

VII. INTOLERANCE AND THE SPANISH INQUISITION

1.

The Spanish Inquisition has been a fertile ground of abuse directed against Spain, and is still adduced as one of the most glaring examples of uncompromising Spanish intolerance and cruelty, and as the epitome of the obscurantism of the century of Philip II.

Without wishing in the least to minimize all that was nefarious and detestable in that institution, or apologize for its errors and abuses, I hasten to say that, in its nature and methods of operation, as well as in the number of victims it accounted for, it was not essentially different from other institutions which, under different names, were then in operation in every country of Europe and in America.

The tremendous proportions assumed by the Spanish Inquisition in the minds of the average person are not due to any inherent wickedness that did not taint similar systems of repression then dominating the politico-social life of Europe, but to two factors which the clever propagandists have exploited ever since without any regard for truth and fair dealing. The first is that it has been represented as an isolated case of repression in the face of Europe, an institution unique in its nature and methods of operation without counterpart in any civilized country. In other words, it has not been placed side by side and studied in conjunction with similar institutions of other countries designed to force upon others conformity of creed or opinion.

The second factor of this misunderstanding consists in the

malicious displacement of the abhorred institution from its proper setting, leaving out the element of time, without which no historical phenomenon can be adequately judged. The general reader has no sense of historical values and in comparing the Inquisition with the institutions of today he is apt to forget that tolerance had no practical meaning in Europe of those days.

In the introduction to his book Intolerance in the Reign of Elizabeth, Arthur J. Klein makes these pertinent remarks: "Most of us feel that intolerance is an antiquated evil. We hasten to enroll ourselves in the ranks of the tolerant, and at least in the free world of hypothesis and speculation, we experience, at little cost, the self-congratulatory pleasure of thus reckoning ourselves in the advance guard of civilization. As a matter of fact, our conception of tolerance is usually so vague as to entail no renunciation of our pet prejudices...We easily recognize the inconsistency between the utterances and the attitude of Elizabethan Englishmen who insisted by means of prison and banishment that the forms of a Prayer Book be strictly observed, and looked with horror upon the Spanish Inquisition. We smile a superior smile over their boasts of tolerance on the score that the number of Catholics killed by Queen Elizabeth did not equal the number of Protestants killed by Queen Mary, and we may even see the weakness of their modern apologists who point with pride to the fact that Elizabethan England had no St. Bartholomew's eve. The examples of such inconsistency are amusing and satisfying, in direct proportion to their antiquity and their distance from our own ruts of thought. When in England it became possible for all religions

to exist side by side, and men therefore proclaimed themselves to be tolerant, there was still attached to Catholicism and to all forms of Protestantism other than the particular form known as Anglicanism the penalty of the curtailment of political rights. Some Englishmen are still ipreconciled to the removal of divorce and marriage from the jurisdiction of the Established Church. Some Americans still defend Sabbatarian legislation enacted at the demand of the religious prejudice which saw no intolerance in forcing the extreme interpretation of the Mosaic law upon Christian and non-Christian alike. Like our ancestors, we leave sufficient leeway for the full play of our own intolerances and with easy carelessness avoid the discomforts of exact definition."(1)

The cruelties and the abuse of the most elementary principles of justice on the part of the Spanish Inquisition, horrible as they actually were, must be considered in the light of the spirit, not of our times, but of the times and conditions under which they were perpetrated. Although the Inquisition dealt with matters pertaining to religion, it was in fact a purely political instrument, by which certain countries proposed to bring their subjects to closer national unity. As such, it was used by all European countries from the fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries, and is now again in a period of very intensive recrudescence, not only in the Fascist countries, but even in our own. Of course we have never called these multiform manifestations of intolerance by the name of Inquisition, but their scope, their methods, and ultimate

(1) Klein, A. J. Intolerance in the Reign of Elizabeth, p. 1. Boston, Houghton and Mifflin Co., 1917.

results were, and are, identical,—to compel all dissenters to conform to what we think to be right, or what we want others to think is right.

But because the Inquisition happened to be the instrument by which Spain proposed to defend, and actually succeeded in defending, her own religion—Roman Catholicism—which the northern countries were trying so strenuously to wipe off the face of the earth, and failed to accomplish, it is natural that the Protestants should view it with the greatest alarm, and devote to it their deepest and most venomous rancor and unforgiving hatred. This explains why the Inquisition, of all instruments in the service of intolerance, was the only one that elicited such opprobrium, on a grand scale, such venomous recriminations, such detestation and opposition on the part of the adepts of the Reformation. The Protestants did not consider, or else refused to notice, the fact that they were using exactly the same sort of instrument against the Catholics, and, worse of all, against all the other Protestant sects outside of their own, although all kinds of dissenters were following the fundamental principle of the Reformation—the right to worship God according to their own inner light.

Thus the Protestants were not only using one of the worst forms of Inquisition, though under a different name, to impose beliefs or repress opinions even of their own correlative-ists, but they were illogical, for if the people from the North of Europe had the right to worship in the way that best suited them, why should this right be denied to the people from the South of Europe? And if Spain is to be execrated because

she used the sword to uphold the religion of her choice and exterminate the dissenters, what right had the Protestants to slay those who had been taught by them to follow the dictates of their own consciences? Why should the disceptic reformer of Geneva torture and burn at the stake the Spanish scientist, Miguel Serveto, just because his interpretation of the Bible did not coincide with his own? Were the outrages of the Inquisition any worse than those perpetrated by the peasants in Germany at the beginning of the Reformation, and the ferocious vengeance that the nobles took on them with Luther's blessing, and by which 150,000 peasants were butchered like sheep? Was the burning of Joan of Arc at the hands of the English different from similar cases perpetrated by the Spanish Inquisition? The executions, massacres, and the wholesale butcheries of the religious wars in England, from Henry VIII and the Puritans to the advent of the Prince of Orange, are they to be attributed to the spirit of religious liberty and tolerance, or are they different from the acts of the Spanish Inquisition?

As so much has been made of this iniquitous institution in order to bring Spain into disrepute and discredit among the civilized nations, and so little notice, on the other hand, has been taken of the methods employed by other nations to obtain the same ends; methods that, under whatever name, were not less intolerant, less cruel and ruthless than those used by the Spanish Inquisition, I propose to pass in review the main facts in the case, and show that the indignation of the enemies of Spain against the Inquisition is nothing more than hypocrisy and false pretense, and that the abhorrence it inspires in our public in general is only the lam-

entable fruit of misinformation, of insidious and malevolent propoganda.

2.

