: 'No group in America is seeking union of church and state, and least of all are Catholics. We deny absolutely and without any qualification that the Catholic Bishops of the United States are seeking a union of church and state by any endeavors whatsoever, either proximate or remote. If tomorrow Catholics constituted a majority in our country, they would not seek a union of church and state. They would then, as now, uphold the Constitution and all its Amendments, recognizing the moral obligation imposed on all Catholics to observe and defend the Constitution and its Amendments'" (Cited by Parsons, *First Freedom*, 83).

Latin America

"But, Jim—how about those Catholics south of the Rio Grande in Latin America? You've read about their intolerance toward Protestant missionaries from the United States. And in Latin America, you must

admit, the Catholic Church is in a position to dictate."

"As, for instance, in Mexico, where Catholic churches have been burned or closed, Catholic priests executed or exiled, ecclesiastical property nationalized, religious ceremonies banned from the streets, all in our life time?"

"Well, Mexico is an exception. But you can't deny that other Latin American Catholics have not been over-friendly toward the Protestant missionaries."

Troublemakers

"Sometimes you can't blame them, John. Consider the case set forth by John W. White in his *Good Neighbor Hurdle*: 'I am not a Catholic, nor do I hold any brief for the Catholic Church as organized and operated South of the Rio Grande . . . I am siding only with the United States of America. The one most serious obstacle to closer friendship and understanding between the people of the United States and those to the South of us is the proselytizing activity of the army of North American Protestant missionaries who have been sent to the southern republics 'to bring Christianity to them.' This conclusion is the result of more than 25 years spent as a traveling newspaper correspondent in the southern Americas, attempting to study objectively the problems and difficulties of our relationships with the countries and people South of the Rio Grande. It also is the conviction of thousands of non-Catholic business men and other North

Americans who have had the opportunity, as I have, of knowing our southern neighbors. The first and most important step in winning that friendship would be to call home our missionaries and show the people to the South of us that we recognize them, not as infidels and heathen, but as educated, civilized, and cultured people.”

War Against Church

“What are the reasons for White’s attitude?”

“He himself gives some of them: ‘These missionaries personify better than any other North American activity that smug superiority and holier-than-thou attitude which always has exasperated the people of the southern Americas . . . Our foreign mission boards further insult the people whom we want and need as good neighbors by counting only the Protestant ‘converts’ as Christians and treating the huge Catholic population as non-Christian . . . One of the most debasing features of the proselytizing campaign of the United States missionaries is the eagerness with which they grab up these expelled priests whenever they can find one and use them as heavy artillery in their war against the Catholic Church.’” (*White, Good Neighbor Hurdle*, xi, xiii, 49-50; 51-52; 57; 174).

“It seems to me that these Latin American Catholics are simply afraid of competition.”

“It’s as much a matter of national politics as of religion, John. Most Latin American politicians would endorse the statement of Dr.

Laureano Gomez, leader of the Conservative party in Colombia: ‘The fundamental pillar of our culture is religion.’ By traditions older than our own in the United States, Latin Americans have come to identify Catholicity with national patriotism. Hence they are likely to consider Anglo-Saxon Protestant missionaries as alien political agents as well as differing in religion. Besides, you must not identify the people with the governments. These latter may — while granting freedom of worship to non-Catholics — tend to endorse the Catholic Church officially, but with many of them the Vatican cannot be entirely satisfied. For these governments have retained from Spanish colonial days some of the features of the ‘royal patronage’ with its excessive secular control of ecclesiastical persons and institutions. For example, Venezuela in both its 1931 and 1936 Constitutions claimed ‘ecclesiastical patronage.’ In Bolivia, according to the 1931 Constitution the President named ‘dignitaries, canons, and prebends; granted or refused ‘conciliar decrees, bulls, briefs, and rescripts.’ Similarly in Argentina the 1926 Constitution claimed for the President the right of patronage in the choice of bishops and the right to grant or withhold papal communications (*Edwin Ryan, Church in South American Republics*).

