

VIII. INTOLERANCE AND THE REFORMATION

1.

The Spanish Inquisition is considered the highest expression of Spanish intolerance, and came to have such an ominous significance in the characterization of the Spanish people at the hands of the apostles of hate, owing to the fact that their respective nations did not have a similar institution called by the same name. It has been discussed, not as intolerance, or the expression thereof, but as Inquisition in capital letters, which seems something peculiar and distinct from anything else. Thus thrown out of proper perspective it was easy for the unscrupulous propagandists to build around it a huge edifice of the most cowardly and infamous calumnies against Spain, proclaiming at the same time how innocent and clean they were of such foul, tyrannical, and obscurantist misdeeds. However, in general, they know very well what they were talking about, and one wonders if it was intolerance, as such, that they condemned, or if it was Spain that was the real object of their hatred.

But, in the last analysis, what was the Inquisition? It was, we admit, the expression and instrument of intolerance; a phenomenon to be met with in all ages and among all peoples; a phenomenon universal in Europe of those times; a phenomenon which reached its highest development in the age and in consequence of the Reformation; a phenomenon still rampant in most civilized nations of the West, and which, especially since the Great War, has everywhere been growing again to gigantic proportions. Russia, Germany,

Italy, and Japan are glaring examples of a tremendous recrudescence of intolerance. And here in our own country, if we are willing to search our own hearts, we may find enough intolerance to cover us with confusion and shame.

Intolerance has never been a Spanish monopoly. It was a social disease, a virulent canker, which infested all European nations of the age of Enlightenment. It had in its grip all the peoples and their rulers. It was advocated by the great reformers, and preached from every reformed pulpit of Europe and America. It galloped over the bloodiest tidal wave that ever swept Christendom from the Pyrenees to the North Sea, from Russia to England and America.

What were some of the most obvious manifestations of intolerance among the Caucasian nations of both hemispheres? Abolition of freedom of thought, extreme cruelty towards dissenters, arbitrary rules and proceedings in the administration of justice, greediness, iconoclasm, ruthless and wholesale murder of non-conformists. In all these things the Spanish Inquisition was only a poor imitation of some of the multiple inquisitorial instrumentalities which afflicted the reformed nations of Europe and America. It never reached the proportions of that huge conflagration that devastated the nations where Protestantism gained a firm foothold, especially during the first century or two of the Reformation, and in consequence of it.

And has it already disappeared from among us forever? Not in the least. It is still with us under the guise of patriotism, of one-hundred-percentism, of race purity, of the status quo, of rugged individualism, of the unlimited right to exploit and oppress

the masses, of a thousand obfuscating shibboleths by which the wolf is disguised under the skin of the lamb. It manifests itself in programs against the Jews, in the relentless persecution of racial minorities, in the political disabilities of great numbers or whole classes of citizens, in the murder or exile of those who may not subscribe to the opinions of their masters, in the repression and suppression of public or private opinion, in the terroristic methods by which labor is made to work for the plutocrat at starving wages, in degrading and savage lynching parties, in the chaingangs and peonage, in the exploitation of the children, in the liberal use of the third degree, in the degrading practice of the teachers' oath, in a thousand villainous and barbaric methods to which nations and peoples, institutions and corporations, even individuals, resort in order to smother thought, suppress legitimate action, oppress and rob the unorganized masses who create wealth but whose fate is to suffer, to reproduce a new crop of beasts of burden, and starve to death.

Yes, intolerance is with us, perhaps more insidious, more cruel, more ruthless and brutal than ever before, and certainly more arbitrary, more lawless, more hideous and more materialistic than that which was typified by the Spanish Inquisition.

But it is not with the intolerance of our times that we are particularly concerned. What we want to show presently is that during the ominous age of the Inquisition there was no such thing as liberty of thought, freedom of conscience in other parts of Europe as a result of the high fever of Reformation. Free examen was, in fact, the cause or excuse for mass assassination in the name of freedom of conscience, and neither religious nor political

liberty was yet known in the western world. While Spain had the Inquisition to watch for the purity of the Catholic faith, the other nations had scores of similar institutions to watch for the purity of a hundred distinct sects. While Spain used consistently her particular instrument of intolerance for the purpose for which it was established, the protestant nations used their own particular and changeable instruments of intolerance to impose on their peoples strict conformity to the changeable opinions of their no less changeable rulers. To illustrate.

In 1563 the Elector Frederik III changed his previous creed for that of Calvin. This was perfectly legitimate. But he went further; he ordered his vassals to subscribe to the Calvinistic Dogmas under pain of exile. In 1567 his son Luis became a Lutheran, and, undoubtedly in the name of liberty of thought and freedom of conscience, ordered his subjects to do likewise. Seven years later John Casimir reestablished Calvinism, and everybody was again converted to that form of faith. But how could things be otherwise when the peace of Passau authorized the German princes to compel their subjects to profess their own religion or leave the country after paying a heavy fine? For this reason Hajelé was not far from the truth when he said that a zealous Lutheran was more to be feared than the Spanish Inquisition. (1)

In England the same kind of freedom of conscience was imposed upon the people according to the whims of those in power. Henry VIII in order to have a convenient sanction for his polygamies, renounced the faith of which he had been the gallant Defender and pro-

(1) Juderias, loc. cit., p. 445.

claimed himself the Pope of a new church. Then, by decree, he proceeded to the conversion of his subjects administering to them the baptism of blood. Queen Mary, a Catholic, reversed the orders of her father by the use of similar arguments. Elizabeth, who was a Catholic during the reign of her half sister and took the oath of office as such, lured by the new title of Head of the English Church, reverted to the Protestant faith and compelled her subjects to follow her apostasy. Not only the Catholics, but all the followers of any other Protestant sect not her own, had to conform or be visited with dire punishment. When the Presbyterians were in power Catholics, Puritans, and other sects, were the objects of horrible persecutions; with the advent of the Puritans the order was reversed and the freedom of conscience was fertilized with rivers of blood.

Where was, then, that liberty of conscience which the Anglo-Saxon nations are so prone to pitch against the unbearable intolerance of the Spanish Inquisition? It did not exist. It was not born of the Reformation. Intolerance was a characteristic of the age of Enlightenment and was part of the intellectual equipment of both Catholic and Protestant reformers themselves. How does Calvin preface his Christian Institution? "I came to give you not peace but the sword," says the sage of Geneva, who proceeds to institute his own Autos de Fe. Luther wants proscription for the Catholics, and thinks that fire is the best punishment for those who do not belong to his sect. Melancthon wants the Baptists to be punished without mercy. Zwingli approves the assassination of the bishops. They all agree that the followers of other forms of

religion should be exterminated with fire and sword, and that not even women and children should be spared, for God Himself had so commanded in the Old Testament! Such were the principles of tolerance inspired by the Reformation, which led Zeller to say that the ideas of Luther destroyed Christian unity in Germany and brought about the mania of the theological discussions and the horror of the religious wars which lasted longer there than in any other place. (2)

M. Guizot, whom no one can accuse of lukewarmness in his Protestant convictions, says of the Reformation that it never knew the true principles of individual liberty, and that it fell, therefore, in a double error; "it did not respect the rights of the human mind, because while claiming those rights for itself it violated them towards others; and it was unable to gauge the rights of the spiritual authority which acts upon the soul and only through moral influx" (3) In other words, the Reformation, founded on the principle of freedom of thought, did not recognize other than its own freedom, and crushed those who dared to think differently. To make a special case of the Inquisition, and give to Spain the monopoly of intolerance, is not only historically false, but eminently absurd in the nature of things.

In contrast with Spanish intolerance, as manifested especially by the Inquisition, I propose to give an outline of the spirit that animated some of the great reformers of Protestant Europe, of the number and variety of inquisitions they made use of

(2) Juderias, loc. cit., p. 439.

(3) Id., ibid., p. 440.

for the purpose of compelling others to conform to their principles of free inquiry, and of some of the results derived from that most tyrannical age of Christendom.

2.

In comparing the work Spain performed since the beginning of the reconquest from the Moors with that of the nations north of the Pyrenees, one of the most striking characteristics that we observe between the former and the latter are the entirely opposite aims which each of them pursued.