What was the Spanish Inquisition? A tribunal legally organized to cope efficiently with religious dissent, considered at that time, among the European nations, as the greatest danger to National unity and integration, for which every nation was desperately striving. The religious character of this institution was purely accidental. It happened that religion was the ideal of the Spaniard, an ideal for which he had struggled during eight centuries the vital principle of his national unity, the real cause of his triumphs, the paramount element of his greatness. To let this ideal decay, to let this principle weaken in the least, would be tantamount to national suicide. And who should be empowered to watch for the Spanish national unity, which at the time was synonymous with integrity of faith, but the ministers of religion under the sanction of its supreme head—the Pope of Rome? However, this tribunal was not a tool in the hands of the Pope, it was not an instrument at the service of Rome except as a mere coincidence. It was, on the contrary, an instrument of national policy like the civil courts, for instance, the army, the police, and the like. Such agencies—religious, civil and military—existed in all countries of Europe, and were the only ones that any sovereign made use of in the promotion of national unification and integration, in the conservation of their ideals, in the development of their particular institutions and the welfare of their people.

What are the charges generally made against the Spanish

Inquisition? It stifled personal initiative, it is said; it hindered free inquiry; it obfuscated the intellect; it fostered hypocrisy; it developed a national psychology of terror and inanition; it suspended the most sacred rights of men, and abolished freedom of thought and action; it turned Spain into a jungle; it drenched the whole land in rivers of blood!

I shall try to say a few words in extenuation of this much maligned Spanish institution; moreover I shall attempt to reverse the charges, thus giving to God what belongs to God and to the Devil what are his deserts.

3.

One of the effects not produced by the Inquisition in Spain was the paralysis of the intellect. In fact the creative power of the Spanish mind, the abundance of its literary productions of every kind, the flights of its daring imagination, the excellency of its scientific and artistic creations, never arose so high, never shone with greater brilliancy, than during the most influential period of the life of the Spanish Inquisition. This extraordinary effervescency of Spain's intellectual and creative mind was not only very great in relation to other periods of her own intellectual activity, but was also distinctively superior to the intellectual activity, excellency and productiveness, of the intellectual manifestations of any kind, of the other European nations during the same period. "Here we have, says Juderías, Bosán and Garcilaso, Luis de León and Luis de Granada, Francisco de la Torre and Hurtado de Mendoza, Fernando de Herrera and the Argensolas, Góngora and Jorge de Montemayor, Gil Polo and Vicente Espinel, Gutierre de Cetina and Baltasar Gracián, Alonso de Ercilla and Cervantes,

Lope de Vega and Lope de Rueda, Calderón and Guillén de Castro, Tirso de Molina and Alarcón, Rojas and many others whom the Inquisition did not prevent from exercising their talent to the utmost, and influencing that of other lands."(2)

Yes, Spain not only produced a gallery of literary luminaries of first magnitude not to be duplicated, or even approached anywhere in Europe during the reign of the Spanish Inquisition, but also exerted the greatest influence on the literary and other activities of those very nations which were denouncing and would continue to denounce her so fiercely and so venomously. "In regard to literature," says Philipson, "the Spaniards had, during the reign of Phillip II, the supremacy in Europe, in the same manner, though not in the same proportion, that the French held it a century later. The impulse taken by the Spanish genius during the first half of the sixteenth century fertilized its spirit...The greatness and fame of Spain animated all those writers who, in their majority, served their king and the State in all parts of the world, sometimes with the pen, at other times with the sword. Patriotism, faith, and chivalrous prowess, were the distinctive qualities of the Spanish poets and writers."(3)

According to Weiss, quoted by the author of the Black Legend, "Lope de Vega flooded with his theatrical works all the cities of Spain and those of Naples, Milan, Brussels, Vienna and Munich. Many of his twenty-two hundred dramas were translated, during his life time, in all European languages. Both his dramas and those of Calderón soon entered the Portuguese scene. The Spanish

(2) Juderias, loc. cit., p. 118.

(3) Id., ibid., p. 119.

influence reached even England. It is impossible not to recognize it in Shakespeare. The Italians imitated and translated many Spanish works from the last part of the sixteenth century to the time of Metastasio and Caldoni. It was France, however, that was mostly influenced by the Spanish culture. If it is Germany that attracts the French writers in the nineteenth century, if they study with preference English literature in the eighteenth century, it is Spain that, in the seventeenth century, exerts over them the powerful attraction of genius. This Spanish vital fluid was introduced in the last years of Henry IV... The Relaciones published by Antonio Pérez simultaneously in Paris, Geneva and London, stirred every soul... Since then France began to be modified by Spain."(4)

"In France," writes Philarète Charles, "everything is Spanish. Spain attracted the attention of the whole world; nation of conquerors and poets, which discovered a world and was holding it; which had one foot in Peru and another in Germany and Flanders. Since 1580 the Spanish genius gives rise to the League; it finds itself in Brussels, in Naples, in Rome, in Vienna, in Mexico, in the Hispaniola, in Florida; everywhere it is hated, feared, admired, I was going to say--loved, because those are loved, sometimes, who are feared...Spain was becoming the model of Europe.;. A people that dominate and assimilate all the other peoples to their thought and their idiom... The Spanish phrase, full of pompous circumlocution is detected in the memories of Richelieu and of Mme. Motteville."(5)

~~(underline)~~.

The Spanish novelists, poets, dramatists, mystics, political-

(4) Id., *ibid.*, p. 119.

(5) Id., *ibid.*, p. 120.

economists, all are studied, imitated, paraphrased, plagiarized, copied, translated and sought with eagerness not only by the experts in their proper field but by the public in general. "Cervantes," says Juderías, "had more editions in France than in Spain; Luis de Granada was translated immediately, and Henry IV, Spain's great enemy, began to study Spanish with all his might when he was already an old man." (6)

In England the Spanish influence was just as great. When Catalina of Aragón married Henry VIII many Spanish bishops, professors and courtiers accompanied her, and London adopted both the books and the fashions of Spain. Luis Vives exerted great influence in England with his philosophical treatises, which were translated by Moryson and Richard Harde. Guevara's influence was still greater with his Watch of Princes and Familiar Letters, whose style was the origin of a literary school known as Eupheism. Bacon's Apophthegms and the Maxims of Burghley and Sir Walther Raleigh are proofs of Guevara's influence upon his English contemporaries. La Celestina and Guzmán de Alfarache are translated by Mabbe. Lazarillo de Tormes, Cervantes' Novelas Ejemplares, La Diana of Jorge de Montemayor, Quevedo's Buscón, La Pícara Justina, and many others, are the delight of the British reading public. Don Quixote was not only translated and eagerly read by all, but was even imitated several times. Flechter, Beaumont, Schirley Massinger, Middleton, Kowley, Haywood and many others not only translated and imitated Calderón, Tirso, Alarcón and others but even used Spanish novels in the composition of their dramas and comedies." (7)

(6) Id., *ibid.*, p. 122.

(7) Id., *ibid.*

Italy, Holland, and Germany, and even Sweden and Russia, were influenced by the Spanish literature of the age of the Inquisition, but it is unnecessary to go into further details on this subject.

How can all this be explained on the assumption that the Spanish intellect, Spanish initiative, and freedom of thought and expression, were stifled, paralyzed, crushed by the Spanish Inquisition? What must have been the intellectual condition of the writers as well as the readers from those other nations, therefore, when they put such a high price on Spanish letters, culture, and even customs, if these were as poor and as worthless as jealousy and hatred want us to believe them to have been? On the other hand, what have Spain's critics to offer in that field, at the time that all kinds of Spanish books had already flooded Western Europe, in spite of the fact that foreign nations were not under the oppression of the hateful and obscurantist Inquisition?