“Your own reading of the newspapers will tell you that the Peron regime in Argentina had scarcely been 100% Catholic. During 1954 the President-Dictator publicly denounced Bishops Fasolino, Lafitte,

and Reinafe, charging that Catholic Action was interfering with his one-party government. After rail-roading an easy divorce law through the legislature, Peron criticized the clergy: as 'oligarchs hiding behind cassocks.' To him they are 'open enemies of the Government'; hence 'the time has come to lop off the heads of the papist priests.' Nor is this all talk, for all this past year, you read of clerical arrests."

Protestantism in Spain

"All right, but in Spain not a hair's breadth separates the Catholic hierarchy and the Franco dictatorship, and in this ideal Catholic regime Protestants are having a rough time indeed."

"Judging by your complaint, one might conclude that there is nothing more miserable than a Spanish Protestant. Why, if we Catholics only got as much publicity for our sufferings under Communist persecution the newspapers would be all screaming headlines. The NCWC Catholic News Service has just tabulated the number of the Catholic prelates dead, in prison, or in exile behind the Iron Curtain. They include four cardinals, thirty-three archbishops, 116 bishops, thirty-one other prelates. And who can number the priests and lay folk who have suffered? Our Catholic papers print this, but does the secular press play it up? Do your own religious propaganda services give us whole-hearted cooperation in denouncing this bleeding sore on humanity's back, this daily crime

against all religion at the hands of a godless regime?"

"There may be truth in what you say, but you needn't look at me. I'm against Communism in every respect. But let's get back to the question of Spain.

"The Spaniards have the right to run their country the way they see fit, so long as they let us alone. And I think that we must admit that the Red menace in the thirties gave the Spanish people plenty of provocation for dictatorship. But in any event, John, the Catholic Church doesn't endorse the Spanish dictatorship nor any other form of secular government. The Church can get along with any type of government that the people wish to set up or permit to function."

"That still doesn't explain the fate of Protestants in Spain."

Free to Worship

"They are in no danger, John. According to a decree of the Nationalist Government, November 12, 1945, 'non-Catholic religious groups may worship freely anywhere in Spanish territory, provided this worship is conducted inside their respective churches, with no public manifestation. The directors of these denominations or the persons in charge of the worship are free to organize religious ceremonies on condition that any ulterior purpose or end is avoided, that is, political violations with illegal groups, or anything that is not purely pious or liturgical.' By Article 28 of the Elementary Education Act of July 17, 1945,

Education is provided "at least for non-Catholic foreigners — the natives are after all a negligible minority. And civil marriage is available to non-Catholics in accord with the regulation of March 12, 1938" (Richard Pattee, *This is Spain*, 386-395).

"But those regulations fail to give Protestants equal rights with Catholics."

Small Minorities

"That I cannot deny, John, but neither does Switzerland give Catholics equal rights in every instance. Article 50 of the Constitution forbids the erection of a diocese without the consent of the Confederation; Article 51 reads: 'the Jesuit order and groups affiliated with it cannot exist in any part of Switzerland.' In Scandinavia Catholics, if treated fairly, are not considered equals since they form such a small minority of the population. There is an analogous situation for Protestants in Spain. There you are faced with the same link between religion and culture as in Latin America, only the mother country has an additional thousand years of tradition behind it. Today Protestants remain a tiny, utterly alien force in Spanish national life. Stanley Stuber, writing in the *Christian Advocate* for June 30, 1949, recognized this fact: 'It was impressed upon me strongly, especially as I viewed the famous cathedrals in comparison with our little Protestant chapels, that in Spain, the Protestant faith is an alien religion, living at the very mercy of

the Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Franco dictatorship.'" (cited by Pattee, *This is Spain*, 372).

"I'll wager that Spanish Protestants get as much mercy as a mouse from a cat."

