

## **A Review of *A History of US* by Joy Hakim, 1999 edition**

**Review written by Elizabeth Yank**

Recommended in several Protestant homeschool catalogs, the 1999 edition of *A History of Us* by Joy Hakim includes 10 books with the eleventh book having an index, famous speeches, and other documents. Because of the level of the language, the primary audience is considered middle grades and above, ages 9-13.

The main differences between the 99 edition and the first edition, 1993, are that the second edition has color pictures and glossy paper. The main text is the same, although some pictures and comment boxes are different.

Since I originally wrote this review, there is now a 2003, 3rd edition. Oddly, the title is changed to *A History of US*. The main text is exactly the same. The last book has been updated by adding several chapters. Some pictures and a few comment boxes have been changed. To add more color, at times the text is highlighted. The introductory page has new text and color pictures added. The major change in this edition is that there is an atlas section at the end of each book. This section is the same in each book. Because of these slight changes, page numbers will not correspond between the second and third edition. There may be additional information at the end of some books, for example, at the end of the second book, a new section was also added on cartography.

This review is of the 2nd edition, 1999. Please keep in mind when reading this review the age of the audience.

### **Why Study History?**

Before we examine the series *A History Of Us*, we need to ask ourselves some questions. What is our primary purpose for studying history? Why do we want to study history? What do we want our children to get out of it?

When I am in the bookstore or library, it is not uncommon to hear someone say, "I don't care what my grandchildren or children read as long as they are reading." Do we want to have this same attitude toward history? Do we want to say, "I don't care what my children are reading as long as they are reading history?"

## What's Your View?

At the same time, we also want to flip the question around. "What does the author want to tell us?" "What is the author's view of history?" "What does the author want us to remember when we are finished reading this book?"

As the lyrics say in *Jesus Christ Superstar*, "What's the buzz, tell me what's a happening?" Yes, historians like to tell us "what's a happening." Yet, every author has a point of view. In the past, history textbooks presented history as an unfolding of significant events. For example, the First World War was triggered by the tragic assassinations of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his wife. In fact, most children's textbooks were fairly innocuous. They focused on Presidents, explorers, and frontiersmen as heroes. They related the objective facts that this battle occurred on this date at this time and these Generals led the battle and this side was victorious.

Today, however, more than ever, a historian will present history from his or her point of view. He (or she) will choose to emphasize particular facts he considers important and omit information he considers unimportant, supporting a specific viewpoint. This in and of itself is not bad until we begin dealing with the author's political agenda, attitudes against the Catholic Church, and a moral philosophy that abortion is okay. Then it becomes problematic. We need to ask ourselves, "Does this book support a Judeo Christian philosophy?" "Does this book support good moral choices?" "After reading this book, what does this author want us to think?" "Specifically, what does this author want us to think about the Catholic Church?"

## Chief Concerns

Although this series is considered popular, there are three serious concerns with it. First, the content of the texts is at times shallow, lacking substance. For example, if we randomly chose a politician, statesman, or person of significance, what we often learn about the character is a trivial fact, not why this person should be studied or what is this person's important contribution to history. Secondly, in trying to be "amusing," her commentary is at times sarcastic, and therefore, not appropriate. Thirdly, my most serious concern, however, is the point of view. There is not a clear and objective presentation of the facts. Important information is omitted, thereby, distorting the facts. By doing this, many passages create a negative impression of the Catholic Church, among many other issues. Although my primary focus is the Catholic Church, there are other serious problems with the text.

Because of the vast amount of information in the ten volumes, I can not review it all in detail. Therefore, I chose topics of particular concern to Catholics. Yes, I am sure there are passages where there are no problems. I will concentrate, however, on the problems. I will examine how these various issues are presented.

## Galileo, Science, and the Church

In reading about Galileo, Giordano Bruno is used as an example of someone who the Church persecuted because of his modern scientific views. This, however, is simply not true. Yes, unfortunately, he was burned alive, but he was by no means a “great scholar.” Furthermore, he was not burned because of his views on the universe. He was a heretic. We read, “The great scholar Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) was burned alive by Italian authorities when he said that the universe was infinite” (2:16). Actually, “Bruno was not condemned for his defense of the Copernican system of astronomy..., but for his theological errors.... Christ was not God, but merely an unusually skillful magician, that the Holy Ghost is the soul of the world, that the devil will be saved.” ... It was a Protestant that said of him that he was “a man of great capacity, with infinite knowledge, but not a trace of religion” (Turner, “Giordano Bruno”).

When discussing Galileo, the Church is accused of being opposed to change and science. We read, “Everyone knew that the planets and stars and sun all revolved around the earth. If that idea was wrong then the Pope and all of Europe’s rulers were wrong” (2:16). One must question: Why is the Pope brought up? Why are peasants not included? Everyone did NOT know that. It was a theory and was yet to be proven. Furthermore, why is Galileo in a history series about the United States? It further states, “Of course, that disturbing idea got Galileo into a lot of trouble. It ended up changing everything people believed. Change is troublesome, especially to those in power” (2:16). In other words, those in power, who are opposed to change, will punish you for your new ideas. In a comment box, it says, “Galileo was disgraced by the Catholic Church and put under house arrest for saying that the earth moves around the sun. Galileo was lucky. The great scholar Giordano Bruno was burned alive...” (2:16).

Does a young child recognize these implications? You don’t want to be a Catholic, because the Church is powerful and will punish you if you have new ideas, if not today, at least back then. Beware, the Church, who is ignorant of scientific matters, is going to get you! Therefore, the logical conclusion is that the child would not want to be ignorant or a Catholic.

Let us put the whole Galileo affair into perspective. The facts about Copernicus are omitted. Copernicus, who was a Polish Catholic monk, who had dedicated his book about heliocentrism to Pope Paul II, had “received a respectful hearing in the Vatican” (Carroll, *Christ the King* 277). Furthermore, Copernicus was not “disgraced” or “put under house arrest.” Copernicus, who preceded Galileo, had no problems with the Church. It was the Protestants; however, who had a problem with this theory. “His theory—the heliocentric theory—was published during the Reformation and was condemned by Luther and his followers as anti-Biblical” (Crocker III 309).