4.

Superior as Spain was to the other nations of Europe, during the period of the Inquisition, not only in her varied literary productions, but in the great influence she exerted on them both in literature and customs, she was no less so in the sciences and fine arts. Her contributions alone to geographical knowledge, to ethnography, zoology, botany, mineralogy, medicine, linguistics, and related subjects, as a result of her discoveries, explorations, and the study of many phases of the aspects and life of an immense new continent, are so great and of such general scope, that to dismiss them with a supercilious wave of the hand, indicates either

bad faith or a supine ignorance of their significance and their most pregnant implications. Without the Printing Press, on one hand, and the maritime enterprises of Spain and Portugal, on the other, that great and momentous phenomenon of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries called the Renaissance would be less than a myth.

Cosmography, in all its phases, deserved very special attention on account of Spanish maritime enterprises, which were not confined to the continent of America alone but embraced practically all regions bathed by the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Indian oceans. Nebrija, Alonso de Santa Cruz, Pedro Nuñez, Jerónimo Muñoz, Juan de Molina, Andrés G. de Céspedes, Juan de R. Sarmiento, Hernando de los Ríos, El Brocense and Simón de Tovar, are some of the most illustrious exponents of the science of Cosmography. The astrological problems of longitude, studies on the sphere, on the magnetic variations, on the planets, and many other subjects, were the object of very conscientious study by those eminent men of science.

In Geography the following deserve to be remembered: Nebrija, Eduardo López, Pedro de Medina, Luis de Mármol, Antonio de Herrera, Juan Martínez, Fernandes de Oviedo, Cómara, Vargas Machuca, Bernal Díaz del Castillo and others. Juan de la Cosa made the first mapa-mundi in which America was represented as a continent, contrary to the opinion and wishes of Columbus, as we have already remarked. The first great Atlas of America consisting of 97 maps, was made by de Céspedes by order of the great obscurantist—Philip II.

"Among Barents's property (left in Nova Zembla on the departure of Barents' expedition of 1594 and found by Captain Carlsen in 1871) was a copy of Pedro de Medina's Li Arts de Navegar, the most exhaustive treatise on navigation of its time. It was published in

Valladolid in 1556 and translated into Dutch in 1580."(8)

The study of these and all other subjects pertaining to the sciences and the arts, observes Juderías, was fostered by Philip II, the enemy of progress, the soul of the iniquitous Inquisition, the Demonius Meridianus, in the phrase of Spain's detractors. It was he who created the Academy of Mathematics, and offered a prize of 6,000 ducats income for life to anyone who should discover the way of calculating longitude by astronomical means, a gesture which was imitated, much later on, by France, Holland and England. The study of the Eclipses, the reform of the Calendar, and the Census, or Description, of the Peoples of Spain, the first work of statistic known and which reveals the high degree of culture attained by Spain at that time, were initiated by Philip II.

One of the sciences in which Spain had made extraordinary progress, since the splendors of the Caliphate of Cordoba, was Medicine. The works of Vallés, Mercado, Bruguera, Carmona, Díaz de Toledo, Fragoso, Huarte, Jiménez, Valverde, etc., all of whom flourished at the time of the Inquisition, rank with the best of medical inquiry and practice. Miguel Serveto's discovery of the circulation of the blood, generally attributed to Harvey for nationalistic and racial reasons, would be epoch-making if its author was not a Spaniard. The same might be said of the great revelations made by Doña Oliva Sabuco de Nantes in relation to the nervous system. Vaccine was practiced in Galicia long before it was studied in England, and institutions for the care and cure of the feeble-minded were of long standing in Spain before France,

(8) Spilhaus, loc. cit., p. 241.

England, and Germany adopted them. Alejo de Venegas devised adequate means to teach the blind, and Pedro Ponce and Juan Pablo Bonet did likewise in behalf of the deaf and blind. The invaluable medicinal substances: sarsaparilla, guaiacum, saffron, camphor, nutmeg, jalap, cascarrilla, and above all, quinine, which saves perhaps more lives than all the other medicines put together, are Spanish medical contributions to the welfare of humanity. Without the last one, many of the most important colonial enterprises of France, pre-war Germany, Holland, Great Britain and the United States would be utterly impossible. Without it the Suez Canal might never have been cut. As for the Panama canal, one of the most important basis of American imperialism, it could even scarcely be built without the discovery of quinine and the cause of yellow fever, and both were gifts of the sons of Iberia. A Bulletin of the Pan American Union states that this very important water way was made possible "thanks to the genius of Dr. Carlos Finlay, who by means of remarkable laboratory investigations, verified with the aid of his eminent coworker, Dr. Carlos Delgado, had discovered and demonstrated that yellow fever is transmitted by the mosquito stegomyia fasciata." (9) However, to the surgeon Gorgas, an American, rather than to those two eminent Cuban scientists, has gone the glory that resulted from the control and almost complete elimination of that great scourge of tropical America.

The Exact Sciences were cultivated by an eminent cohort of scientists whose names alone would make these pages too cumbersome.

(9) Bul. Pan. Am. Union, 59: 489-94 May 24.

The Museum of Sciences of Valladolid, founded by Philip II, contained maps, spheres and every conceivable nautical instrument, and other scientific objects, in such variety and number, that made it the most complete museum of arts and sciences of its time anywhere in Europe. The Duque of Alba, for his part, laid the foundations of the famous University of Louvain. The Germans, who had no use for the Spanish contributions to knowledge, set this same university to the torch. Even the telescope had been invented by the Brothers Rogete before Galileus ever made use of it. (10)

In Metalurgy the discoveries of Boethius, Bergen and Rosnel were preceded by those of Juan de Arfe published in 1572. Esteller, Bernardo P. de Vargas, Garcí Sánchez, Carlos Gorzo, Pedro de Contreras, Blas del Castillo, Alvaro Alfonso Barba, and others, discovered in America the modern formulas of the foundry of metals. The Natural Sciences were studied in Spain by competent men of science, and those who first studied the natural wealth of America were Spaniards. The first Botanical Garden of Europe was the one established by Laguna in the reign of Phillip II. It was this obscurantist monarch who ordered Hernández to write a Natural History of the Plants and Animals of the Indies, and it was Acosta who traveled in India, Persia, and China, in order to write a book on the plants, fruits, birds, and animals, both land and aquatic, which existed in those countries.

The study of Linguistics made by the Spaniards was truly extraordinary. Omitting those which refer to the Spanish language, we have, among others, a Hebrew Grammar by Alonzo de Zamora,

(10) Juderias, loc. cit., p. 241.

Hebrew Studies by Arias Montano, Caldean Grammar by Diaz Paterniano, Art and Vocabulary of the Arabic Language by Juan López.