The memorable epic initiated in the fastnesses of Covadonga, and ending eight centuries later at the gates of Granada, had as its paramount object the preservation and final triumph of the Spanish religion and Spanish culture. Its heroes are not, therefore, this or that prince, this or that leader, but the whole people who fought and died for a principle, for an ideal, for their spiritual heritage.

The conquest, exploration, and civilization of the New World, were not the work of one, or a dozen, or a hundred heroes. This great adventure was likewise the work of the whole Spanish people: the humble soldier, the farmer, the artisan; the missionary, the scientist, the man of letters; the adventurer, the traveler, the proud conquistador; the magnate, the bishop and the king. What was the supreme motive of their heroic labors? The conversion of the natives to what they thought to be a better religion, a superior culture, a better way of life—things of the spirit and not of the flesh alone.

What spurred the Spanish philosophers, scientists, artists,

men of letters, in the indefatigable labors of their particular avocations? Material gain? But they never exchanged the fruits of their talents for mere gold or silver, never prostituted the gifts of their spirit on the altar of Mammon. Hard work and poverty have always been their portion, for their reward they have looked elsewhere. The joy of revealing some phase of the truth, or of creating a thing of beauty, far surpasses the gratification resulting from the highest material gain.

The Inquisition itself, with all its intrinsic wickedness attributable to mistaken notions of right and wrong then prevalent among all the nations of the West, was it an instrument of revenge, or was it a seeker after material gain? Not at all. It was an institution essentially spiritual; it devoted all its energies to the prosecution of an ideal, the highest ideal attainable, according to the notions and beliefs of the Spanish people of its time.

All the manifestations, in sum, of Spain's prodigious activity in all fields of human endeavor, since the beginning of the Reconquest, had as their primary purpose, and most characteristic objective, an ideal, a thing of the spirit, values that raise the soul upwards instead of dragging it down in the mire where it had its baser origin. Such were the aims of Spain in her gigantic work of over a thousand years of her mediæval and modern history.

The history of the nations farther north, on the other hand, has been, in the same span of time, but especially since, and as a result of, the Reformation, one of essentially materialistic aims. Not that the original motives of the Reformation were materialistic and mundane in themselves; far from it. But those of practically

every reformer of that age were characteristically so. Besides, the ground on which the seeds of the Reformation did fall had already been panned to Mammon and needed only to be bathed in rivers of blood for ever a century to yield rich harvest of power and stolen wealth. Kings and princes, prelates and captains of industry, men of influence and endowed with worldly wisdom, rallied around the banner of the new Joshua at the first blare of the clarion of revolt and marched in close formation to the spoliation of the Canaanites. As they visualized what a big prize was to be had for the taking in the rich abbeys and bishoprics, in the property of the church in general and in that of its devotees, by such a simple right about face, they felt the sharpest compunction for their sinful adherence to the Roman form of worship, and repentantly decided that the new religion, any kind of new religion, would offer them greater promises; promises of rich estates, of an abundant harvest of loot and plunder to be consecrated to the holy cause of their materialistic desires.

Oppression, murder, and massacre were out at the service of covetousness and of an orgy of rapine; all in the name of freedom of conscience. Luther's doctrine of free interpretation of the Bible had all the earmarks of a new dispensation and was sufficient justification for whatever atrocious act anyone cared to commit. Rich and poor alike made lavish use of it, either to avenge personal grievances, to seize the property of others, or to burn and destroy what they could not take for themselves.

But by free interpretation of the Bible Luther must have meant his own interpretation, because when the German peasants began to interpret it in their own way and act according to their own find-

ings, what did the emancipator of consciences do? He wrote a diatribe Against the Thievish Murderous Hords of Peasants. "In this," says P. Smith, "he denounced them with the utmost violence of language, and urged the government to smite them without pity. Every one...should join the forces to stay them like mad dogs. 'If you die in battle against them,' said he to the soldiers, 'you could never have a more blessed end, for you die obedient to God's Word...'" (4)

What new advantage had been brought about by his doctrine of free interpretation of the Bible if he alone knew what was and what was not God's Word? "Later on," adds the same author, "he wrote: 'it is better that all the peasants be killed than that the princes and the magistrates perish, because the rustics took the sword without divine authority...' Melancthon entirely agreed with his friend. 'It is fairly written in Eccl. 33,' said he, 'that as the ass must have fodder, load, and whip, so must the servant have bread, work, and punishment. These outwardly, bodily servitudes are needful, but this institution (serfdom) is certainly pleasing to God.'" (5)

The German princes who, unlike the peasants, did not need anyone to interpret the Bible for them, entered eagerly and fully into the spirit of the Reformation, as it was understood in practice. Freedom of conscience was understood to mean licence to do as they pleased, without any restraints, provided they had the brute force on their side. Massacre and loot could always find entire justification in their free interpretation of the Bible. "As a rule,"

(4) Smith, loc. cit., p. 98.

(5) Id., ibid.

says Juderias referring to the religious intolerance in Germany, "the reign of the Gospel is established and the defeat of Antichrist celebrated by the looting of the churches and the ruthless destruction of the works of art... The treasures of the societies have unusual charms for the reformers. And, naturally, as these treasures cannot remain in the possession of the idolaters they disappear in the pockets of the disciples of Luther, Melancton, or Zwingli, which is a manner, as any other, of practicing liberty." (6)

Farther north this form of liberty grows apace with the growth of the Reformation. In Denmark the Diet of 1536 "abolished Catholicism, confiscated all church property and distributed it between the King and the temporal nobles." (7) says P. Smith. And referring to Gustavus Vasa, he continues: "He, too, saw in the Reformation chiefly an opportunity for confiscating the goods of the church." (8) Calvin himself, the stern reformer of Geneva, seems to have developed an extraordinary liking for worldly goods, and "among other things," writes the same author, "he was accused of levying tribute from his followers by a species of blackmail..." (9)

In England the Reformation was never a thing of the spirit, but of the flesh, blood, and spoliation. The King hated the German heresy, and was so proud of his Catholicity that he undertook to write a thesis in its defense and win, by the way, from the Church of Rome, the title of Defender of the Faith. But this was only

(6) Juderias, loc. cit., 442.

(7) Smith, loc. cit., p. 137.

(8) Id., ibid.

(9) Id., ibid., p. 179.

vanity and had nothing to do with convictions or ideals. A pretty woman came between him and his religion; so he foreswore the things of the spirit for those of the flesh. In imitation of those German reformers whom he hated so much, he set up a reformation of his own that should be willing to wink at his polygamies and absolve him of the murder of his wives. And if the King's reformation was good for the King what objection could his people have against it? He was now the English Pope in his own right, and he knew what was best for his subjects. So he ordered a nation-wide apostasy, and the royal farce changes into a colossal tragedy of blood, rapine, and destruction. "Francis and Charles" (of France and Spain, respectively), says P. Smith, "showed themselves persecuting, and were capable of having a defaulting minister or a rebel put to death; but neither Charles nor Francis, nor any other king in modern times, has to answer for the lives of so many nobles and ministers, cardinals and queens, whose heads, as Thomas More put it, 'he kicked around like footballs.'" (10)

The spoliation of churches and monasteries was nothing new in England, but the Reformation furnished the best pretext for wholesale robbery and barbaric iconoclasm. It was the boast of Thomas Cromwell, according to P. Smith, "that he would make his king the richest in Christendom, and this (the confiscation of churches and monasteries) was the shortest and most popular way to do it. Accordingly an Act was passed for the dissolution of all small religious houses with an income of less than 200 pounds a year. By this Act 376 houses were dissolved with an aggregate

(10) Smith, loc. cit., p. 278 ff.

revenue of 32,000 pounds, not counting plate and jewels confiscated." (11)

With such a shining example of the new way of life as the King himself, who could remain immune to the virulent contagion that swept the whole land? It is true that "in the wilds of the north and west...", notes the same author, "hardly any bourgeois clan of traders existed to adopt 'the religion of the merchants,' as Protestantism has been called." (12) But, "As in England and Scotland," he adds, "so here the lands of abbeys and prelates were thrown to new men of the pushing commercial type. Thus was formed a landed aristocracy...strong in supporting both King and Reformation. And, innumrating some of the results of the new dispensation, he remarks that "the immediate effect was a large amount of misery," and adds: "Perhaps the principal political importance of this (act for the dissolution of all small religious houses) and the subsequent spoliations of the church was to make the Reformation profitable, and therefore popular, with an enterprising class. For the lion's share of the prey did not go to the lion, but to the jackals." (13)

Speaking of the Parliament that met in 1545, James Gairdner says that "the chief measure of the session was 'an Act for the dissolution of Chantries, hospitals, and free Chapels.' This was another measure to meet the drain on the exchequer occasioned by war." (14) But the rapacity of the monarch could not be satis-

(11) Smith, loc. cit., p. 297.