"Cats usually kill mice, John, while Protestants in Spain live on to distribute over 6000 of their own Bibles annually. They have offices at the Editorial Espanola at 2 Calle Zurbaran in Madrid. Besides, nearly 5000 other volumes of Protestant literature have been distributed within a single year."

"What about those attacks on Protestant institutions?"

"Greatly Exaggerated"

"Say rather political demonstrations, John. These were really a sort of protest against alleged discrimination by Anglo-Saxon governments against Spain in the international field. Knoblauch, head of the Madrid bureau of the International News Service, reported in the *Peoria Register* on April 11, 1949: 'All recent stories from Spain tending to give the impression that non-Catholics are persecuted are greatly exaggerated. There have been some fanatic outbursts against Protestant chapels, but they were more political than religious.' (Cited by Pattee, op. cit., 380). And as for the Jews, the *Hed Hamizrah* of Jerusalem reports on March 17, 1944: 'There is no anti-Semitic legislation in Spain. Contrary to the idea that the government of that country is not favorable to Jews... for the first time in my life I was received with

the greatest cordiality precisely because I was a Jew, and in this country which is supposedly anti-Semitic.' This experience is in keeping with the sentiments expressed by the Spanish hierarchy in a joint pastoral of June, 1948: 'Faith must never be forced upon people through violence; charity paves the way and always requires the efficacy of divine grace'" (Cited by Pattee, op. cit., 395).

What About Spain?

"That all may be very fine — for Spanish Catholics. I suppose we will have to leave them alone. But I wish they would leave us alone. There is this new atrocity about requiring foreign military and civil personnel in Spain to have recourse to Spanish civil and religious bureaucrats in order to contract marriage. Incidents like these keep multiplying and we Protestants have got to make a stand some time. For as Dr. Newton has said, 'We dare not surrender our constitutional birthright of religious freedom for any mess of pottage.'"

"Don't make much ado about nothing, John. Those regulations to which you refer are in keeping with customary procedure for our military personnel in foreign lands. You hear no complaints from Catholics who find themselves in similar conditions in countries where the state religion is non-Catholic. But let the government of a Catholic country enact such laws and the cry 'religious persecution' immediately goes up."

"May be so, but I'll always feel

safer when dealing with the American type of Catholic, rather than the Spanish."

Papal Pronouncements on Tolerance

"Suit yourself, John, but remember that there aren't different 'types' of Catholics. Catholic means universal, and all true Catholics who heed the teaching of their Church and practice what they believe should think and act alike in essentials. Now in our question of tolerance the official attitude of the Catholic Church can't be sought either from Spain or America, but is properly to be found in the pronouncements of the Holy Father, Christ's Vicar, and Peter's Successor."

"Well, what did the Pope say?"

"First, while the Papacy still had temporal rule over Rome and surrounding territory, Pope Pius IX declared: 'Jews have their Synagogue in the Ghetto, and the Protestants their Temple at the Porta del Popolo' (Cited by Dom Butler in Eyre, *European Civilization*, VI, 1403). Next, *Pope Leo XIII* carefully distinguished the respective spheres of Church and State: 'Church and State alike both possess individual sovereignty; hence in the conduct of public affairs neither is subject to the other within the limits to which each is restricted by its constitution. It does not follow from this, however, that Church and State are in any manner severed, and still less antagonistic' (*Sapientiae Christianae*, cited by

Powers, *Papal Pronouncements on the Political Order*, 167).

"Finally, our present Pope Pius XII had made some clear statements on tolerance. On October 6, 1946 he told the Roman Rota: 'Increasingly frequent contacts between different religious professions, mingled indiscriminately within the same nation have caused civil authorities to follow the principles of tolerance and liberty of conscience. In fact, there is a political tolerance, a civil tolerance, a social tolerance in regard to adherents of other religious beliefs which, in circumstances such as these is a moral duty for Catholics' (Allocution cited by Powers, 181).