Andrés de Oviedo wrote on the Abyssinian, Paes and Caldera on the Goptic, Luis de Acebedo on the Ethiopian, Diego de Ribero on the Sanskrit, Cobo on the Chinese, Gaspar de Villela on the Japanese, and a Japanese-Spanish Vocabulary was published in Manila in 1630, "three centuries before cultured Europe compelled the Japanese, at the point of long range guns, to adopt for themselves the fashion of the Occident." (11)

Meanwhile a legion of unpretentious, but enlightened, missionaries were building an imperishable linguistic monument in the study of the native languages of America, as they had done with those of Asia. Besides the splendid work they did for the education of the natives, as noticed elsewhere, the following works and studies may be mentioned. The Grammar of the Nahuatl Language composed by Andrés de Olmos in 1547; Mexican-Spanish Vocabulary, the most complete known, by Alonzo de Molina; Studies on the Zapotec language by Juan de Cordoba; Art and Vocabulary of the Mayan Language by Luis de Villalpando; Dictionary of the same by Antonio de Ciudad Real; Grammar and Vocabulary of the Quichua Language by Francisco Marroquin... To try to record all that the Spanish missionaries did on this subject would be an impossible task. It is enough to say that without the devotion of these obscure Spanish workers the science of philology would be much poorer indeed. And all this work of enlightenment was done under

(11) Id., *ibid.*, p. 137.

the very nose of the terrible and ominously obscurantist Spanish Inquisition.

5.

What was said in the preceding paragraph answers sufficiently the charge that the Spanish Inquisition paralyzed the *intellect* and hindered the flights of both mind and imagination in the realms of science and literary art. As a matter of fact the period of the Spanish Inquisition was the golden age of all manifestations of the Spanish intellect and the Spanish genius. No country in Europe could compete with Spain in that and many other forms of national vitality, creative power, and rich culture, as anyone who wants to take the trouble may find out for himself.

But can it be said that the Spanish Inquisition did not stifle freedom of thought and inquiry, did not kill liberty of opinion and expression, especially on the subjects of religion, morals, law and philosophy? In these particulars, if in any, it seems that the Inquisition would have everything to say and, if we are to credit its adversaries, must have said it and enforced its injunctions with an iron hand. Let us see how the theologians, philosophers, and moralists, fared under the oppressive atmosphere of the dark and dreadful Spanish Inquisition.

Menéndez Pelayo, whom any one not altogether blinded by ignorance or prejudice, will recognize among the great scholars of our time, searching for the currents of philosophical thought in Spain, finds the existence of perfectly definite schools of philosophy during the period of the Inquisition, and shows that

such schools were remarkably characterized by boldness of thought and perfect independence of scientific inquiry. As significant is the testimony of Adolfo de Castro who finds that no philosopher was ever condemned by the Spanish Inquisition, but on the contrary many appealed to it in certain cases of opposition on the part of the supreme civil authority. This shows, too, that, though the Inquisition was an instrument of national policy, like any other court of law, it had complete freedom of action in its investigations and decisions.

To reconcile the doctrines of the Aristotelian school of philosophy, or, worse still, to reconcile Theology with Philosophy, may mean very little today. But in those times these were questions of the gravest moment from the religious point of view. However, Fox Morcillo and Melchor Cano became famous exponents of these difficult questions without being bothered by the all powerful and always vigilant Inquisition. Gómez Peryera anticipated many of the theories of Descartes, and José de Sigüenza did the same in the application of Geometry to Metaphysics. Gall and Lavater were preceded by Fijasol. Dámingo de Soto and Alonso de Sandoval protested against Negro slavery, but Clarkson has the honor of having initiated the movement against slavery, though he came only a century and a half afterwards. Juan de Vergara contended that the descendants of the Jews should not be excluded from the ecclesiastical benefices. Juan de Espinosa and Fray Antonio Alverca defended regicide under certain circumstances. Fray Barillo Ponce de Leon did the same for suicide. The witches were defended by Pedro Ciruelo and Pedro de Valencia. The universality of the principle of gravitation, which is the fundamental principle of

Newton's theory, was expounded, long before the author of Principia was born, by Fray Antonio Fuente de la Peña.

Theology, Jurisprudence and Mystic had many brilliant and exceptional minds at their service. Laines, Salmerón, de Soto and Suárez; Arias Montano and Luis de León; Santa Tereza; Juan de Avila, Luis de Granada and San Juan de la Cruz...are scarcely the beginning of the list. Florián de Ocampo, Morales, Zurita, Caribay, Sandoval, Sigüenza and Father Mariana, are a few of the Spanish famous historians.

One thing that surprises anyone who reads these and a legion of other Spanish authors of all times, but especially of the period of the Inquisition, is the boldness of their theories, the freedom with which they treat the most delicate matters pertaining to religion, law, and ethics. Mariana investigates the questions of whether it is permitted to kill a tyrant, and whether the power of the King is inferior to that of a republic. Father Agustín de Castro posits the questions of whether a government is better than none, whether the monarchical government is better than the republican, and whether the elective monarchy is preferable to the democratic. Fox Morcillo is of the opinion that the most civilized peoples prefer the democratic form of government. Quevedo maintains that the kings should obey the law and should not act arbitrarily. Father Alonso de Castille, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, declares in a Treatise on the Republic that "all men are born equal and free; that no one has the right to give orders to another; that all the things of this world are common by natural right; and that the violation of the natural law together with the institution of private property is the origin of

all evils."(12) Cerdán de Tallada adds that the poor have the right to steal; Polo de Ondegardo and José de Acosta exalt the communism of the Peruvians.

With the exception of the first sentence of the preceding quotation, which we are enjoined to believe was first formulated in the Declaration of Independence, and are apt to feel sometimes that it was left there for its high sounding effect, the remaining pronouncements would be liable to persecution and disabilities in, and, for non-citizens, expulsion from, this country, as seditious and calculated to overthrow the status quo.

What did the Inquisition do about the proclamation of such dangerous doctrines, or what did the sovereign do about those that put him on a par with the least of his subjects, or doubted the divine right of kings, or denied that he was above the laws of the land? Nothing whatever. Both King and Inquisition recognized the absolute freedom of thought and expression in their institutions of learning. Their academic freedom was unlimited, and there were no teachers' oaths in the kingdom of the tenebrous Philip II.

Suppose that such liberties were taken in this country or in the enlightened and progressive Germany of today, or in England of Henry VIII, Mary, Elizabeth, James and Charles, to as far as... a very long time afterwards? To give just one case of the History of the Reformation in England. It took place under Charles I. "A multitude is assembled at Westminster," says Miall "to witness the punishment of one of Laud's victims... First, with a sharp knife, one of his ears is sliced off; then, with the same instru-

(12) Id., *ibid.*, p. 143.

ment, one side of his nose is cut open; the attendants then bring a red-hot iron, which with hissing sound imprints on one of his cheeks the letters S. S. (sower of sedition) amidst the prisoner's yell of agony. Then... he is left...to stand for two hours in the severity of the weather. This done the poor victim is tied to a post; whipped with a triple cord... Seven days after, he undergoes ...the cutting off of another ear, the branding with a red-hot iron of another cheek; a similar whipping; after which, he is kept in the Fleet prison for a fortnight, in an apartment exposed to the snow and cold." (13) This victim, who had other companions of martyrdom, was the scholar Dr. Leighton.