(12) Id., ibid., p. 302.

(13) Id., ibid., p. 369.

(14) Gairdner, J. History of the English Church, vol. 4. p. 231. London, McMillan and Co., 1924.

fied and he started to exact tribute from any one on any pretext whatever. When the clergy, notes Mall, acknowledged the authority of the Pope by receiving Wolsey as his delegate, Henry VIII found it an excellent excuse to extort from them 118,000 pounds.

Why multiply the instances of gross materialism, the most distinctive characteristic of the followers of the Reformation, or, if you prefer, of those who started it and carried it to completion? Ideals as such were altogether alien to them. In fact, according to Juderías and other authorities quoted by him, the acquisition of wealth and physical comfort have always been, and are now, more than ever, the specific trait of the Anglo-Saxon culture, with the pursuit of ideals and the seeking after spiritual values as secondary in its scheme of life. The modern progress, as it is understood today, is the triumph of materialism, and had its inception in the Reformation. Such is the frank confession of Brooke Adams, who goes on to say that the development of nations depends on money, and that the Reformation triumphed because it was "the most suitable mask of the new ideal, the economic man."

In an attempt to define this new breed of the Homo Sapiens Juderías writes: "The economic man, whose prototype is to be found among the Anglo-Saxons, is the one whose only serious pre-occupation is money; the one for whom the life of his fellowmen has no other significance than that of an instrument of wealth; the man who monopolizes the products of an industry so that he may sell them at his own price without any regard for the misery of others; the one who exploits the backward races so that he may sell them his knives and calicoes; the one who skillfully disguises his intentions under the resounding names of culture and progress, if not of

liberty itself." (15) In fact, asks this author, in what consists the excellence of the material progress of Europe when, in spite of all its great inventions, it has not exerted the least influence in the order of the higher things of life? We have made great strides in the development of certain material things, in many cases of very doubtful value. But what have we done in the establishment of universal justice, in fostering real brotherhood of man, in making accessible to all the abundance of the earth, the contemplation of the beautiful, the unmixed enjoyment of life?

Even in the hateful period of the Inquisition Spain was motivated by ideals, Spiritual aims, Quixotic dreams, if you like, but dreams that uplift the soul, that inspire acts of supreme heroism, that ennoble that something which distinguishes man from brute. In the Anglo-Saxon nations, on the contrary, even in the hour in which their liberation is supposed to have been proclaimed by the revolt of Luther, what we notice is more accentuated materialistic aims, a more eager rooting for acorns, a more covetous searching for the escudos in the dead mule's saddlebag, like Sancho; a search that may perchance bring affluence to a few, but will never be the cause of real happiness. Happiness, which in the last analysis is the only thing we all pursue, is not a purchasable merchandise. It resides within one's self and knows no other elements of growth than the prosecution of ideals, the contemplation of the beautiful, the enlargement of one's intellectual horizon by the exercise of that faculty that distinguishes man from brute.

(15) *Juderías*, loc. cit., p. 436.

The economic man, the man with an insatiable spirit of acquisitiveness, is under the grip of a perpetual fever, of a nervous restlessness, of an everlasting discontent, that betray desires unquenchable. He may be a millionaire, but it is doubtful that he may ever attain undiluted happiness. And at what price has he become a Cræsus or a Midas? At the price of the happiness of myriads whom he has condemned to perpetual squalor, degradation, starvation, and despair.

3.

The fact that all forms of Spanish intolerance were centered in one institution called the Inquisition, while the intolerance of the nations of the Reformation manifested itself in one hundred forms—tribunals of various designations to deal with different kinds of dissent, religious or otherwise; the arbitrary and despotic whim of kings; the ferocious zeal of reformers; the brutality and murderous licence of troops; the iconoclastic fanaticism of the masses; the bloody reprisals of nobles and men in power; the tornado-like sweep of factions, like those that left Ireland, Scotland, the Netherlands, Germany, and France, drenched in blood—made it easy to single out the Inquisition as the very prototype of intolerance, a phenomenon unique in all Christendom, an institution exclusively Spanish, alien and unknown to the nations that professed the Protestant faith. All the characteristics of intolerance were attributed to that particular institution named Inquisition, and because they had no Inquisition they soon began to disclaim or explain away the part they themselves played in that colossal

tidal wave of intolerance that swept Europe during three centuries. When the Inquisition is, thus, studied as a manifestation of intolerance, and not as a phenomenon apart from any other, it is clear that Spain was not only in supposedly good company, but also that she failed to keep up, in this particular, with her sister nations, what is obviously to her credit.

To start with, what was the famous, or infamous, Star Chamber, one of the crucibles used to reduce to the monarch's standard of purity the ore represented by so many sects, but an Inquisitorial tribunal at the service of the English Reformation? This tribunal is thus described by Miall: "When in the reign of Elizabeth, it developed its full powers, it became a tremendous instrument of despotism. It possessed the power of fining, imprisoning, banishing, mutilating, inflicting corporal punishment; and as it had authority to proceed on confession, every kind of examination, not excepting that by torture, was within the range of its jurisdiction. It was, moreover, administered by judges whose appointment and removal were entirely within the power of the crown. Hume says: 'I question whether any of the absolute monarchies of Europe contain at present so illegal and despotic a tribunal!' (16) Of course one of the absolute monarchies of Europe of that time was Spain, but Hume, an Englishman, and a good authority on the subject, questions whether she had so illegal a tribunal as that of the Star Chamber.

Commenting on some of the despotic measures of the English crown of the time of the Reformation, Lord Macaulay give a small

(16) Miall, loc. cit., p. 78.

sample of the proceedings of two of its inquisitorial tribunals in one of his Essays: "The decision of the Exchequer Chamber," he says, "had placed at the disposal of the Crown the whole property of the English people. About the time at which that decision was pronounced, Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, were mutilated by the sentence of the Star Chamber and sent to rot in remote dungeons. The estate and the person of every man who had opposed the Court, were at its mercy." (17) The Spanish Inquisition could do no worse. It never placed at the disposal of the Crown the whole property of the Spanish people. It was not a blind instrument in the hands of the sovereign, for not only was he subject to its jurisdiction as the rest of the people, but the people had recourse to it in case of encroachment on the part of the sovereign. As a matter of fact the Inquisition was a democratic institution for, according to Juderias, it was wished by the people as "safeguard of their faith and their morals. It was hated by those who suffered for their dissent, but so are all the instruments of social justice.

Another agency of royal despotism in Protestant England was the Court of High Commission which, according to Miall, "exercised a jurisdiction greatly resembling that of the inquisition in other countries, the rack, torture and imprisonment, were means it was authorized to employ... It was entitled to administer the oath called ex-officio oath, which demanded that the prisoner should answer all questions put to him; if he did, he was convicted on his own confession, and if he did not, he was imprisoned for con-

(17) Macaulay, Lord. Essays, Vol. II., p. 78.
Philadelphia, Carrey and Hart, 1843.

tempt of court." (18) "The death of Elizabeth," he says in another place, "abated little of the severities practiced in these terrible courts. James I received and transmitted them as a part of the heirlooms of the British monarchy... The Star Chamber and the Gatehouse, as well as the Clink, Newgate, the Marshalsea, overflowed with victims." He records the words of Lord Burghley spoken on the occasion of the proceedings used in trials like that of John Greenwood. Said Lord Burghley: "The inquisition of Rome (meaning perhaps the Spanish Inquisition) uses not so many questions to trap their prey." (19)

The proceedings used in the trials conducted by these English inquisitorial tribunals of the Reformation are further illustrated by Miall in the trial of John Udal accused of having signed The Book of Discipline. "With fetters on his legs," he says, "he was...tried...on written depositions, without being allowed to confront the accusing witnesses, and so to cross examine them or to produce any evidence in his own exculpation; he was denied even to be heard by counsel. Though no legal evidence proved Udal to be the author of the book, he was condemned (to death) as a felon..." (20) And referring to the persecution against the Puritans he makes the following remark regarding another court: "Lacking the power to exterminate, which alone could be successful, the court took to tormenting, to which it was more competent; and no inquisitor showed more alacrity for the task." (21) That this alacrity was

(18) Miall, loc. cit., p. 79.