Cockle and Good Seed

"On December 6, 1953 the Pope told a national convention of Italian jurists: 'Reality shows that error and sin are in the world in great measure. God reprobrates them, but He permits them to exist. Hence the affirmation: religious and moral error must always be impeded when it is possible because toleration of them is in itself immoral, is not valid absolutely and unconditionally. Moreover, God has not given even to human authority such an absolute and universal command in matters of faith and morality. Such a command is unknown to the common convictions of mankind, to

Christian conscience, to the sources of revelation and to the practice of the Church. To omit here other Scriptural texts which are adduced in support of this argument, Christ in the parable of the cockle gives the following advice: let the cockle grow in the field of the world together with the good seed in view of the harvest... The Church — out of regard for those who in good conscience, though erroneous but invincibly so, are of different opinion — has been led to act and has acted with that tolerance after she became the State Church under Constantine the Great and other Christian emperors, always for higher and more cogent motives. So she acts today, and also in the future she will be faced with the same necessity'" (Allocution, 'Ci Riese' in *The Pope Speaks*, 1st Quarter, 1954).

Cause of Conflict

"Well, Jim, if I have learned anything from our conversation, it has been this: in religious discussion it is easy to oversimplify incidents in the history of the historic Mother Church of Christianity. Perhaps that is the principal cause of so much misunderstanding."

"I think you are right, John, and too much time has been wasted in negative thinking about the human errors made by the human beings that made that history."

BIBLIOGRAPHY



- ALZOG, JOHN—Church History, II.
- BILLINGTON, RAY—Protestant Crusade.
- BLATZER, JOSEPH—Inquisition: Catholic Encyclopedia, VIII, 26.
- CONWAY, BERTRAND—Studies in Church History.
—Question Box.
- GRISAR, HARTMANN—Luther.
- GUIRAUD, JEAN—Medieval Inquisition.
- HASKINS, CHARLES—Medieval Culture.
- MACDONALD, WILLIAM—Documentary Source Book of American History.
- MCNEILL, JOHN—History and Character of Calvinism.
- MYER, GUSTAVUS—History of Bigotry in the U. S.
- NICHERSON, HOFFMAN—Inquisition.
- O'NEILL, JAMES—Religion and Education under the Constitution.
- PARSONS, REUBEN—Studies in Church History.
- PARSONS, WILFRID—First Freedom.
- PATTEE, RICHARD—This is Spain.
- PHELAN, THOMAS—Catholics in Colonial Days.
- POWERS, FRANCIS—Papal Pronouncements on the Political Order.
- RUMBLE, DR.—Radio Replies.
- RYAN-BOLAND—Catholic Principles of Politics.
- SABINE, GEORGE—History of Political Theory.
- SHEA, GILMARY—Catholic Church in U. S., I.
- THORNING, JOSEPH—Religious Liberty in Transition.
- VACANDARD, ELPHEGE—The Inquisition.
- WALSH, WILLIAM—Characters of the Inquisition.
- WHITE, JOHN W.—Our Good Neighbor Hurdle.
- WILLIAM, MICHAEL—Shadow of the Pope.

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS — RELIGIOUS INFORMATION BUREAU

4422 Lindell Blvd., St. Louis 8, Missouri

233 5238

List of pamphlets available at the above address. One title may be requested at a time free of charge. Several titles, complete sets, and quantities of individual pamphlets may be ordered at 7¢ for each pamphlet, plus postage.