Now, what do you think his crime was? It was not the writing of any seditious book. It was not the dissemination of any communistic ideas, or of any doctrines dangerous to the maintenance of the established order of things. Still, under the beneficent, just, and enlightened rule of the English sovereigns, free from the thralldom of the all-seeing and all-hating Inquisition, it is inconceivable that a scholar like Dr. Leighton should suffer such inquisitional treatment without some very serious cause. Well, there was a reason for his horrible punishment; Dr. Leighton maddened by the persecutions and outrages of his enemies dared to denounce them to the proper authorities!

No, in the Spain of the Inquisition things were not as bad for the activities of the intellect and for the freedom of thought and expression as the enemies of Spain want the world to believe. In fact all the phases of the human knowledge were cultivated so

(13) Miall, loc. cit., p. 94.

intensively and so freely that all nations of Europe began to import scholars from Spain so that those nations might get abreast of the times and learn what Spain's numerous universities and colleges were doing. Alvaro Tomas, Jerónimo Pardo, Pedro de Lerma, the Coronel brothers, Juan de Encina, Juan de Gelaya, Juan Célido, Luis Baeza, etc., taught philosophy, theology, mathematics and medicine in the University of Paris. Professors of the Sorbone were Gaspar Luz, Miguel Francés, Pedro Ciruelo, Juan M. Gilicco, Father Mariann, Fray Gregorio Arias, Francisco Escobar, Fernán Pérez de Oliva, and others. Luis Vives, Antonio Pérez, and Juan Verzosa, taught in Louvain. Father Pedro de Soto, Martín de Valencia and Juan Angel Sumarán taught in Dillingen and in Ingolstadt. Rodrigo de Ariaga taught philosophy in Prague; Law was taught in Toulouse by Antonio Gouvea, Luis de Lucena, and Sanchez. Pedro R. de Moros and Alfonso de Salmerón taught in Warsaw and Cracow. Luis Vives, Pedro de Soto, and Francisco Encinas, taught in Oxford. Bologna, Ancona, Naples and Rome, and many other universities of France, Switzerland, Italy, and other countries of Europe, had numerous Spanish scholars as teachers in all branches of knowledge. Thus the Spanish culture, acquired in Spanish Universities, was diffused throughout Europe and exerted imperishable influence in France and Italy, in England, Holland and Germany.

From a German author—Brentano—comes this modest and reluctant paean in tribute of Spain: "In the sixteenth century the Spanish culture attains transitorily the first place in the intellectual life of Europe... It is not surprising, therefore, that the whole world follows the model of Spain." (14)

(14) *Juderías*, loc. cit., p. 150.

6.

The sterilizing influence attributed by Spain's detractors to the Inquisition, its antagonism to all progress, its inherent enmity to all that was beautiful, pleasurable, and enlightening of the mind and daring to the imagination, would be expected to manifest itself in the Fine Arts as much as it has been supposed to have manifested itself in Literature, in the Sciences, in Philosophy, in the Freedom of thought and expression. But we saw how the latter thrived, prospered, flourished, shone throughout the dominions of Spain's obscurantist monarchs, cast their rays into the wide world, and influenced and moulded European thought and customs. Did the former fare so well, or did it languish and die at the mortiferous breath of the execrated institution?

Architecture had already shown all its vitality in such monuments as the cathedrals of León, Santiago, Tarragona, Burgos and Toledo, to which we may add the mosques of Córdoba and Seville transformed into Christian cathedrals after the Reconquest. This vitality was not diminished by the Inquisition, as is shown by the Cathedrals of Sigüenza, Salamanca, Jaen and Segovia, and the Colegio Mayor in Valladolid, the Hospital for Foundlings in Toledo, the Palace of Charles V in Granada, the famous stair-way of the Alcázar of Toledo, the Escorial, built by Philip II, and others which would be tedious to enumerate. Juan Bautista de Toledo, Herrera Villacarta, Villal Pando, Arfe, Bustamante... are some of the famous architects of this period.

Sculpture followed the same trend and furnishes us with such names as Diego de Siloe, Alonso Berruguete, Gaspar Becerra and many

others who had gone to Italy to learn the lessons revealed to the Italians by the classic statuary.

The excellency of Spanish Painting is recognized even by the enemies of Spain. How could it be otherwise when one comes to know the names of Juan de Juanes, Ribalta, Morales, Pantoja, Navarrete, Velázquez, Zurbarán, Cano, Jordán, Murillo and so many others? Besides "when in the golden age of painting, observes Jesús Corte Manos quoted by Juderías, the Flemish school was materialized to the point of vulgarity, and the Italian to the point of a sickly eroticism, Spain balanced the great art with the mystic energy of Ribera and Murillo; when the eighteenth century closed with that eclipse of serious painting, in which painters of fans, like Wateau and Chardin, became the favorite artists of the hour, Spain brought about a new revival in the masculine and immortal brush of Goya." (15) But this goes beyond the Inquisition.

Of the Spanish Musio says Weiss: "The period of the beautiful Spanish music, of the simple, great and deeply moving music, is the same as that of good painting and good architecture. In the second half of the sixteenth, and the first half of the seventeenth centuries, Spain produced great composers, especially of the religious kind. The archives of the cathedrals of Toledo, Valencia, Seville, Burgos and Santiago, contain priceless treasures without number. Each cathedral had its traditions, its repertoire, its maestros, and its disciples... Some of the most distinguished composers of this epoch took their art to Italy. Such was Pérez, whose magnificent fragments are still sung in the Sistine chapel; Monteverde was one

(15) Id., *ibid.*, p. 153.

of the creators of the Italian opera, and Salinas, blind as was Beethoven, was perhaps the best organist ever known." (16)

This estimate of Spanish music, though favorable, falls far short of the real state of affairs, in the opinion of Julián Juderías. No mention is made, he remarks, of Victoria, Morales, Guerrero, Escobedo, Vilá, Pujol, and many others, studied later on by Collet and Mitjana, who sees in the compositions of Ramos de Parejas "the base and foundation of modern harmony," and in those of Domingo M. Durán, Juan de Espinosa, Francisco Tovar, and others, the origin of the modern musical technique.