(19) Id., ibid., p. 83.

(20) Id., ibid., p. 80.

(21) Id., ibid., p. 85.

not beneath the dignity of an English monarch himself is shown by the fact that James "was to be found on the bench whenever a trial took place for witchcraft in any of the courts of Scotland and (used to) direct the application of the torture to the wretched victims." (22)

That these horrors were not merely an effect of mistaken and misguided zeal for the perseveration of religious purity, as those committed by the Spanish Inquisition, but the result of baser motives, is shown by the case of Francis Johnson and fifty other Puritans who had been committed to prison in the time of Elizabeth. They presented a petition to the Privy Council complaining of bad treatment and saying that some were overburdened with irons; many, and among them aged women and young maidens, had died; in certain cases prisoners had been beaten with cudgels while the houses of those suspected of Puritanism were liable to be broken into and rifled at any hour of the night. Johnson, when examined, made a candid statement of his principles and practices, but expressed his wonder that he should be treated in a manner which could only make men hypocrites. The Commissioners' reply was: "Come to the church and obey the queen's laws; and be a dissembler, be a hypocrite, or a devil, if thou wilt." (23)

For those who, through hatred of Spain on account of her devotion to the Catholic form of worship, have reviled Queen Mary for her intolerances, and praised Queen Elizabeth to the skies as the providential guide of the more enlightened Established

(22) Miall, loc. cit., p. 53.

(23) Id., ibid., p. 82.

Church, Lord Macaulay's appraisal of the two sisters in relation to their religious policies must sound shocking, traitorous, unpatriotic. The famous essayist who, as a Protestant and a patriot is second to none, says of the great Queen: "A crucifix, with wax-lights burning round it, stood in her private chapel. She always spoke with disgust and anger of the marriage of churchmen. But she would only connive; and the children sprung from such marriages were illegitimate till the accession of James I... Having no scruple about conforming to the Romish Church, when conformity was necessary to her own safety, retaining to the last moment of her life a fondness for much of the doctrine, and much of the ceremonial of that church, she yet subjected that church to a persecution even more odious than the persecution with which her sister had harassed the Protestants. We say more odious. For Mary had at least the plea of fanaticism. She did nothing for her religion which she was not prepared to suffer for it. She had held it firmly under persecution. She fully believed it to be essential to salvation. If she burned the bodies of her subjects, it was in order to rescue their souls. Elizabeth had no such pretext. In opinion, she was little more than half a Protestant. She had professed, when it suited her, to be wholly a Catholic. There is an excuse, a wretched excuse, for the massacres of Piedmont and the Autos-da-fé of Spain. But what can be said in defense of a ruler who is at once indifferent and intolerant?" (24)

Commenting on the results of Elizabeth's duplicity, the

(24) Macaulay, loc. cit., p. 125.

author of the Essays adds that if she "had possessed sufficient virtue and sufficient enlargement of mind to adopt those principles which More, wiser in speculation than action, had avowed in the preceding generation, and by which the excellent 1st Hospital regulated the conduct in her own time, how different would be the colour of the whole history of the last hundred and fifty years! She had the happiest opportunity ever vouchsafed to any sovereign, of establishing perfect freedom of conscience throughout her dominions, without danger to her government, or scandal to any large party among her subjects... Unhappily for her own glory and for the public peace, she adopted a policy, from the effects of which the empire is still suffering. The yoke of the Established Church was pressed down on the people till they would bear it no longer. Then a reaction came. Another reaction followed. To the tyranny of the establishment succeeded the tumultuous conflict of sects, infuriated by manifold wrongs, and drunk with unwonted freedom. To the conflict of sects succeeded again the cruel domination of one persecuting church... It is melancholy to think with what ease conflicting sects might be harmonized under the shelter of the same impartial laws, and the same paternal throne; and thus have placed the nation in the same situation, as far as the rights of conscience are concerned, in which we at length stand, after all the heartburnings, the persecutions, the conspiracies, the seditions, the revolutions, the judicial murders, the civil wars, of ten generations." (25)

In other words, the inquisitorial practices of Mary were motivated by a sincere conviction in the justice of the cause for

(25) Macaulay, loc. cit., p. 125 ff.

which she was fighting. They were the result of higher ideals, even if mistaken ones. In this sense she imitated the Spanish Inquisition, which, like her, did nothing for its religion which it was not prepared to suffer for, to paraphrase Lord Macaulay; which full believed its religion to be essential to salvation; which burned men's bodies in order to rescue their souls. We may sneer at these great human delusions, but they were not delusions to our forefathers, they were vital and of the utmost concern to everybody at that time, and it is by the standards of their times that the princes, reformers, and the masses of people should be judged. We may execrate Queen Mary and the Spanish Inquisition for the misery and suffering they caused, but we cannot in fairness withhold from either our respect and admiration for their higher aims, for their sincerity, for their idealism whether we share their own brand of religion or not. Elizabeth, on the other hand, held no deep convictions in religious matters. For her one religion was as good, or as bad, as another. She lacked sincerity. She had no ideals. Material interests, opportunism, the glory of being the Head of the Established Church, were the motives of her senseless policies in regard to religious matters. In this respect she only deserves our contempt.

But to go back to the subject of the inquisitorial agencies of the English Reformation. After the restoration of Charles II another High Commission Court was established, in which according to Miall, 'without 'accusation, evidence or defense,' fines and imprisonment were extensively inflicted...These persecuting laws were put into execution in a manner which renders it difficult to

determine whether ferocity or cupidity were the most conspicuous ... When a soldier, pursuing his severe exactions, was asked by his victim why he was so treated, he replied: 'Because ye have gear, and I maun ha' a share o't'...' (26) Sir J. Turner, one of the typical missionaries charged by this tribunal to reduce the heretics to the faith professed by the monarch, "swept like a whirlwind over Nithsdale and Galloway at the head of his 'lambs', dragging people to church, devouring the substance of families, binding prisoners with iron chains, applying thumbscrews and instruments of torture, and carrying ruin and desolation in his train... They (the dissenters) suffered extremities that tongue cannot describe, and which heart can scarcely conceive of... Such of them as escaped execution were transported, or rather sold as slaves, to people desolate and barbarous colonies." (27)

It appears, therefore, on the authority of both English and American Protestants of repute, that intolerance was not the monopoly of Spain of the time of the Inquisition, and that the latter was by no means more cruel, more indifferent to human suffering, more uncompromising, than any one of the many agencies used by the Reformation for the forced conversion of dissenters. The only difference between the Spanish Inquisition and the Protestant inquisitions consisted in this, that the former was sincere, acted through conviction, pursued the things of the spirit, sought ideals. The latter, on the other hand, was materialistic, sought the things of the flesh, had neither convictions nor sincerity.

(26) Miall, loc. cit., p. 296.

(27) Id., ibid., p. 296 ff.

Even the highest hierarchy was tainted with these materialistic aims according to the judgement of Miall. "The oppressive conduct of James," he says, "which was no little disguised as to show that he was more weak than wicked, was next turned against the prelates. This aroused the clergy, who now employed their pulpits to denounce his course. As if by some sudden wind, all the statements which they had so profusely made, in favor of non-resistance and the royal prerogative, like the sentences of the Cumaean Sibyl, were whirled away in an instant. The word of a king had been pronounced by Archbishop Sharp to be as sacred as his text; but when the English hierarchy was threatened, the doctrine became naught. In an instant they threw themselves into the position in which the reviled puritans of the Commonwealth had stood before them. Even Oxford, which had described resistance as 'impious, seditious and damnable,' refused compliance with James' new Commission court, and drew from him the sarcasm, 'Is this your church of England loyalty?'" (28)

Of Queen Elizabeth's lack of convictions and sincerity, the same author remarks: "Resolute despotism was the law of her reign... That she had no hesitation in overstepping law, when it suited her purpose, is evident from her whole history... If religion had been a dogma held carelessly and doubtfully (by her subjects)...she would have extinguished its light, when with flashing eye she trampled it in the dust. She...became, when her spiritual supremacy was in question, so instinct with wrath as to be almost a demon." (29) Quite a contrast with the idealism

(28) Miall, loc. cit., p. 326.