Oddly enough, in a different book we read “Copernicus, a Polish priest and scientist, thought so. He moved the sun to the center of the solar system. And that idea (it wasn’t easy to think so differently from everyone else) is often said to be the beginning of modern science” (1:76). Suddenly, the Church is not against science?

Yes, the Church did, and continues to support science. “The popes supported astronomical research. Pope Gregory XIII (1572-1585), who straightened out the calendar, also built the Vatican’s observatory, Galileo Galilei (1564-1642) himself had Pope Urban VIII as a benefactor, friend, and even poetic champion—at least until the sharp-tongued Galileo made ridicule of the pope part of his elaboration on the Copernican system. There was nothing in Galileo’s science that was at odds with the Church—the issue was his manner, and his manner was an issue because the Church had finally realized that the Reformation would not peter out on its own, but intended to be a full-out assault on the faith. The Church felt on the defensive.... The Church was trying to shore up its reputation where Protestants had attacked it, and one of the major attacks was on whether the Church adhered to the Bible, and the Bible implied—see, for instance, Joshua 10:12-14—that the sun revolved around the earth....Galileo’s ridicule of the pope and his continuing to teach that the earth revolved around the sun lead to his second inquisitional trial, which found him ‘suspected of heresy’ ...[because his astronomical system] ‘appears to contradict scripture.’ He was sentenced to a rather leniently enforced house arrest and was allowed to write and even teach” (Crocker III, 309-311). “As for the Church being opposed to science, it might be worth mentioning that the Jesuits—not to mention the Vatican—still operate their own observatory, and the Catholic Church remains by far the most prominent Christian spokesman regarding the ethical implication of modern science” (Ibid. 311).

Anne Carroll states concerning Galileo that “The Church officials were willing that heliocentrism be taught as a hypothesis (not a fact) and discussed in scientific circles, so long as the faith of the ordinary people was safeguarded” (*Christ the King* 278). Galileo, however, did the complete opposite, culminating in his arrest. Furthermore, “At no time did any official Church teaching condemn heliocentrism as heretical. The Pope did not, nor did any bishop, nor did the Inquisition itself” (Ibid. 279).

### **Maryland Catholics and the Thirteen Colonies**

The description of the Thirteen Colonies is riddled with problems. Of crucial importance is the fact that religious intolerance of Catholics is omitted, especially since it appears that Catholics were welcome where they were not. In Bk. 2, p. 150, it states that Catholics came to Georgia, and in Bk. 2, p. 69, it says that “Roger Williams welcomed everyone who wished to come to Rhode Island, including Quakers and Catholics.” Yet, “The [Georgia] charter granted liberty of conscience to all except Catholics” (Carroll, *Christ and the Americas* 89). If you look up Rhode Island in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917, in 1680, there was not a single Catholic in Rhode Island, while other sects existed (West). Maggie Bunson also reiterates this fact: “In 1739, there were 33 churches in the Colony, but there were no Catholics” (Bunson, *Founding of Faith* 101). As F. Michael Perko, S.J. states “Catholic activity in the other colonies was virtually nonexistent.... Catholics were always seen as beyond the limits of such [religious] toleration” (69).

In fact, why did the first Lord Baltimore seek permission to begin his own Colony? Because he was not welcome anywhere else, because of his Catholic faith. After George Calvert's (the first Lord Baltimore) first unsuccessful attempt to settle a colony in Newfoundland, he hoped to settle in Virginia. "In 1629, he turned to Virginia, of whose founding company he was a member, in the hope of better fortune. But on his visit to Virginia he was quickly disabused of the notion after being informed that Catholics were not welcome. It was then that he decided to ask Charles I, the son and successor of his old patron, to grant a charter for a colony north of Virginia" (Ellis 22).

The description of Roger Williams' defense of religious liberty is not true. He may have said he believed in "freedom of conscience." But that is not what he practiced. He believed in freedom of conscience for everyone except Catholics. Williams was granted a charter in 1644 and a second charter from King Charles II of England in 1663. "This charter offered a model for toleration and self-government, although Catholics were not guaranteed any right to worship freely" (Bunson, *Founding of Faith* 105). As Maggie Bunson further states, "The laws of Rhode Island, penalizing Catholics to the extent that none could vote or hold office, were not repealed until 1783, making this haven of religious freedom one of the last States to allow Catholics the right to worship according to their own consciences" (Ibid. 105).

The full picture is not presented. Maryland was founded in 1634 and Rhode Island was founded two years later. Therefore, Maryland was the first to establish freedom of worship, both informally and formally, NOT Roger Williams. As the text does admit, Lord Baltimore, Cecil Calvert, had written his brother Leonard, who was to be governor, to be "very careful to preserve unity and peace...and treat the Protestants with as much mildness and favor as justice will permit" (2:115). This was considered radical—to have both Protestants and Catholics settle a colony together. Therefore, Maryland, not Rhode Island was the first colony to practice freedom of religion, eventually being the first to formally pass an Act, which allowed freedom of worship. In fact, "the first statutory reference to toleration occurs in an ungrammatical 1639 declaration of the Maryland Assembly: 'Holy Churches [sic] within this Province shall have all her rights and liberties'" (Henesey, S.J. 41).

As far as Maryland's Toleration Act, 1649, also called "An Act Concerning Religion, April 21, 1649," the Act can be viewed in its entirety on the internet (Papenfuse). This Act is misconstrued, and the events preceding it are omitted. At the time the Act was passed, the "freemen" of Maryland's Assembly passed the Act, not the Calverts. This included any adult male not bound by indenture or slavery. In fact, during those first years, a black man, Mathias de Sousa, not only voted, but also served as a member of the General Assembly. Because of its increasing, burdensome size, the last known general assembly of "freemen" was in 1648. With the next assembly, the representatives were elected. But, nonetheless, they were considered "freemen," not the Parliament or the crown.

Because of their concern about protecting the rights of the Catholic citizens of the Colony, the Calverts were, however, instrumental in drafting and introducing the legislation. Also, at the time of the Act, Governor William Stone was a Protestant and there were many Protestant assemblymen.