He notes also that the soul of that artistic movement of the sixteenth century was no other than Philip II, the great obscurantist, the smotherer of all progress, the embodiment of the worst characteristics of the ominous Spanish Inquisition. Philip II, the friend of Titian, patron of Federico Zuchero, Lucas Cambiaric, Tibaldi, Romulo Cincinato, Navarrete the Dumb, Barroso, Carvajal, and a legion of other artists, scientists and men of letters. The artistic crown of this monarch, much maligned and hated by the other nations of his time just because he was great and made them tremble, was El Escorial. According to Stirling this was the great architectonic enterprise conceived and executed by a single man. And Justi remarks that there is no notice of anyone who has been so active in enterprises of this kind, and that not only the idea of the huge structure, its plan and style were his own, but that he acted often in all capacities; executed the plans, contracted artists from all parts of the world, procured the materials

(16) Id., *ibid.*, p. 154.

from all parts of Spain and foreign nations, and even worked as an ordinary artisan. (17)

And while this fanatic fostered and protected all the arts and sciences, and built imperishable monuments under the shadow of the terrible tribunal of the Inquisition, what were the enlightened monarchs and princes of England, Germany and other Protestant countries where the Inquisition was not a part of the states' machinery doing? They were razing churches and monasteries to the ground, destroying priceless works of art, burning, slaughtering, and robbing the ecclesiastic property, which was, for most Protestant princes and high dignitaries, the real incentive in their adherence to the doctrines of the Reformation.

7.

And now we come to the crux of the whole subject of the Spanish Inquisition—the fiendish cruelty it exercised on its victims, the diabolical methods it used in order to extort their confessions, often on framed charges, and the ghastly spectacle of its huge Autos de Fé. Who can deny that the Inquisition is a shameful page in the annals of Spain? But what a wonder would it not be if Spain had not had at that time some such institution, no matter what its name might be?

It has already been remarked that the Inquisition was nothing more than a tribunal whose functions were to preserve the bonds of national unity by inquiring into, and punishing, the acts or tendencies that might threaten national disintegration, the most

(17) Id., *ibid.*, p. 138.

important of which, at that period of European History, were all kinds of religious dissent.

The church had fallen from its pristine simplicity, and had deviated from the straight path of virtue. The spirit of reform had arisen everywhere, because religion was then considered the most important thing in life, for it was through it that the poor and downthrown were to be rescued from this life of hardship and misery and come into the kingdom of everlasting bliss. Religion was, therefore, the most vital principle in the lives of the great multitudes, and consequently charged with the most powerful dynamite, pregnant with the seeds of the most far reaching discords and national disintegration. Hadn't Christ said that those who were to follow Him had to leave their father and their mother, their brothers and sisters, and even their worldly possessions? It follows that, in order to preserve order and unity within nations, agencies had to be created whose duty it was to watch for the most dangerous and menacing ripples on their apparently calm seas, and smooth them over before they threatened to wreck the ship of state. In Spain this agency was called Inquisition; in England it was called the Star Chamber; in other countries it had other names, but in most cases it was simply called the army, composed of mercenaries, for the most part, commanded by despots of one sort or another.

Up to the time of the final exulsion of the Moors, Spain did not need this kind of institution, for the common enemy of their religion kept the unity of their faith, which, in the course of eight centuries of struggle, had been fashioned into their national ideal. But after the tension was relaxed by the final

victory against the Crescent, and owing to the religious fermentation that was stirring all Christendom, the danger of dissention and disunity in Spain became apparent and some new instrument of civil power was to be devised to take care of the impending danger. This instrument took the form of an ecclesiastic tribunal, as was natural and logical, and was called The Holy Office or the Inquisition.

The suddenness of its appearance and the systematic thoroughness with which it began to operate was one of the reasons why it startled the world. The hatred it aroused in the breasts of the Protestants is also understandable, not only because one of its aims was to prevent the dissemination of their pet doctrines, doctrines on which they themselves were never able to fully agree, but in fact closed effectively the Spanish frontiers to them.

Most of the lies, however, that have been told about it, and the greater lies of conveying the idea that the Protestant nations were innocent of such horrors as those committed by the Inquisition, are also understandable, but not on the ground of true Christian zeal, of a sincere love of truth and fair-play. Their only explanation is jealousy arising from the greatness of the Spain of Charles V and Philip II, of her astounding discoveries, of her successful conquests and colonization, of her immense wealth that resulted therefrom, as well as of her amazing literary and scientific productions at a time when the rest of Europe was just emerging from a state of semi-barbarism, and on account of her far-reaching influence, both material and spiritual, over all Europe.

Other countries had had some form of inquisition from time immemorial, never systematically organized, evolving one way or

another according to circumstances, and therefore looked upon as more or less natural institutions.

Up to Wiclif's time, "In matters of religious freedom," says James G. Miall, "Britain had been hitherto far behind its continental neighbors. Its submission to the pope was more abject, its dread of heresy more obstructive to free inquiry. Though from this circumstance it persecuted less than others, it was not, however, entirely guiltless of human blood. In the year 1159, a band of German exiles had appeared in this country, who...denied or ignored many of the favorite doctrines of the Church of Rome... They were condemned to be branded in the forehead, whipped through the streets, and denied the smallest offices of life. Thus wounded, naked, desolate, they died miserably. During the reign of John, mention is also made of a company of Albigenes who were burned alive." (18) It was still a long way to the appearance of the Inquisition, and freedom-loving England was already making use of a little inquisition of her own, an inquisition which by the time of Henry VIII, and thereafter, would grow to huge proportions and would successively drown all religious British sects in rivers of blood.

One of the first manifestations of Spanish intolerance, and of that spirit which at a later date was to animate the Inquisition, and give so much scandal to the more progressive and tolerant nations of Europe, especially those which broke with the faith of Rome, was the barbaric expulsion of the Jews. Who can fail

(18) Miall, loc. cit., p. 25.

to condemn an act so unjust, so cruel, even so anti-Christian? Certainly no one who has the vaguest sense of the brotherhood of man, who professes to follow in the footsteps of the Apostle who proclaimed that there was no distinction between Jew and Greek. In what Christian nation did the Jews fare any better than in Spain the moment they became a menace to the economic interests of the masters? What has been their fate, even in more recent and enlightened times, all over Europe wherever they have attained a conspicuous preponderance either in the economic field or in that of the intellect? Spain, which in the fifteenth century was more affected by the Jews than perhaps any other nation has ever been, got rid of them by expulsion and occasional massacres. But what method did other nations use then and at a later date to get rid of them? Periodical massacre; wholesale slaughter with every refinement of cruelty imaginable. Compare their fate in the Spain of the republic and in Germany. Spain, the obscurantist, the intolerant, the inquisitorial, has given them absolute equality with the rest of the Spanish people. Germany, the tolerant, the progressive, the enlightened, has robbed them, has tortured them, has massacred them, has sent them to perpetual exile, without excepting the greatest and most creditable representatives of the German culture. In the twentieth century one of the leading exponents of the highest stage of human culture, is enacting the scenes of the Spain of the fifteenth century which they have so indignantly condemned and so hypocritically used as proofs of Spanish backwardness and barbarism as compared with their own pretended higher ideals of progressiveness, culture and spirit of democracy.