(29) Id., ibid., p. 76.

the deep convictions, the spiritual zeal, and the serenity of Philip II, her so maliciously and unfairly maligned contemporary.

4.

In fact Philip II is la bête noire of Protestantism, which sees in him the incarnation of the nefarious spirit of the Inquisition, the embodiment of Spanish intolerance, the highest expression of darkest obscurantism, a bloodthirsty despot who only left ruin and desolation all around him. All this, however, and much more, are only venomous drippings from the pens of those who have been consumed by jealousy. It is like the stamping of feet of an enraged child who was thwarted in some very cherished desire, for neither had he anything to do with the Inquisition nor was he more intolerant than the princes and monarchs his contemporaries; neither was he an obscurantist, but the most enlightened sovereign of his time; nor as despotic as Henry VIII, Elizabeth, and other princes of that age. The real reason of the hatred against Philip II was impotent jealousy of his power and wealth which is thus described by Lord Macaulay: "The empire of Philip II was undoubtedly one of the most powerful and splendid that ever existed in the world. In Europe he ruled Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands on both sides of the Rhine, Franche Comté, Roussillon, the Milanese, and the two Sicilies. Tuscany, Parma, and the other small states of Italy, were as completely dependent on him as the Nizam and the Rajah of Berar now are on the East India Company. In Asia, the king of Spain was master of the Philippines, and of all those

rich settlements which the Portuguese had made on the coasts of Malabar and Coromandel, in the Peninsula of Malacca, and in the Spice Islands of the Eastern Archipelago. In America, his dominions extended on each side of the equator into the temperate zone. There is reason to believe that his annual revenue amounted, in the season of his greatest power, to four millions sterling; a sum eight times as large as that which England yielded to Elizabeth. He had a standing army of fifty thousand excellent troops, at a time when England had not a single battalion in constant pay. His ordinary naval force consisted of a hundred and forty galleys. He held, what no other prince in modern times has held, the dominion both of the land and of the sea. During the greater part of his reign he was supreme in both elements. His soldiers marched up to the capital of France; his ships menaced the shores of England."

"It is no exaggeration to say, that during several years, his power over Europe was greater than even that of Napoleon... Spain had what Napoleon desired in vain—ships, colonies, and commerce. She long monopolized the trade of America, and of the Indian Ocean. All the gold of the West, and all the spices of the East, were received and distributed by her." (30)

This influence, this power, and splendor, that had been growing steadily in the course of centuries, and which culminated in the magnificence of the reign of Philip II, dazzled all Europe, excited gnawing jealousy, arousing murderous envy in those nations which had frankly espoused materialism as the true way of life.

(30) Macaulay, loc. cit., p. 160.

The Reformation, which gave a kind of divine sanction to this materialism, was also the agent that united all the Protestant nations in a profound hatred to all things Spanish. Thus originated the whole black legend against her religion, against her culture, against her maritime and colonial enterprises, against her motives and intentions, against her character, against her social institutions, and against that great, honest, and cultured monarch, whose power and glory, whose sincerity and force of convictions, whose culture and idealism, made the other monarchs feel so small, so insignificant, so much like barbarians.

What irked them most, both the nations and their sovereigns, was the recognition of the fact that Spain had attained such heights of glory, preponderance and wealth, above all others, through her idealism which they were unable to adopt or even comprehend, and could only acknowledge with reluctance and mental reservations. Lord Macaulay echoes this general feeling when he says: "The ascendancy which Spain then had in Europe, was, in one sense, well deserved. It was an ascendancy which had been gained by unquestioned superiority in all the arts of policy and war... The skill of the Spanish diplomatists was renowned throughout Europe. In England the name of Gondomar is still remembered. The sovereign nation was unrivalled both in regular and irregular warfare. The impetuous chivalry of France, the serried phalanx of Switzerland, were alike found wanting when brought face to face with the Spanish infantry. In the wars of the New World, where something different from ordinary strategy was required in the general, and something different from ordinary discipline in the soldier—where it was every day necessary to meet by some

new expedient the varying tactics of a barbarous enemy, the Spanish adventurers, sprung from the common people, displayed a fertility of resource, and a talent for negotiation and command, to which history scarcely affords a parallel." (31)

That this unquestioned superiority was not one of arms alone, but radiated, so to say, in the higher spheres of the intellect, is acknowledged by the author of the Essays. "In no modern society, not even in England during the reign of Elizabeth," he notes, "has there been so great a number of men eminent at once in literature and in the pursuits of active life, as Spain produced during the sixteenth century. Almost every distinguished writer was also distinguished as a soldier and a politician. Boscan bore arms with high reputation. Garcilaso de la Vega, the author of the sweetest and most graceful pastoral poem of modern times, after a short but splendid military career, fell sword in hand at the head of a storming party. Alonso de Ercilla bore a conspicuous part in that war of Arauco, which he afterwards celebrated in the best heroic poem that Spain has produced. Hurtado de Mendoza, whose poems have been compared to those of Horace, and whose charming little novel is evidently the model of *Gil Blas*, has been handed down to us by history as one of the sternest of those iron procounsuls, who were employed by the House of Austria to crush the lingering public spirit of Italy. Lope sailed in the Armada; Cervantes was wounded at Lepanto." (32)

Of the dread inspired by the Spanish superiority and power,

(31) Macaulay, *loc. cit.*, p. 161.

(32) *Id.*, *ibid.*, p. 162.

he says: "It is curious to consider with how much awe our ancestors in those times regarded a Spaniard. He was, in their apprehension, a kind of demon, horribly malevolent, but withal most sagacious and powerful. 'They be verye wyse and politticke,' says an honest Englishman, in a memorial addressed to Mary, 'and can, thorowe ther wysdome, reform and brydell theyr owne natures for a tyme...; whose mischievous maners a man shall never knowe untill he come under ther subjection; but then shall he perfectlye perceyve and fele them;...for in dissimulations untill they have ther purposes, and afterwards in oppression and tyrannye, when they can obtayne them, they do exceed all other nations upon the earthe.'" "This," comments Lord Macaulay, "is just such language as Amminius would have used about the Romans, or as an Indian statesman of our times would use about the English. It is the language of a man burning with hatred, but cowed by those whom he hates; and painfully sensible of their superiority, not only in power, but in intelligence." (33) (Italics mine)

The last period coming from the pen of an Englishman and a Protestant of the stature of Lord Macaulay is the most lucid and comprehensive characterization that could be desired of the spirit that animates the whole black legend concerning the work of Spain, the character of her people, the deeds of her great heroes and leaders, her social institutions and her culture in general.

The most conspicuous figure during this period of the

(33) Macaulay, loc. cit., p. 163.

Spanish history, owing to his elevated position, was that of Philip II, and in consequence he becomes, for the enemies of Spain, the incarnation of all evil, the embodiment of all powers of darkness. And yet, as we have already had occasion to point out, not only literature, the sciences and all the arts, flourished in his reign, as nowhere else in Europe, but he himself was perhaps the most cultured sovereign of Europe, and certainly the greatest patron of all the pursuits of the intellect, the initiator of scientific and artistic enterprises that had no rival in any part of Christendom; enterprises that were not confined only to Spain, but were freely and impartially disseminated throughout America, the Netherlands, Italy, and wherever his authority could make itself felt.