By ignoring important, groundbreaking language and focusing on the penalties of the law against blaspheming and other similar crimes, the Toleration Act is misconstrued. The comment about the law persecuting “even some Christians who asked too many questions” (2:116) is quite unnecessary and inflammatory. Through the use of language, the impression is created that the law was enacted to persecute non-Christians, not to protect the rights of people to worship freely.

As Dr. Papenfuse, historical archivist of the state of Maryland says, “This section had nothing to do with the main purpose of the act, and it is reasonably certain that Baltimore did not write it. It may even have been camouflage to obscure the latter section which granted toleration. However, to assume as some have done, that the first section was a repudiation of the spirit of tolerance constitutes an unwarranted removal of the act from its historical setting. Severe laws against blasphemy and similar crimes had been on the statute books of England and other European countries for generations” (Papenfuse).

Furthermore, he goes on to state that because of the fines against anyone who should “in a reproachful manner or way apply certain terms to other persons to disparage their religion” the act went “beyond mere tolerance and looked toward fellowship, understanding and complete freedom of conscience” (Ibid.). Papenfuse also believes that Jews were included in this toleration. “But in fact Jews were potentially included by the provision of the act and the record is bare of any successful prosecution of Jews. On the contrary, a Mathias de Sousa, a Moor who may have been a Portuguese Jew was serving in the Assembly in 1641” (Papenfuse). The significant language reads, “Be it therefore enacted that no person or persons whatsoever within this province...professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall henceforth be in any waies troubled, molested or discountenanced for or in respect of his or her religion or in the free exercise thereof within this province nor in anything compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent” (Knott, “Maryland”).

Because of the constant threat of religious persecution, Catholics held a tenuous position in the Colony. The reader is not informed that Protestants repeatedly raided Maryland, seeking to completely annihilate it. In 1644, Protestants from the Virginia colony “captured and burned St. Mary’s, destroyed valuable records, plundered and destroyed the residences of many of the inhabitants, especially the houses and chapels of the missionaries, and took Father White a prisoner in chains to London, where he [the Protestant invader] had him indicted as a returned Jesuit, an offence for which death was the punishment. Father White pleaded, however, that his return was not voluntary, and escaped” (Knott, “Maryland”). In 1647, Governor Leonard Calvert then returned with a small force and drove them out. In 1649, the Toleration Act was passed.

In 1650, Protestants started a rebellion and seized the government. They convened a General Assembly to which Catholics were declared to be ineligible, repealed the Act of Toleration, and passed ““That none who profess and exercise the Papistic, commonly known as the Roman Catholic religion, can be protected in this province”” (Ibid.). During this time chapels and mission houses were broken into and property destroyed. The Jesuits fled for their lives. In fact, “Ten Catholics were condemned to death, and four were executed” (Nevins, M.M. 101).

In 1658, the government was restored to Lord Baltimore. In 1676, Protestants assembled in arms against the government. But the movement was suppressed and the two ringleaders hung. In 1689, after the Protestant revolution in England (1688), and with William and Mary on the throne, Lord Baltimore was deprived of all authority. “Catholics were excluded from civil rights; priests were threatened with imprisonment. In 1692, the Act of Religion was passed...: the Mass was illegal, the making of converts was punishable by death, a parent who educated his children in the Catholic religion would be heavily fined, a Catholic child who apostatized to Protestantism could take possession of everything his parents owned” (Carroll, *Christ and the Americas* 89).

In fact, Catholics continued to be subject to penalties, disabilities, taxes, and unjust laws until the American Revolution. “In 1715, a law was adopted providing that if a Protestant would die leaving a widow and children, and such widow should marry a Catholic, or be herself of the opinion, it should be the duty of the governor and council to remove such child or children out of the custody of such parents and place them where they might be securely educated in the Protestant religion....There was no appeal” (Knott, “Maryland”).

It must be remembered that many history books like to emphasize that the Puritans came here to enjoy religious freedom, yet fail to mention that they were not themselves religiously tolerant, particularly to Catholics, or Quakers, for that matter. Although this text does admit this point, the reader has no idea how grossly intolerant the Puritans were to the point of destroying Church property, kidnapping priests in the hope of executing them, and enacting unjust laws against Catholics. As John Tracy Ellis states “A universal anti-Catholic bias was brought to Jamestown in 1607 and vigilantly cultivated in all thirteen colonies from Massachusetts to Georgia” (19). For example, “A Massachusetts statute of 1647 threatened priests with death” (Hennesey, S.J. 37).

The life of Enemond Masse is another example of Puritan intolerance to Catholic priests. “A Jesuit missionary taken prisoner by the English in Maine, he was born in Lyons, France, in 1574. Father Masse arrived in the American colonies with Jesuit Pierre Biard, and established a Native American mission at Bar Harbor, Maine. The English sent a military unit to destroy the chapel and arrested Father Masse, putting him in an open boat on the Atlantic Ocean to die of exposure or in a storm. He was saved by a French ship sailing in the region, and was taken to France, then returned to Canada in 1625. There he labored until his death on May 12, 1646, at Sillery” (Bunson, *Faith in the Wilderness* 232).

Fr. Biard was similarly treated by the Puritans. “Father Biard went to Saint-Sauveur, in Maine, where he began his labors. Within months, however English troops arrived at the mission and took the Jesuits prisoner. They were marched to the English at Jamestown and then forced to accompany a second English expedition to complete the destruction of Saint-Sauveur. It was hoped that the presence of the Jesuits in this final raid would turn the local Indian tribes against them and all of the French—a tactic that did not succeed. Father Biard was placed on board a ship bound for England and was then returned to France. Knowing that he could not hope to continue his missionary efforts in America he returned to his academic career” (Bunson, *Faith in the Wilderness* 214). Look up on a map where Jamestown is and where Maine is. For them to march that incredible distance through the wilderness simply to destroy a Catholic mission is a testimony of the Puritan hatred of Catholics.

Furthermore, little is said of the Jesuit missionaries who converted many native Indians, including the Indian chief of the Piscataway and his family, and the first Protestant colonists who sailed with the Maryland colonists and settled in the area. These people freely chose to become Catholics. “The missionaries obviously had some success in gaining converts, since their annual reports continually mentioned this point” (Dolan 82).