And what right have these enlightened nations to point their finger at the Spain of Ferdinand and Isabel when in more recent times they outdid her many times over not alone towards an assumed alien people, but towards their own people who happened not to think as they did at the moment? Why did the puritans expatriate themselves by the thousands whenever they could afford to do so? Why did the Irish migrate en masse to America after rivers of blood had drenched the soil of Ireland? The cruelties perpetrated against dissenters of every kind under Charles I became so unendurable that, in the words of James G. Miall, "Thousands emigrated to Holland, or to New England. So distasteful was this self-expatriation to the court, that the king issued a proclamation, declaring that none should be allowed to depart without testimonials of conformity!.. The materials that had been long gathering into one huge volume of combustible matter were fired, at length, by the insanity of the king; and Laud, Stafford, prelacy, lords, and the king himself, perished in the tremendous conflagration." (19)

The massacres of peasants in Germany, where 150,000 were butchered with the approval of Luther; those of the anabaptists in Holland at the hands of their own countrymen; the terrible and bloody reprisals of Cromwell in Scotland and Ireland against all sects but the Puritan; the massacres and expulsions of Catholics by Huguenots, and those of Huguenots by the Catholics in France, did they represent a more tolerant and enlightened policy than that followed by Spain against the Jews? Which of the two was more humane, or less humane, if you please?

(19) Id., *ibid.*, p. 99.

Let us give some details of the French intolerance on the part of both Catholics and dissenters. Later on we shall refer to the Anglo-Saxon intolerance.

According to Lavisso and Rambaud (General History), "Intolerance was the law of nations in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries... The beliefs of the majority were inexorably imposed upon the dissenters... The Protestants are as intolerant as the Catholics wherever they have the power on their side. They not only kept the exclusive use of the churches wherever they could, but absolutely prohibited the Catholic worship in the cities which were under their tyrannical power... In the Huguenot centers of the south, the Catholic minority was always threatened with arrest or mass expulsion." (20) The massacre of Vassy, which the Huguenots attributed to the Catholics and the Catholics to the Huguenots, started bloody reprisals in the south of France, where the Huguenots committed atrocious cruelties against the Catholics. In 1567 and 1569 the streets of Nimes ran with Catholic blood. Thousands were butchered in the churches where they had taken refuge. The massacres of Nimes, Parniers, Rodez, Volence and other cities, where the Calvinists exerted all their fury against the Catholics, were followed by St. Bartholomew's eve, which, both in Paris and other French cities, accounted for 15,000 dissenters at the hands of the Catholics, according to the reckoning of the Calvinists. The Huguenot Baron des Andrets alone killed 4000 Catholics. The duke of Guise, Henry III, and Henry IV, were

Juderias, loc. cit., p. 461.

assassinated. All these horrors took place during the reigns of the ominous Philip II and Philip III of Spain. (21)

Then came to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes by which, according to Voltaire, about 60,000 families left the kingdom in three years, and were followed by many others. England, Denmark, Holland, Germany, the United States, and even the Cape of Good Hope, were some of the places where they took refuge. This did not seem sufficient to the intolerance of the French King who ordered the children of the Calvinists to be taken away from their parents so that they might be instructed in the Catholic faith. The Calvinists, on the other hand, proved that, had they the power and opportunity, they would have done exactly the same.

Now, in what particular respect did Spanish intolerance towards the Jews differ from that of other nations towards both Jews and dissenting nationals both Catholic and Protestant? There was no essential difference, intolerance is intolerance no matter what form it may assume. Our own intolerance towards negroes, towards Chinese, towards aliens in general, towards people of different political opinion from our own, is not different from that of all ages and of other peoples. If it does not manifest itself in the same manner it is owing to the particular racial and religious composition of our people, among whom there is a very close balance of power.

8.

The horror inspired by the Spanish Inquisition in the great

(21) Juderias, loc. cit., p. 465.

majority of those who have had any notice of it at all arises from two main sources: the extreme cruelty of its methods of operation, and the huge number of its victims. These two positive charges, which have been drummed into their consciousness by insidious propaganda namely: that we, champions immemorial, if not originators, of liberty, tolerance, and fair-play, have not been guilty, in the memory of men, of such barbaric deeds, of such refinements of cruelty, as those with which the Spanish people contaminated the pages of human history.

Unfortunately for those who base their justification on the guilt of others, and who have been taught to score one virtue in their favor for every sin they discover in others, neither the cruelty of the Spanish Inquisition, nor the number of its victims, were greater than those of other nations, especially England, Germany, and France.

In fact, if we remember that the Inquisition was nothing more than an instrument of intolerance, and that its functions were not limited to religious matters alone, but to many others which had no direct relation with questions of faith—necromancy, witchery, sodomy, counterfeiting, etc.—, and that all such crimes were investigated into and ruthlessly punished by all kinds of agencies in all nations, it is not difficult to see that both the severity of the inquisitorial punishments and the number of victims of the dreadful institution take an entirely new aspect.

Therefore, in order to make a just judgement concerning the Inquisition it is necessary to consider it as an agency intended to cope with every element of national disintegration and disunity, as such questions were understood in those days; that, to take its

place, other nations employed other agencies, including tribunals of various kinds and denominations, and even the arbitrary and irresponsible action of the army under the orders, in most cases, of a despotic ruler. We must also bear in mind the fact that the Inquisition was not an institution of the twentieth century, but belonged to an age in which intolerance was universal, uncompromising, ruthless, both in the Catholic and in the Protestant countries.

With these considerations in mind one has nothing more to do than to open the pages of history, especially in reference to the Protestant Reformation, which was accomplished within the time of the Spanish Inquisition, and compare these two social phenomena both in the severity of the punishments they inflicted, the methods they used in the fulfillment of the respective roles they were to play, and in the number of victims each system of repression accounted for.

"The true history of the Inquisition has not been written yet," says Juderías. "The only information we have regarding it is that furnished by the traitor Llorente who arranged the data according to his bias, availing himself of those that suited his purpose and burning all the rest." (22) It stands to reason that the few Spanish Protestants who sought a refuge in England or Germany took little pains to tell the truth about the Inquisition, but, on the contrary, did all they could to discredit it. Such was the case of Llorent.

Who was this man Llorente? A Spanish renegade who fled the

(22) Juderías, loc. cit., p. 108.

country and joined the Protestants. He had an ax to grind and did not scruple in using any means at his disposal to carry his revenge to completion. His purpose was to discredit Spain by discrediting her social institutions, and in attacking the Inquisition he was not only fulfilling his main purpose but giving aid and comfort to his new friends and Spain's enemies. It is natural, therefore, to imagine that his picture of the Inquisition was as lurid and as exaggerated as possible; and yet one scarcely needs to impugn his veracity, so great is the number of victims of intolerance on the other side of the fence.

According to this Llorente, who is for the Protestants the classic authority on the Spanish Inquisition, the number of its victims was 23,112 burned alive and 201,244 punished in various other ways, making a total of 224,356 victims in 330 years. (23)

James Stephen (History of English Criminal Law) calculates that 264,000 executions took place in England alone during the same period of time. And this author was not a renegade Englishman, and the purpose of his work was not to blacken the honor of England. (24)

Even if we accept unreservedly the figures of Llorente, which no unbiased person can do, we see that English cruelty surpassed that of Spain by 39,640 in the same period of time. It may be objected that the number of English executions refer to all criminal offenses and not to those related to religious intolerance alone. But we must bear in mind that the Inquisition dealt with all kinds of offenses, religious and civil, especially those that called

(23) *Juderias*, loc. cit., p. 114.