That he was a relentless foe of Protestantism cannot be denied; and here lies perhaps the greatest grievance of the Protestant nations. But in this he was only carrying out the wishes and aspirations of the Spanish people, who had as much right to choose their own form of religious worship as the followers of Luther or Calvin, of Zwingli or John Leyden, or Knox, or Henry VIII. And in this respect he again differed, but only for the better, from the Protestant princes, who, in the name of liberty and free interpretation of the Bible, compelled their vassals to profess this or that creed that they themselves had adopted for purely mundane reasons, thus having them change their convictions as they might change an old suit for a new one. His only role in the great drama, or tragedy, that was being enacted in Europe, was that of the watchman who stands

between his flock and the pack of wolves who are howling for carnage and spoils. His great sin was, in the eyes of the reformers, his championship of Spanish ideals vs. their materialistic aims. So they heaped calumny upon calumny against him, against the Inquisition, against everything Spanish; and the Spanish people, together with their king, their social institutions and their culture, were painted in the colors of blood, of greed, of perfidy, of colossal tyranny. By the same token the Reformation was displayed as the work of liberation, endowed with the true Christian spirit, the master stroke that broke the chains of prejudice and intolerance, the Magna Charta of the freedom of conscience, the new dispensation that forever would free Christendom from such tyrannies as those committed by the dreaded Inquisition.

Did that dream ever come true in the lands of the Reformation? "In 1529," says P. Smith, "the emperor and Diet at Spires passed a mandate against them (the Anabaptists) to this effect: 'We ordain, decree, oblige, declare, and will, that all Anabaptists, men and women who have come to the age of understanding, shall be executed and deprived of their natural life by fire, sword and the like...' Lutherans united with Catholics in passing this edict, and showed no less alacrity in executing it." That the Catholics of Germany should approve of this measure is understandable on the basis of their beliefs and of the notions then current regarding religious tolerance. For the Lutherans to join forces with the Catholics in such measures of intolerance was most inconsistent with the fundamental principle of the Protestant Reformation.

How Luther himself incited the nobles of Germany to massacre the peasants, who took rather seriously the teachings of the master, has already been told elsewhere. Other reformers showed themselves as inconsistent, intolerant and bloodthirsty. "The helpful eloquence of Thomas Münzer," continues the author of The Age of the Reformation, "was exerted at Mühlhausen to nerve the people to strike down the Godless with pitiless sword. Already in Sept. 1524 he preached: 'On! on! on! This is the time when the wicked are as fearful as hounds... Regard not the cries of the Godless... On, while the fire is hot. Let not your swords be cold from blood'." (35) And he adds: "The propaganda of deed followed close upon propaganda of words. During the spring of 1525 in central Germany 46 cloisters and castles were burned to the ground, while violence and rapine reigned supreme with all the ferocity of class warfare. On Easter Sunday, April 16, one of the host-armed bands of peasants, under one of the most brutal leaders, JHoklein Rohrbach, attacked Weinsberg. The count and his small garrison of eighteen knights surrendered and were massacred by the insurgents, who visited mockery and insult upon the countess and her daughter... But in fact the insurgents were poorly equipped, untrained, without cooperation or leadership... The lords...put down the rising with great cruelty... The soldiers far outdid the rebels in savage reprisals... Oppression stalked with less rebuke than ever through the land." (36) The number of victims of these

(35) Smith, loc. cit., p. 94.

(36) Id., ibid.

religious crusades, for the implantation of freedom of thought and worship, is estimated at 5000 slaughtered by the peasants, and 150,000 massacred by the nobles with the blessing of Luther. (37)

In Switzerland Calvin gives a fair sample of Protestant tolerance in the case of Miguel Serveto. It is a characteristic case of liberty of thought and free interpretation of the Bible. This Spanish savant, who first discovered the circulation of the blood, had an idea respecting the Trinity which did not coincide with that of the disceptic divine of Geneva. Servetus was, therefore, condemned to be burned alive in the middle of frightful refinements of cruelty, and of the scurrilous and cowardly insults of Calvin himself. "This act of persecution," says P. Smith, "one of the most painful in the history of Christianity, was received with an outburst of applause from almost all quarters. Melancthon, who had not been on speaking terms with Calvin for some years, was reconciled to him by what he called 'a signal act of piety.' Other leading Protestants congratulated Calvin, who continued persecution systematically." (38) And further on, "Strengthened by his victory over heresy, Calvin now had the chance to annihilate his opponents. On May 16, 1555, he accused a number of them of treason, and provided proof by ample use of the rack...Calvin ruled from this time on with a rod of iron." (39)

(37) Perkins, C. Man's Advancing Civilization, p. 372. New York, Rand, McNally and Co., 1934.

(38) Smith, loc. cit., p. 178.

(39) Id., *ibid.*, p. 179.

8.

In England, represented by her writers and the admirers of her power as the champion number one of the human liberties, of tolerance and respect for the individual rights, of fairness and give-him-a-chance attitude towards man or beast, the Reformation followed the same trend. It was intolerant not because of deep convictions in an ideal, but in defense of covert materialistic aims. "The truth is," says Lord Macaulay speaking of the policies of Queen Mary, "that the people were not disposed to engage in a struggle, either for the new or for the old doctrines... That queen found that it would be madness to attempt the restoration of the abbey lands... If she was able to establish the Catholic worship, and to prosecute those who would not conform to it, it was evidently for the rights of property." (40) The rights of property in this case meant the undisturbed possession of stolen property. For this the English were ready to fight to the death, but for the religious ideal of the Reformation they did not give a heat. Lord Macaulay estimates that no less than nineteen twentieths of the English population shared this materialistic point of view. It regulated their acts, it moulded their convictions.

The persecutions, cruel lies, injustices, massacres and violences which England committed for several generations in the name of liberty of conscience, are, therefore, devoid of any excuse or justification. They were the expression of a huge

(40) Macaulay, loc. cit., p. 119.

national hypocrisy at the service of unparalleled rapacity, which, when unable to lay hands on the property of others, indulged in its destruction and defilement. Thus Knox, in his fanatic zeal to convert everybody to the liberating principle of free interpretation of the Bible, by compelling them to conform to his own point of view in religious matters, gives us a shining example of reformatist brutality and intransigency. Wherever he went, avers P. Smith, burst forth the flame of iconoclasm. Images were broken and monasteries stormed, not, as he himself wrote, by earnest professors of Christ, but by the rascal multitude. From Perth he wrote: "The places of idolatry (meaning churches, monasteries, etc.) were made equal with the ground; all monuments of idolatry that could be apprehended, consumed with fire; and priest commended, under pain of death, to desist from their blasphemous mass." (41) And Spain is accused of iconoclasticism when her conquistadores destroyed the Mexican temples where their brothers had been sacrificed to the bloody Mexican gods!

The English monarchs, reformers themselves and supreme arbiters of the consciences—and the property—of their subjects, carried fire and sword to the confines of the British Isles in the name of a liberty, which was the twin sister of tyranny, and of a Kaleidoscopic religion in whose tenets nobody believed effectively. All means were justified whenever they tended to enhance their power and pride or to fatten their purses. Says P. Smith: "True to the maxims of the immoral political

(41) Smith, loc. cit., p. 360.

science that has commonly passed for statesmanship, the Tudors consistently sought by every form of deliberate perfidy to foster factions in North Britain, to purchase traitors, to hire stabbers, to subsidize rebels, to breed mischief, and to waste the country, at opportune intervals with armies and fleets... Henry VIII, with characteristic lack of scruple plotted to kidnap the infant queen (Mary) and either to kidnap or to assassinate the Cardinal (Archbishop of St. Andrews). Failing in both, he sent an army north with order to put man, woman, and child, to the sword wherever resistance was made." (42)

When forty thousand men had joined the movement called Pilgrimage of Grace, "a petition was drawn up," writes the author just quoted, "demanding that the church holidays be kept as before, that the church be relieved of the payment of first-fruits and tithes, that the suppressed houses be restored except those which the king 'kept for his pleasure only'... Henry thundered an answer in his most high and mighty style... He at once dispatched an army with orders 'to invade their countries, to burn, spoil and destroy their goods, wives and children'." (43)

The Act of Union which in 1536 incorporated Wales with England was executed with the severest measures, "in the course of which," says this author, "5000 men were sent to the gallows, the western mountaineers were reduced to order." (44) And else-

(42) Smith, loc. cit., p. 381.

(43) Id., *ibid.*, p. 303.