Naturally, because this is a secular series, we do not expect to read about the incredible hardships that the priests had to endure. “The Church had a hard beginning. Of fourteen Jesuits who came out in the first twelve years, four were back in England within twelve months of arrival. Four more died of yellow fever. Their superior, Ferdinand Poulton, was mysteriously shot dead while crossing the St. Mary’s River. Three young priests died exiled in Virginia. White and Thomas Copley, the last two priests in Maryland, were taken to England in chains in 1645 and there charged with violating the penal law prohibiting priests ordained abroad from entering the country. They were banished to Flanders” (Hennesey, S.J. 41). Dolan reiterates this fact. “Though many Jesuits did sail to Maryland, ‘they seemed to be coming only to die’; of the twenty-one Jesuits who came to Maryland between 1634 and 1672, seventeen died on the mission at relatively young ages.... Things got so bad in the 1660’s that the Jesuits even considered abandoning the mission, but they stayed on” (81).

“The situation of Jesuit ‘Gentlemen of Maryland’ has sometimes been idealized. The mission was in fact neither easy nor attractive. Pastoral demands were routine, but strenuous and insistent. Those who lived on Jesuit manors doubled as farmers, husbandmen, and veterinarians. They managed grain mills, sawmills, and tobacco sheds. Others depended for support on a Catholic magnate, not always a happy situation.... Joseph Mosley...saw his nearest priest-neighbor perhaps once a year.... Priests rode circuit by boat and on horseback to outlying stations in parishioners’ homes. It could mean from three to four hundred miles of hard riding a week. Provisions were scarce: ‘I’ve asked, when I’ve been fainting,’ Mosley wrote, ‘for a mouthful of bread and a glass of milk and could not get it.’ Even when food could be had, the itinerant priests were held to rigid rules of fasting before celebrating the Eucharist. At each stop they heard confessions, said mass, and preached. For the children there was catechetical instruction.

They made a special point of visiting the sick and administering the church's last rites.... [Mosley writes in a letter] 'Must I refuse when the sick want me? Must I neglect my Sunday church exercise to ease myself by staying at home? Must I, when at the chapel, refuse to hear half that present themselves? Must I, if call'd to the sick in the night, sleep till morning, and thus let the sick die without assistance? Must I, if call'd to a dying man in the rain, stay till it's fair weather?'" (Hennesey, S.J. 44-45).

Mosley was responsible for eight "congregations" on his missionary circuit, visiting six of them every two months. The other two were more remote and visited twice a year. Mosley also writes about "riding all day 'in excessive heats, the use of bad water, salt meats, bad accommodations, violent colds, poor open lodging, often out whole nights in the woods'" (Dolan 89). After working here for twenty-nine years, he died in 1787, at the age of fifty-six (Ibid. 89).

In 1773 devastating news came to the Jesuits, Pope Clement XIV suppressed the order. This was a particularly low point for them as well as the community they served, although they continued on their priestly ministry. As Dolan says, "By the stroke of a pen, a central part of their identity and a major reason for their living had been destroyed. Joseph Mosley expressed his sense of loss as well as anyone: 'To my great sorrow, the Society is abolished; with it must die all the zeal that was founded and raised on it. Labour for our neighbor is a Jesuit's pleasure; destroy the Jesuit, and labour is painful and disagreeable.... with joy I impaired my health and broke my constitution in the care of my flock. It was the Jesuit's call, it was his whole aim and business. The Jesuit is no more; ...in me, the Jesuit and the Missioner was always combined together; if one falls, the other must of consequence fall with it'" (95).

One aspect of the Maryland community that is often overlooked is vocations. "During the seventeenth century, only three or four Marylanders entered the Society of Jesus; one of these, Robert Brooke, became the first native of the English colonies to become a Roman Catholic priest. In the eighteenth century the situation changed dramatically. Thirty-six native Marylanders entered the Jesuit order prior to its suppression in 1773, and four other young men entered seminaries affiliated with other religious orders. Young women also began to enter religious life in impressive numbers. Mary Digges, the first native female from Maryland to enter religious life, joined the Sepulchrine Convent in Liege in 1724. Afterward an increasing number of young Maryland women entered convents in Europe; prior to the revolution, a total of at least thirty-six women entered such orders as the Benedictines, the Poor Clares, the Carmelites, the Dominicans, and the Augustinians" (Dolan 86).

Albert Nevins reminds us that "It is of interest that the first experiment of religious freedom in America should have been attempted by Catholics. Sanford H. Cobb, an American Historian, has written, 'In face of the remarkable fact that, during the half century in which the Romanists governed Maryland, they were not guilty of a single act of religious oppression, the legislation against them was unwarranted and base'"(101). As another historian stated, all Cecil and Leonard had to do was renounce

their Catholic faith, and the Puritans would have stop persecuting them. Yet, they chose not to.

It then states in Bk. 2 “But in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century most Americans were happy to be part of the mighty British empire.... On the frontier no one cared if you were Puritan or Baptist” (151). Compare this with *The Catholic Encyclopedia for Home and School*, 1965. See “United States, History of the,” Subarticle: “Catholic Participation in the American Revolution” (Metzger, S.J. 11: 186). “In 1776 the total number of Catholics in the American Colonies was less than 1 percent of the population.... The vast majority of these Catholics were concentrated in Maryland and Pennsylvania where they escaped, to some extent, the intolerance present in the other Colonies.... All of the Colonies except Pennsylvania had laws restricting the religious, civil and property rights of Catholics.... This anti-Catholic sentiment had reached a high pitch during the French and Indian War (1754-1763), when the Catholic minority was accused of every conceivable treachery by the Protestant clergy, government officials, and businessmen.” The text fails to acknowledge that Canadian Catholics had nothing to gain by supporting the Colonies during the American Revolution, because they had recently attained religious liberty, the Quebec Act, 1774, which they would not enjoy by helping the Colonies.

To summarize, I do not expect these many details in a secular history textbook. But I do think Catholics should get credit for the Toleration Act and the first to practice religious tolerance, and not be accused of being narrow-minded bigots who practice cruelties against non-Christians. For example, how many Atheists were there in Maryland in 1649? As James Hennesey, S.J. says, “If religious harassment was not violent, it was constant” [against Catholics, not Atheists]. “Only in the early years when Catholics controlled the government, was there universal religious toleration. Robert Baird, never loath to criticize the Roman Catholic Church, later admitted that: ‘Think what we may of their creed, and very different as was this policy from what Romanism elsewhere might have led us to expect, we can not refuse to Lord Baltimore’s colony the praise of having established the first government in modern times in which entire toleration was granted to all denominations of Christians’” (Hennesey, S.J. 40-1).