(24) *Id.*, *ibid.*,

for severe punishment; and, on the other hand, the number given for the English executions during the same time do not comprise the multitudes who perished in the murders, wars, and massacres, caused or occasioned by religious intolerance and denominational ferocity. It leaves off many thousands slaughtered in Ireland, Scotland, and England, owing to religious intolerance; it does not take into consideration the massacres of Catholics and Huguenots in France, which ascended to several hundred thousand; those of the German peasants against the nobility and the clergy, whose number is unknown; those of the nobles against the peasants in which 150,000 were slaughtered in a single action; those against the anabaptists in Flanders, and others that would be tedious to enumerate. It is safe to say that in these religious wars of the Reformation half a million, at least, maybe a million and more, lost their lives through intolerance.

Not even the most rabid enemies of Spanish intolerance assign a number compared with that to the three hundred and thirty years of the Spanish Inquisition, including the period of the Spanish rule not only in the Hispanic peninsula but also in Germany, Netherlands, Naples, Franche-Comté, and America.

On the question of cruelty the Spanish Inquisition did not invent, or use, any means of torture which were not known and lavishly used by all the peoples of Europe in her ferocious attempts to stamp out every form of dissent. A sample of English ingenuity in this art has already been given in relation to the execution of Dr. Leighton. Others will be forthcoming. To ball the victims in oil, to burn them at the stake, to impale them, to quarter them, to submit them to the rack, were some of the devices employed

everywhere as punishment, or to extort forced confessions even from the presumably innocent. The rack was used in Prussia till 1740, in Saxony till 1770, in Austria till 1776, in France till 1789, in Russia till 1801, in Germany till 1841. What is the third degree, not intended to safeguard the highest interests of the state but to justify the blunders or the revenge of ignorant or imbecil guardians of law and order, but a brutal form of the worst phases of the Inquisition? What is a lynching party but the most cowardly and lawless form of an Auto de Fé?

It is customary to refer to the cruel and bloody political repression undertaken by the Duque of Alba in the Netherlands as something unique in the annals of rebellion. Not only unique, but also so excessively ferocious that there are no terms of comparison in the history of any other despotic ruler. How many Protestants were killed in these Alba's wars of extermination? The Protestants themselves, who were no lovers of the Duque, estimate that 18,000 were sacrificed to his ferocity. (25) The Spaniards, even when they accuse, say that all his victims did not exceed 6,000. Gachard calculates that their number was from 6,000 to 8,000. We may suppose that the last number is nearer the truth. (26) Is this figure, or even the highest of them all, so damning of the policies of Alba or of Spain? Let us examine other facts.

The war of extermination carried on in the Netherlands by the Duque of Alba was against the anabaptists who were the Bol-

(25) Smith, loc. cit., p. 258.

(26) Juderias, loc. cit., p. 116.

sheviks of their time. Says Pirenne in his Histoire de Belgique: "The Protestants hate them as much as do the Catholics. The cities are inexorable with the anabaptists... Their communism exasperates and terrorizes those who possess anything and hardens to death the followers of Mattys and of John of Leyden; the men to the fire or the knife; the women to the water. In June of 1538 all the anabaptists were condemned to death, even those who abjured their errors. (27) These measures, which were desired, and had the consent of the other Protestant sects, as well as that of the Catholics, were certainly more drastic than those carried out by the Duque of Alba. It is equally safe to say that 8,000 victims would be a very conservative figure to be assigned as the result of this decree alone by which all the anabaptists, even the repentant ones, had been condemned to death. And what about the 150,000 peasants slaughtered by the nobles and 8,000 nobles slaughtered by the peasants in a single explosion of religious fanaticism in Germany? And the massacres perpetrated by the Puritans in Ireland and Scotland, not to mention those that took place in England and elsewhere? The Duque of Alba was only a piker in the great game of killing religious dissenters.

In fact Alba, the emissary of Phillip II, did not punish the heretics of Netherlands as such, but as enemies of the State and of the Spanish rule which was then the only legitimate rule in the Netherlands. His severities had no relation at all with the Inquisition, for whatever inquisition there was in the

(27) Juderias, loc. cit., p. 117.

Netherlands was not brought by Spain, but by her native clergy and magistrates, who, therefore, are to blame for any cruelties inflicted by that tribunal. Moreover, as it was already remarked, what Alba did in the Netherlands was what her magistrates and people themselves were doing on a much larger scale. Who decreed death by fire for the men and by water for the women, in 1534, in Amsterdam, against the anabaptists, but the people of the Netherlands themselves? Who issued from Antwerp an edict banishing the same anabaptists, and proceeded to massacre them as if they were wild animals? Not Alba, but the national authorities. As a matter of fact Alba was fighting the battles of both the people and the authorities of the Netherlands as much as he was fighting for the integrity of the patrimony of Philip II. The beneficences Alba made in behalf of the Netherlands, related elsewhere, should also be remembered in connection with his work of deliverance in behalf of that distressed country.

It is clear, therefore, that Spanish intolerance, as manifested by the expulsion of the Jews, by the severe measures taken by the Duque of Alba against the Flemish Communists, by the Inquisition at its worst, and by similar agencies, was no different from the intolerance then prevailing over all Europe. The only difference was one of method. While Spain had a specific tribunal with definite rules of procedure, with jurisdiction over certain kinds of offenses and empowered to apply certain kinds of penalties, in other parts of Europe there were generally no specific agencies to deal with such matters of national policy, and therefore there was greater personal insecurity, less likelihood of a square deal at the hands of tyranny or caprice.

While the Inquisition (barring occasional abuses) proceeded against offenders by legal means and through machinery established in conformity with the spirit of the times, repression in other lands took for the most part the form of surprise attack, according to the whims of this or that tyrant, haphazard raids whose main objective was slaughter, rapine, arson, rape and debauchery. Again, can the victims of the Spanish Inquisition, or Spanish intolerance, which operated for over three hundred years in so vast a territory as was under Spanish rule, compare in numbers, by any stretch of the imagination, with those of the Protestant and, especially, of the Anglo-Saxon intolerance?

Far be it from me to absolve the Inquisition from many acts of terrible cruelty, from great abuses of the human liberty. But that was not the twentieth century, and to judge the Inquisition by today's standards is absurd. Those times were intolerant, exceedingly cruel, with different notions of retributory justice, with a different sense of values, with no definite conception of the rights of men, with different ideas of liberty and freedom. Why should the Inquisition be expected to be above the ideas of its time?

What I want to emphasize is the fact that, in spite of its shortcomings, especially as they are considered in the light of the present day notions of justice, equity, and respect for everybody's opinions, the Inquisition was a very orderly institution of national policy, as compared with the haphazard or improvised institutions made use of by most of the other nations and for the same purpose. Its cruelties and ruthlessness pale before the cruelties and ruthlessness which the Reformation used in combating

not only Catholics, but also all the other Protestant sects in the minority for the time being. To single out the Inquisition for adverse criticism is sheer hypocrisy.