(44) Id., *ibid.*, p. 298.

where: "When Paul III rewarded Fisher by creating him a Cardinal Henry furiously declared that he would send his head to Rome to get the hat. The old man of seventy six was accordingly beheaded. This execution was followed by that of Sir Thomas More, the greatest ornament of his country... But...his courage was shared by humbler martyrs. In the same year...thirteen anabaptists were burned...by the English Government." (45)

In fact burning was not a prerogative of the Inquisition. Long before this tribunal was established the burning of heretics had been practiced in England, and continued throughout the enlightened and liberating influence of the Reformation. Book III of Burnet's Reformation gives the names of 23 men, and indicates others without giving their names, who were burned as the first fruits of the English state church. (46) Miall states that, before Elizabeth's accession to the throne, "the old statutes for burning heretics were revived. Rogers, Hooper, Taylor, were put to death by Gardiner, to try the example of severity in terrifying the rest. On its failure Bonner took up the work in a spirit akin to the bloodthirstiness of a famished tiger. Bradford, Ridley, Latimer, and Crammer, are the world-wide names of some who followed. 'Turn or burn' became the prevailing motto. Tomkins, a weaver, whose hand Bonner held in the flame of a candle till the skin burst, etc... Companies of martyrs consigned to a common and miscellaneous death; women in travail executed, and their just born

(45) Smith, loc. cit., p. 224.

(46) Miall, loc. cit., p. 48.

infants committed to the flames; children pitilessly destroyed; christian men driven in all directions into foreign countries; one martyr forbidden to say farewell to his wife and children; ...another denied fire enough to put an end to the inexpressible torture of his death; horrible severities in prison, where multitudes perished by famine and wretchedness... It is computed that in this reign 400 persons were publicly executed for their religion." (47)

After enumerating the horrible persecutions and executions that took place in the reign of Queen Elizabeth on account of religious dissent, Hall exclaims: "How glorious soever the days of Good Queen Bess! might be so far as the national character was maintained among foreign potentates, much of its domestic administration was intolerable. In the severity of her laws the Queen exceeded every predecessor." (48)

With the multiplication of sects, which is a natural corollary of the free interpretation of the Bible, one of the chief principles of Protestantism, the persecutions multiplied, for each sect struggled for the mastery over all the others. Whichever was in power tried its best to exterminate every rival in the field of free thought, always, of course, in the name of liberty of conscience and freedom of worship. The reigns of Charles II and of Cromwell were perhaps the most ruthless in the extermination of their protestant correlative as well as of Catholics in general.

(47) Hall, loc. cit., p. 50.

(48) Id., *ibid.*, p. 52.

Following the accession of Charles II, "a fierce, exterminating war, was carried on against the Presbyterians," says Miall, "by the very men they had most trusted. The royalists avenged themselves for their wrongs, real and imaginary, by every kind of reprisal... The havoc committed among them (Catholics and Protestants alike), during the recent execution of the penal laws, was frightful. Twenty thousand Presbyterians suffered martyrdom in Scotland, during the reigns of Charles II and James II. The Quakers complained that fifteen hundred of their body were in prison; of whom three hundred and fifty had died since 1660. Eight hundred and forty one were transported to the West Indies, many of whom died in the passage, and some were sold as slaves. Eight thousand dissenters are said to have perished in prison, during the reign of Charles I alone... According to Oldmixon, White (Jeremiah) had collected a list containing sixty thousand, who suffered for their religious opinions, from the Restoration to the Revolution, five thousand of whom died in prison." (49)

Under the gentle rule of Good Queen Bess, the Puritans were among the greatest sufferers. Referring to this sect whose ideals have exerted, and still exert, such a strong influence in certain aspects of our mores, Miall says: "They had bled under Mary for being Protestants at all, and under Elizabeth for being Protestants of any form save one." (50)

What were the aims and aspirations of this strange sect? Avowedly to worship God according to the dictates of their conscience as revealed to them through the free interpretation

(49) Miall, loc. cit., p. 293.

(50) Id., ibid., p. 150.

of the Bible. What they apparently wished was freedom to lead their own lives as they knew best, while leaving the rest to follow their own particular inclinations according to the light they had received from on high. One cannot but sympathize with these truly great ideals of brotherly love and with the fact that the Puritans so clearly recognized man's fallibility in matters so vital to the salvation of the soul. Then the wheel of fortune made a turn, and afforded the Puritans an opportunity to demonstrate in practice the loftiness of the theories they had adhered to in the days of their tribulation. What use did they make of their great opportunity?

It would seem that the triumph of the Puritans, who had suffered so much for freedom of worship at the hands of several tyrants, both Protestant and Catholic, and many of whose brothers had escaped to the wilds of a mysterious New World so that they might enjoy that freedom, would be the signal for a more Christian order of things, and the occasion to prove to the whole world the sincerity of a theory that was the very ideal of Christian meekness, tolerance, and self-effacement. But it was not so. It was, instead, the clarion call for newer and vaster reprisals, bloodier massacres, and more ruthless vandalism in the extensive destruction of ecclesiastical property. "Organs were pulled down; communion plate was melted down; prayer books were torn to pieces; tombs were broken and despoiled; market crosses were pulled down or defaced. The Commons sent Commissioners into the counties to remove from the churches altar, images, crucifixes, and other idolatrous

relies." (51) Thus does Miall describe the first onrush of the Puritanical fury. Above all, however, remarks the same author, "they desired to seize the lands of popish recusants, to execute bloody laws against priests, and to depress and subject to penalties all forms of religion except their own." (52) After observing that the Puritans showed the same lack of logic which afflicted every sectarian who, in the name of liberty of conscience and of free interpretation of the Bible, showed himself as intolerant as the most zealous inquisitor, he adds: "Protestantism destroying Puritanism was to them murder; Protestantism destroying Anabaptism, or Popery, or Arianism, was not murder at all." (53)

Thus, as soon as the Puritans assumed power, they forgot all their complaints, all their thirst for righteousness, all their theories of free thought, all their love for freedom of worship in accordance with one's individual convictions. They proceeded, accordingly, to make a clean slate of the British Isles for the doctrines of Puritanism triumphant, which is a different thing from Puritanism under the heel of tyrants. Ireland, being one of the greatest sinners in the eyes of the victorious, confident, and aggressive Puritans, was among the first to experience their tender mercies. In the words of the author of "Footsteps of our Fathers", "Ireland was subdued (by Oliver Cromwell); the flame of its disaffection quenched in blood." (54)

(51) Miall, loc. cit., p. 151.

(52) Id., ibid.

(53) Id., ibid., p. 33.

(54) Id., ibid., p. 206.

The extremes of intransigency on the part of the Puritans, avowed champions of the liberty of conscience, may be judged from a resolution passed by the parliament that was dissolved in 1634. This resolution, according to Burton's Diary quoted by Miall, was to the effect "That the true reformed Christian religion, as it is contained in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, shall be asserted and maintained as the public professions of these nations." (55) shall be asserted and maintained. By what means? By the same that quenched in blood the flame of Ireland's disaffection. And where is now the liberty of conscience, the freedom of thought and of worship so dear to the followers of Cromwell?

His government was accused by the episcopalians, and might also have been accused on the same grounds by both Catholics and other sects, of gross inconsistency, for the extreme severity with which it restrained, persecuted and punished the non-Puritans, especially after the much heralded profession of liberty of conscience on the part of the Puritans. They rightly asserted that, "although Archbishop Laud was beheaded, yet it could not be proved that the Episcopalians had persecuted so severely as these pretended assertors of liberty of conscience had done, who being in possession of power, did oppress more than those they had driven out." (56) But after all, this was a question of Right to Right, and the Episcopalians, who were now disarmed and helpless, had to suffer the consequences of their past intolerance

(55) Miall, loc. cit., p. 269.

(56) Id., ibid., p. 226.