### **Spanish Colonization and the Santa Fe Mission**

By highlighting in a slanted manner a negative event involving the Church in Santa Fe and ignoring the Church’s positive contributions, the Church is not fairly portrayed. Yes, this incident did occur. I do not want to underrate that some missionaries in their zeal to get rid of anything they considered pagan and evil were sometimes cruel, or that many Spanish officials were sometimes harsh and oppressive. However, by focusing on the Pueblo revolt in 1680 in a very dramatic and distorted manner, a full or balanced picture of the Catholic Church is not presented. Without whitewashing the rebellion, Marc Simmons’ *New Mexico, A Bicentennial History*, a secular text, fleshes out the missing details and corrects the errors (Marc Simmons’ text is based on meticulous research with detailed footnotes).

At issue here are several problems with the text. Since the Spanish colonized the southwest and Santa Fe in particular and they brought with them Catholic missionaries, I will first address the comments made about the Spanish and then the Santa Fe Mission.

In a separate chapter than the story about Santa Fe, the text does admit that the Spanish did have a positive influence in the New World (1:117). This, however, is minimized by the constant complaining about the Spanish bringing “disease and death.” They brought more than disease and death. What about the hospitals, care for orphans, poor and sick, schools and other acts of charity by the Church? It also states, “The life of many Incas born after the Spanish invaded...was much poorer and harder” (1:117). If the Incas in South America are going to be mentioned then the Jesuit Reductions in Paraguay and other South American missions in Brazil, New Granada (Columbia), Chile, Peru and Quito (Ecuador) should likewise be pointed out (Huonder). Yes, in some ways life for the Incas and other Native Americans definitely was more difficult, but in other ways it was not. The text does not offer any positive, concrete influences of the Spanish that affected the Indian’s daily life. There is no credit given to the Catholic Church or the Catholic Faith for improving their lives. What motivated the Spanish to get rid of human sacrifice? It was not Christian. The Spanish influence was more than architecture and the printing press.

In Santa Fe, for example, the Spanish improved the Indians’ lives by introducing cattle, sheep, fruit trees, new grains, and better tools. “New crops, and manufactured articles introduced by the Spaniards contributed to the Pueblo economy and eased domestic life” (Simmons 76). Furthermore, “the padres were versatile men who could give instruction in catechism, music, Latin, painting, blacksmithing, carpentry, weaving, and a dozen other subjects” (Ibid. 58).

The text says “They [Europeans] came as conquerors and colonists” (1:116). By lumping all Europeans together, a distorted picture is already created. From the French and Spanish point of view, the exploration of America had a different purpose than the English. From the Spanish crown’s point of view, they came to spread the Faith to the Indians. A patent granted Lucas Vasquez de Ayllon in 1532 for exploration along the Florida coasts reads: “Whereas our principal intent in the discovery of new lands is that the inhabitants and the natives thereof, who are without the light of knowledge of faith, may be brought to understand the truth of our holy Catholic Faith, that they may come to a knowledge thereof, and become Christians and be saved, this is the chief motive that you are to bear and hold in this affair, and to this end it is proper that religious person should accompany you...” (Bunson, *Faith in the Wilderness* 24).

The Puritans had a different point of view. “These Puritans [Puritans from the New England colonies] held to two distinct and yet connected views of Catholics and Native Americans, and as a result both groups were condemned and eradicated whenever possible....

Believing that the Divine plan for the New World could not be completed as long as Indians resided in their midst, the Puritans prayed that such foes would be eliminated. In order to accomplish this act of faith, the Puritans established their own reign of terror on the local Pequot tribe along the Connecticut frontier. In 1637, a force of two hundred fifty colonial militia, aided by almost one thousand warriors from the Narragansett and Mohegan territories, attacked the camp of Chief Sassacus on the Mystic River. More than six hundred Pequot died in the raid, with women and children trapped and burned to death.

Dr. Cotton Mather, the Puritan leader is reported to have expressed his personal satisfaction over the affair, rejoicing that ‘no less than six hundred Pequot souls were brought down to hell’ as a result” (Bunson, *Faith in the Wilderness* 31).

The text also claims that “Europeans came to America to expand their world and to enrich themselves” (1:116). When speaking of the Spanish, there needs to be a distinction between the conquistadors and civil authorities, who were more interested in the search for gold and wealth, and the religious missionaries, and the crown. For individuals and some conquistadors, searching for gold was most likely a motivational factor. There is no doubt that Pizarro was greedy. In the end, however, few enriched themselves. For example, almost the whole crew of Narvaez’s ship died. Certainly, the missionaries were not interested in searching for gold, but the spiritual welfare of the Indians’ souls. For the crown, who offered money and support for the Colonization of the New World and missionary activity, they did not always make money. What money did they receive from Columbus’ voyages? Also, “The seventy years in New Mexico history following the founding of Santa Fe in 1610 has properly been called ‘the Great Missionary Era.’ Some 250 friars of the Franciscan Order worked among the Pueblos during these decades, and the crown spent upward of a million pesos on salaries, supplies, and the building of massive churches. The expenditure of so vast a sum on what was purely a humanitarian undertaking underscored the king’s commitment to the spread of the True Faith. The friars, it is accurate to say, played the primary role in bringing Hispanic civilization to the upper Rio Grande, but their work returned not a single peso to the royal treasury” (Simmons 57). This alone refutes the statement that the Crown was only interested in gold.

It is important to note that the Spanish government did not approve of violence. For example, “His Spanish Majesty had issued a set of Royal Ordinances in 1573, outlawing the use of violence in dealing with the Indians, except in a few specified cases, such as when they offered submission and then later rebelled. The measure set strict standards of conduct for soldiers, colonists, and friars, and bade them use gentleness and persuasion with the native people.... It meant that the king firmly intended to protect his Indian subjects” (Simmons 30). This does not mean that these rules were followed; however, it does mean that the king did not approve of such methods as forced conversions and recognized them as bad. In fact, one could argue that the government of Spain never approved of such means.