3. The Bible is a Catholic Book
5. Christ's Seven Sacraments
6. The Holy Sacrifice — the Catholic Mass
7. Why the Catholic Church says "Investigate" — Masons, Inquisition, Nuns
8. Speaking of Tolerance — Controversial periods in history
9. These Men They Call "Knights"
10. Why Catholics Believe As They Do — Existence of God, Immortality
11. A Short Story of the Popes
12. Let's Stick to Moses — Ten Commandments explained
13. But Can It Be Found in the Bible? — Bible not sole rule of faith
14. What Happens After Death?
15. Yes . . . I Condemned The Catholic Church
16. What Do You Mean "Only One True Church"?
17. But How Can Educated People Be Catholics?
18. No . . . Belief in God is not Enough!
19. The Real Secret of Successful Marriage
20. The Way to Everlasting Life . . . The Catholic Church
21. Is the Catholic Church a Menace to Democracy?
22. But Do You Really Understand the Bible? — Rules for understanding
23. A Letter to Our Non-Catholic Neighbors — Aspects of Catholic faith
24. Yes, the Mother of God Will Help You!
25. What Makes a Woman Choose Such a Life? — Life of a Catholic Nun
26. I'll Tell You Why I Am a Catholic
27. Why So Many Decide to Become Catholics — Convert stories
28. Let Us Judge Catholics by the Bible — Prayer to Saints, unmarried priests
29. But Would Christ Call You A Christian?
30. But Do You Understand What God Told Us? — Apostles' Creed
31. Should Children Learn About God—in School?
32. The Bible Is Not Our Sole Guide
33. This Was the Faith of Our Fathers
34. These Are Our Seven Deadly Enemies — Seven capital sins explained
35. Let's Test Catholic Loyalty — A Good Catholic is a good citizen
36. Remember the Sabbath . . . Keep It Holy — The "Sabbath Question"
37. I Am a Catholic Priest
38. But Why the Candles, Holy Water and Beads? — Sacramentals
39. The Reformation. Was It Reform or Revolt?
40. Why I Had to Embrace the Catholic Faith — Convert stories
41. Yes, Miracles Happened at Fatima
42. Does the Bible Contradict Itself? — Peter the Rock, Faith and/or Works
43. I Was Warned About the Catholic Church! — Religious Liberty
44. Why a Woman Needs the Catholic Faith!
45. The Early Years of the Catholic Church — First three centuries
46. Yes . . . A Priest Can Forgive Your Sins — Sacrament of Penance
47. But Why Don't You Pray to the Saints? — Communion of Saints
48. God's Story of Creation — Genesis
49. Is the Catholic Church Out of Place Here? — Catholicism and Loyalty
50. This Is the Catholic Church — Creed, Sacraments, Mass, Commandments
51. Revelation . . . A Divine Message of Hope — Revelations or Apocalypse
52. Does It Pay to be a Catholic? — How to be a Catholic
53. Think About Death and Start to Live — Catholic attitude toward death
54. What Do You Find Wrong With the Catholic Church?
55. His Name Shall Be Called God With Us — Divinity of Christ
56. The Infallible Church, Truth or Trickery? — Church of the Scriptures
57. Tell Us About God . . . Who Is He? Existence and nature of God
58. The Word Was Made Flesh — Humanity of Christ
59. Let Us Pray—Prayer
60. Gift of the Holy Spirit—Confirmation

Learn All About
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH
By Mail . . . At No Cost!

You can easily investigate Catholic faith and worship in the privacy of your home.

Just send us your name and address and advise that you desire to learn about the Church by mail.

We will send you an interesting course of instruction which is short, yet complete.

The book explaining Catholic faith and worship is written in an easy-to-understand form, and there are six tests sheets to be checked. There is no writing to do, and nobody will call on you unless you request it.

You merely mail your marked test sheets to us. We correct them and return them to you. This enables you to determine how well you understand the book and on what points further explanation by mail may help you.

There is no cost to you, no obligation.

Write today to:

Supreme Council
KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS
Religious Information Bureau
4422 LINDELL BLVD.
ST. LOUIS 8, MO.

Imprimatur:

✠JOSEPH E. RITTER

Archbishop of St. Louis

St. Louis, January 12, 1956

Published in United States of America
6th Reprinting, April, 1961