Therefore, "many laws..." observes Miall, "were put in force against them. Men and women were imprisoned merely because they were found on the road, some of them to visit their friends, or to transact their necessary business. Others were whipped and sent with a pass from tything to tything; one, a female, was stopped about ten miles from her home, and robbed of her horse, which was sold to pay the expenses of her incarceration. As this body held different view of the Sabbath from other Christians, they were often tormented under the pretext that they abused it; and when found travelling to their own houses of worship, were frequently punished by distresses, impoundings, fines, imprisonment, whippings and confinement in the stocks... Scarcely a Quaker was known to escape the violence of this general persecution." (57)

Again the regime changed in Great Britain, but intolerance did not abate an iota. Maddened by the outrages perpetrated by Turner in the name of the king, the Scottish dissenters revolted against Turner. The rebellion raged for a time with varied success on both sides but it was finally crushed by Claverhouse. "Everywhere was disaster and dismay," says Miall. "The carnage was fearful. Four hundred men were killed, almost in cold blood. Twelve hundred were taken prisoners. These were disarmed and stripped, commanded to lie flat on the ground, and forbidden to change their posture." Many of these were killed in the most horrible manner. The rest were imprisoned in the Inner Greyfriars church-yard (Edinburg), lying at night on the ground, and stand-

(57) Miall, loc. cit., p. 267.

ing during the day, for a period of five months... The women suffered all kinds of insult from the soldiers by whom they were continually guarded... Some of these prisoners were liberated, on a promise not to take arms without the king's leave. But two hundred and fifty, who refused to take the bond, were ordered to be transported to Barbados, and sold as slaves." The insurgents who escaped were declared rebels and "Claverhouse," adds this author, "now began a course of proscription and extermination. Marching into Gallway, he tracked all who had been, or might have been, at Bothwell-bridge, seizing their horses, plundering their persons, and committing himself, as well as tolerating in his soldiers, every kind of outrage and debauchery... It is said that Claverhouse,...subsequently to the battle of Bothwell-bridge, killed nearly a hundred persons in cold blood, amidst varied circumstances of licentiousness and atrocity. For such services he was created Viscount Dundee, and made a privy-councillor." (58)

The net result, for England, of this sectarian hatred on the part of every offspring of that devastating conflagration which arose with the dawn of the age of Enlightenment, born of disappointment and spite, and nurtured in licence and greed, could not have but the most disastrous results for the nation as a whole, and so, towards the end of the reign of Charles II, observes Miell, "The nation was hastening to ruin. The court was dissolute to a degree which, in the present day, seems incredible. The

(58) Miell, loc. cit., p. 305 ff.

church deprived of its most faithful ministers, was left a prey to clergymen who...were mostly careless, whilst many were desolute, and some abandoned... The office of jailer alone was profitable... Noblemen suffered death under the suspicion of indefinable treasons. Judges and jurics were alike servile and venal. The monarchy was hastening to its extinction" (59) which was soon effected by the accession of William of Orange.

6.

In fairness to all parties concerned it must be said that religion, as such, had very little to do with the outrages committed against humanity either in the age of Enlightenment or in any other age. Neither Catholicism was to blame for the horrors of the Inquisition, nor Protestantism for the massacres and exploitations that followed in the wake of the Reformation, but both of them, as well as intolerance itself, sprang from the particular ideologies of the peoples upon whom they held sway. In fact the influence of religion on the ideologies of mankind is negligible, while that of their ideologies on religion is paramount. Thus it may be said that Christianity is, or has so far been, alien to the peoples of the Western World, because, though they have professed it for the last fifteen hundred years, they are still the most unchristian of all mankind. No other people on earth has given such flagrant examples of the most shameful disregard for the rights of

(59) Miall, loc.,cit., p. 259.

man. It is not a given set of dogmas and formulas we arbitrarily call Christianity that make us Christians, but that particular behavior towards the whole human species which Christ was pleased to observe, for Christ himself was never a Christian in our image and similitude. He was himself, and only those who imitate him have the right to be called Christians, that is, followers of Christ.

It matters little, or not at all, if one is a Christian, a Jew, an Agnostic, or merely indifferent, as long as he is consciously, vitally, and actively aware of the fact that he is a living member of the human family, as long as he considers his highest good inseparable from the highest good of others, and that the way to participate in the good of others consists in a frank, honest and all-embracing cooperation with them all to the best of his ability. In this recognition and practice lies the essence of all and, in the long run, profitable human relations. All the rest are accidents of birth, external influences not in the power of man to control, and, above all, the multiform limitations of the human intellect.

As compared with peoples living farther North the Spaniard seems to have been more a straightforward, more sincere, more generous, more disciplined, more tender-hearted and considerate towards others; in a word, more genuinely Christian even in his manifestations of intolerance and in spite of those weaknesses which are inherent in the human frailty. These characteristics did not radiate in the fact that ~~he~~ he was a Catholic, but sprang from the very depths of his own nature. His religion did not make him what he was, but it rather took the shape of his innermost thoughts and feelings.

The people who lived farther north, on the other hand, appear to have been more insincere, more distrustful, more egotistical, more impervious to human sympathy, more covetous, more materialistic. Self-appointed champions of fair play they will bow even to a savage, as long as the latter has might on his side; but as soon as the tables are turned the savage is exterminated in cold blood to give way to the superior breed. They are the votaries of rugged-individualism, which is another word for ruthless exploitation of both Nature and man. Are these characteristics the result of their particular brand of religion? Absurd! They are manifestations of their own natural and historical make up, of their own particular outlook on life!

What may have been the cause or causes of these differences which seem to open an impassable abyss between those two sets of peoples? Here is a theory which, I think, explains the phenomenon that confronts us.

The Spaniards developed and lived for countless ages in a region bathed by the sun all the year round, under a mild and pleasant climate, in the midst of a rich and bounteous Nature. Their early and close contact with all the races and peoples of the Mediterranean basin—Phoenicians, Greeks, Carthaginians, Romans, Arabs, and others, that is, the pioneers and disseminators of the germs of all culture and civilization of the West—not only made them share in the benefits of civilization since time immemorial, but obliterated among them every vestige of race prejudice, an isolationist notion that radiates in ignorance and narrow provincialism.

In this connection it is curious to observe how much narrower was the view of the Greeks than that of the Romans, in

regard to alien races. The wider experience and greater contact of the Romans with all the peoples of the then known world soon made them oblivious to racial distinctions. The awareness of such distinctions is greater among the most uncivilized tribes of different parts of the world, or of those who, having emerged only a short time ago from barbarism, have suddenly attained a certain measure of success.

This close contact of hundreds of generations, with all the peoples then known, kept the currents of the human thought and the results of their mutual experiences and inventions flowing freely among them all, softened their barbaric ways, accustomed them to look with greater impartiality at accidental characteristics and at different points of view, made them more tolerant, and developed in them a greater sense of the universal brotherhood of men. Such a communion with other peoples and the great civilizations of the East, together with the favorable conditions of the medium where they developed and lived for countless ages, and the necessary training they received in the wonderful art of give and take, would not but make them more indifferent to purely material comfort or the accumulation of wealth, more sympathetic towards their fellow beings, more refined in all their human sentiments and relations, alien to distinctions of race and color, generous and big-hearted towards all, even the humblest of them. In other words, they became more human than their brothers who had settled in the hyperborean regions of Europe.

But they were also men of the most profound convictions.

Heaven and Hell were for them incontrovertible realities, and of all roads pointing to the great Beyond only one, they thought, led to their true destination. For this reason, in their zeal for the greatest good of others, they, who did not themselves flinch at the severest hardships, were convinced that torture, which lasted only a fleeting moment, and death itself, was not too great a price to pay in exchange for eternal bliss and everlasting happiness.

The Northerners, on the other hand, developed in less favored lands and under a climate full of hardships during much of the year. Only recently did they come out of millenniums of barbarism, and their acquaintance with the Mediterranean civilizations came late and very slowly. Other peoples and cultures were in a large measure unknown to them, and their life, in a constant struggle with adverse conditions of the Nature surrounding them, was like that of stray packs of wolves, merciless even towards those of their own species, intent mainly on how to secure the next meal, spurred mostly by purely materialistic desires.

It is no wonder that at their first opportunity the Northerners should oppress, slay, rob, destroy, not in the service of some lofty ideal but by the sole concern of their so long repressed physical wants.

These two ideologies, born of purely external factors, mark the essential difference between the Spanish and the Anglo-Saxon peoples. The former can scarcely be other than idealistic, while the latter are, above all, materialistic. Religion is, in either case, the reflexion of their inner nature and feelings and not the cause of them.

Not by misinformation and misinterpretation of other peoples' actions can the best interests of humanity be served, but rather by a more thorough knowledge of, and a more sympathetic understanding of their virtues and our own shortcomings, that we shall advance the cause of humanity from which our own depends in its entirety.