The text does admit that “In 1542 King Charles I...ruled that Indians could not be made slaves” (1:133). But of course it is no where near a nasty picture of a “forced conversion” (1:139) or the story about the Pueblo uprising in Santa Fe. In fact, already with King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella, they did not approve of slavery. “History shows that King Ferdinand and, especially, Queen Isabella did not approve of slavery in the New World. Isabella had ordered Columbus (on pain of death) to take back the natives he brought to Spain from his first voyage—natives Columbus intended to have used as servants” (Leek 27).

Also, for the Spanish, officials and military men who did not treat the Indians justly had to appear in a court of law. This does not mean that this was always enforced, but at least it was recognized. There are records to indicate that at least some were brought to trial. “The notorious Governor Bernardo Loez de Mendizabal, who was indicted in 1661.... The high court of Mexico City found the former governor guilty on the general charge of illegal use of native labor and, among other penalties, fined him three thousand silver pesos” (Simmons 56).

Not only the Spanish crown, but the Pope as well was concerned about the fair treatment of indigenous people. In 1537, Pope Paul III issued a bull concerning the treatment of natives. It states “The said Indians and all other people who may later be discovered by Christians are by no means to be deprived of their liberty or the possession of their property, even though they may be outside of the faith of Jesus Christ” (Bunson, *Faith in the Wilderness* 25).

Without a doubt, the Spanish conquistadors did not always use common sense when conquering new land and people. But let us also remember that not all Indians were peaceful, docile, and gentle. Some practiced barbaric practices on one another and butchered many missionaries. In the Southwest, “the ferocious Chichimecs of the north...skinned Spaniards alive and left their bodies hanging along roadways” (Simmons 35). For an example of Indian cruelty, read the life of Isaac Jogues. Furthermore, some Indians practiced human sacrifice and others were cannibals. Others performed terrible atrocities on one another and also kept slaves. I am not condoning the violence of the Spanish, because it is not by the sword that people are converted to the Faith.

There also needs to be a distinction between the missionaries who were overzealous in their methods of conversion and the majority of missionaries who were respected and loved for their kindness and goodness. Even if some missionaries used inhumane methods in converting the Indians, how many more did not? Also, the reader needs to ask questions when reading about instances of the missionaries being cruel. What was the background? Why did they do that? In the story of Santa Fe, the missionaries had asked the Pueblo priests to stop practicing their pagan religion. When they did not, the missionaries took action. Was that action correct? Most likely not. But there was a reason behind it. During this time, heretics were not looked on favorably—to put it mildly. It was not an attack on the Indians, so much as a desire to get rid of pagan practices.

There needs to be a balance of information in the text. Where are the examples in this text of the massive numbers of conversions of the indigenous people of the world to the faith without the use of force? Who were the most successful in converting the indigenous people? To read all the biographies of the early missionaries listed in *Faith in the Wilderness* is truly inspiring. Yes, there were forced conversions, but how many more were not? We never see pictures or one word about the thousands of people who converted to the Catholic faith, freely and joyfully. Fr. Serra receives only one line with an attached negative comment about missionaries bringing disease, and Fr. Kino gets only one line embedded between the Indian's not really converting and the Spanish bringing disease. Could it be possible that other Indian tribes did practice their faith? What about all the other missionary activity? Fr. Damien is nonexistent in this series. No one wanted to help the lepers, and Robert Louis Stevenson, who was not a Catholic, even defended him. It should be noted that these three missionaries are often found in secular texts and given credit for their contributions to society. Since it is a secular text, however, we don't read about the great number of missionaries who sacrificed their lives to martyrdom in order to spread the Faith.

Therefore, my point is that although terrible atrocities occurred in the name of converting people to the Catholic faith, at no time was this ever approved by the Spanish crown, who sent out these missionaries, or by the official Church. Also, the issue of forced conversions is separate from the injustices forced on the natives because of the greed of an explorer, local entrepreneur, or magistrate. Missionaries often fought for the fair treatment of the Indians.

When discussing the Pueblo uprising in Santa Fe, there are several concerns. By devoting two whole negative chapters to Santa Fe (1:28; 2:23), the missionary activity of the Church is distorted. Yes, there were serious problems in Santa Fe. However, I find it rather peculiar that there is no other Spanish or French mission to offer as a counterbalance to this event. This fact, more or less, creates the impression that this mission reflects all missions, that all missionaries are bad, that all conversions are not real, and that this particular mission was always bad. Especially distressing is the way the massacred victims—most defenseless—and their tragic deaths were depersonalized.

Another mantra about the Pueblos in Santa Fe is that the Indians did not truly convert. “But many of these new Christians continue their traditional religious practices along with the Catholic rituals” (1:132). “The Pueblo people pretend to do as the Spaniards wish, but, secretly, they keep to the old ways” (2:89). “The pueblo people are made to worship the Spanish god” (2:88). Yes, many did continue to practice their traditional religious practices, but that does not mean that they thought they had not truly converted. Through her use of language, she gives the impression that all Indians resented converting to the faith and only pretended to do so. Some definitely resented converting to the Faith, but not all. Most simply did not consider it incompatible to practice both at the same time. In the Pueblo mind, they saw no contradiction in doing both.

Also, in Santa Fe under different leadership and during another time, the Church reported no problems. When the Franciscan Father Benavides wrote his positive, glowing report of the mission, it was 50 years prior to the uprising. We know in our present day history how different life is today as compared to 50 years ago, even from one President to the next. There is not a whole chapter on this positive period of history, elaborating on it. She basically denies it. "By 1630 Fray Alonso de Benavides reported fifty thousand Indian baptisms in New Mexico" (Hennesey, S.J. 17). Benavides also said that there were "thirty-three convents and churches in the principal pueblos and more than one hundred and fifty churches throughout the other pueblos" (Dolan 26).

While the text mentions that Pope [the leader of the insurrection] is fighting against religious oppression, it omits that ultimately this was a battle instigated by native religious priests, who wanted to retain their power as much as their customs and religious practices. By getting rid of the Catholic priests, as well as the Spanish government, the Pueblo priests could consolidate their power.

Also, Pope led his rebellion in 1680, yet when the Spanish returned in 1692, there were 18,000 Christian Indians. Even if many had apostatized, that still is an incredible number. Furthermore, when they did return, the missionaries should receive credit for allowing at that time the Pueblos to continue their native religious practices without persecution.

An interesting note that I was able to uncover in a secular book concerned the Blessed Mother. "When the Spanish colonists fled from Santa Fe in 1680, they carried a small wooden statue of the Virgin Mary. During their exile, the refugees prayed to the Virgin for help. When de Vargas reconquered Santa Fe in 1692, the Spaniards believed she had answered their prayers. Forever afterward, they treated the statue with special reverence. It was called Our Lady of the Rosary, the Conqueror. The original statue still stands in a chapel of Santa Fe's St. Francis Cathedral. Today, 'the Conqueror' has been renamed 'the Unifier.' The little figure of the Virgin Mary is hailed a bringer of peace" (Kent 24). A beautiful color picture accompanies this side comment.

Now, the real story about the Santa Fe mission is that a medicine man named Pope (pronounced Popay. The "e" has a marking over it.) led a rebellion against the Spanish government and Franciscan priests. The priests embittered the medicine men or religious leaders of the Pueblo Indians by destroying their religious objects, places of worship, and persecuting, and even killing, their leaders. In retaliation, they led a revolt in 1680. Yes, some of the governors, in their greed, were often harsh and cruel. Yes, the missionaries, in their zealotry, sought to get rid of anything or anyone they considered evil. "The difficulty lay in their refusal to throw out the old gods and their persistence in dancing, singing, handling venomous snakes, wearing masks, and sprinkling sacred cornmeal. To the Spaniard, all that smacked of idolatry and devil worship.... There was no way the Spanish mind could accept the coexistence of Christianity and 'pagan practices' among the Pueblo disciples. As they saw it, every mote of paganism must be banished" (Simmons 59). At the same time, the missionaries often disputed with the governor over his harsh treatment of the Indians, creating confusion in the Indian's eyes

over authority. For the Pueblos, the ultimate breaking point culminated with the religious practices. They considered them as part of their cultural heritage and did not understand why they could not incorporate both together. The missionaries thought otherwise.

By picking and choosing facts, omitting information, and distorting other information, the Santa Fe mission and the Pueblo uprising become oversimplified. Now, what is missing is that not all Indians joined Pope. Some Pueblo Indians did not join them, the Piros in the far south. Some Pueblo Indians were actually against the plan. In fact, Pope...”killed his own son-in-law, the *gobernadorcillo* [petty governor] of San Juan, who opposed the revolt. ...[Another leader] threatened to behead anyone who did not join” (Simmons 69). And some Pueblo Indians, who believed in their Christian faith, were killed by the insurrectionists.

The scene where “Great numbers of Native Americans march to Santa Fe to release the medicine men” (2:89) is NOT true. Yes, the medicine men were taken captive and some were hung. Pope is one of them in jail. What actually happened is that a group of armed Tewa warriors from north of the city invaded the governor’s apartment, demanding the release of the prisoners (Simmons 66). The governor’s soldiers were gone fighting Apaches. Surprised and abandoned, he released the prisoners. Furthermore, Hakim’s claim that the Indian’s threatened to leave is NOT true, and simply done for dramatic effect. “The Indians in Santa Fe say they will leave the valley forever if the men are not released. If the Indians leave, the Spaniards will have no one to work for them and they will starve” (2:90). Doesn’t sound like an armed band of Indian’s threatening the governor. Also, Pope at this time, nor ever, was “the most beloved of them” (2:89).

Pope’s greatness lies in the fact that he was able to unite a divided nation. “Tight-knit Pueblo communities functioned under a strict rule of conformity, with every person bound to a common code of behavior. No room existed for a strong-willed individual who deviated from the norm or who worked to outshine others. In such an atmosphere, no one desired to lead—it was bad form and brought public censure—so no one led. Decision making fell to the hierarchy of native priests, which formed general consensus on every issue” (Simmons 61). Besides internal feuds and social divisions, a language barrier existed between the different Pueblo communities. Even though he accomplished this formidable task, how Pope united the Pueblo Indians is questionable. If someone threatened you with death, would you join forces?

Furthermore, the reader is not told how Pope treated his own Indians. For example, it claims that Pope “was wise and good” (2: 90). Contrast that with “The Spanish had introduced many good things into New Mexico; sheep, cattle, wheat and other grains, fruit trees, tools and utensils of many different types. Although all these things had substantially raised the Indians’ standard of living, Pope directed that these improvements had to go. There is no question but that the great majority of the Indians were reluctant to give up the tools and agricultural products that had made their lives better, but they had no choice under Pope’s increasingly rigid rule. One Spanish institution, however, was enthusiastically adopted by Pope, and that was the system of

requiring the Indians to pay taxes in the form of food, blankets, and other supplies” (Burke 141-2).

Deborah Kent describes Pope as follows; “After the Spaniards fled from New Mexico, Pope became chief over several Pueblo villages. Unfortunately, he was sometimes as cruel as the Spaniards had been. In 1688, the Pueblo rebelled against Pope, and he was overthrown by his own people” (23). The text also fails to mention that Pope and his men killed “some four hundred men, women, and children, among them twenty-one Franciscan missionaries” (Arias 179).

The text also fails to tell the reader that Pope’s hatred for the Catholic Church was so virulent that he sought to undo it in all possible ways. For example, he did not consider any Catholic marriage valid and demanded that the men choose new wives. What about all the children of these couples? “Pope put out firm orders. Every Indian should go to the river and scrub with soapweed to wash away the taint of baptism. Men must put aside wives taken in Christian ceremony and marry again according to native tradition. Whatever the Spaniards had brought from afar and had left behind was to be destroyed—clothing, tools, weapons, livestock, carts—even fruit trees. These instructions, given in the first flush of victory, were doomed to be ignored” (Simmons 71).... In spite of Pope’s commands, many villagers retained their animals, continued to use their carts, refused to pull up their orchards, and some kept forges in operation to work the scraps of iron and steel that were spoils of the revolt. A few who had been touched deeply by the friars squirreled away religious articles, salvaged from the churches, against the day when the Christians might return” (Simmons 72).

“All evidence of the Catholic religion had to be destroyed or converted to other uses. Most of the church buildings had been burned down or dismantled during the first days of the rebellion but this was far from enough for Pope and his followers. Church records were burned along with even the crosses in the cemeteries. Indians with Spanish names had to give them up for their traditional Indian names and the Spanish language or even an occasional Spanish word couldn’t be spoken” (Burke 141).

The text also does not describe the final battle scene quite accurately. After butchering the unprepared remote settlers and unarmed missionaries, those who were still alive rushed to the Governor’s Palace, where they remained under siege for nine long days (Simmons 69). Pope does not give the governor an ultimatum as the text states. Pope did; however, let them finally leave unmolested.

The issue of the Spanish being evil and the Indians good is oversimplified. If you read an accurate history, it wasn’t quite that simple. For example, in an earlier Chapter the text reads, “Onate is a dreadful man” (1:131). He wasn’t a saint, but he wasn’t as bad as the text makes him out to be. Simmons’ *New Mexico, A Bicentennial History* offers greater details. Furthermore, the text describes Pope as “good,” yet, he was responsible for massacring 400 defenseless men, women, and children.

The chapter is titled “The Indians Win This One,” but did they really? “Along with the rather harsh rule of Pope, there were other reasons why the Pueblo Indians’ twelve years of independence saw the dream turn into a nightmare” (Burke 142). The text omits that after the Spanish left, Pope was cruel to his own people, and that without the Spanish soldier’s to protect them, Apaches and other tribes raided them. They also experienced drought, and starvation. Rev. Burke sums it up when he states “The Indians of New Mexico made the sad discovery that while living with and under the Spanish was an extremely difficult proposition, living without them was even worse” (Ibid. 141).

### **Problems with British History**

In this text, there are several problems with the British history. We do not see one word about the evils Henry the VIII inflicted upon Catholics, including bloody martyrdom. In fact, the commentary jokes about Henry’s licentious lifestyle, “King Henry tossed the Catholic Church out of England long before Jamestown got started. Why Henry did that is an interesting story, but you’ll have to look up the details yourself. It had something to do with King Henry’s wanting to get married again, and again, and again and –whew—he had a lot of energy” (2:51). Is this language appropriate for middle school children?

When reading about Queen Mary, the reader is manipulated by the skillful choice of words. For example, “Bloody Mary” killed Protestants, but Queen Elizabeth persecuted Catholics (1:141). Actually, Queen Elizabeth killed far more Catholics than Queen Mary Tudor killed Protestants and a fair number of people who Mary killed were criminals. After Mary became Queen, “She arrested Cranmer and the other Protestant leaders who had tried to keep her off the throne. She had them tried for treason and executed. These executions are the source of the ‘Bloody Mary’ legend which has made Mary one of history’s most maligned persons. The source of the propaganda is a book by a rabid anti-Catholic, *Foxe’s Book of Martyrs*, written five years after Mary’s death. In his book, Foxe purported to tell the tales of 273 people ‘martyred’ by Mary for their religious beliefs. A careful study of the book, however, shows that 169 of the persons in it are listed only by name and were most probably criminals who would have been executed no matter who was ruling. That leaves 104 names of persons who were executed by Mary for a religion-related reason. However, it is important to realize that Protestant leaders tried to keep Mary off the throne and were plotting against her once she came to the throne. They were guilty of treason, a capital offense in any country. Furthermore, the 104 executions were fewer than the martyrdoms under her father or her sister, Elizabeth. Henry executed 150 people after the Pilgrimage of Grace alone, after having promised them amnesty; his total number of victims was 649. Elizabeth martyred 189 in England and was responsible for the deaths of many more in Ireland, as we shall see. Thus Mary Tudor has been unfairly named ‘Bloody Mary.’ ‘Bloody Henry’ or ‘Bloody Elizabeth’ would be much more accurate names” (Carroll, *Christ the King* 235). “British historian, and Protestant, Thomas Babington Macaulay wrote that Elizabeth’s draconian measures against Catholics were ‘even more odious than the persecution with which her sister had harassed the Protestants’” (Crocker III 268).

When discussing Elizabethan England, there are more problems. The text states, “The Elizabethan Age was the greatest of times in England (1:154). This was not true for Mary Queen of Scots, who was beheaded; Edmund Campion, who was imprisoned in a cell so small he could not stand up or lie down and was killed by being hanged, drawn, and quartered; Margaret Clitherow, who was arrested several times and imprisoned in miserable circumstances because she would not attend Anglican services and finally crushed to death under heavy stones; and any practicing Catholic. “Elizabeth is often referred to as ‘Good Queen Bess,’ but the English Catholics of her time would not have agreed with that nickname. In Elizabethan England, there were fines for non-attendance at Anglican services; Mass was illegal; anyone caught attending Mass could be fined and imprisoned and had to take the Oath of Supremacy; the penalty for the second refusal of the oath was death; bringing objects of devotion (rosaries, pictures of saints) into the country was penalized by confiscation of property; high treason; priests could be executed as traitors. Informers were paid to report on priests and Catholic activity” (Carroll, *Christ the King* 237).

### **Problems with the Church and Faith**

There are several problem areas in the text concerning the Catholic Church and/or the Catholic faith. A serious problem occurs with the incorrect definition of “heretic.” The Church has a specific definition of a heretic. Through the gross misuse of a very important word, the potential exists to destroy the credibility of the Church. This has the potential to seriously undermine the faith of a child who does not have the capability or resources to recognize an error and research it. We read, “A freethinker is just that: somebody who thinks freely about what he or she believes, instead of just sticking to what’s been told. Another word for such people was *heretic*, and it was a dangerous thing to be at this time” (1:139). A heretic is NOT just a “freethinker.” The text deliberately defines a heretic as a freethinker. Even the dictionary does not do that. The Church teaches that “Heresy is the obstinate post-baptismal denial of some truth which must be believed with divine and catholic faith, or it is likewise an obstinate doubt concerning the same” (Catholic Church, *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2089).

“As commonly understood by the Church, ‘If a person, after receiving baptism and retaining the Christian name, pertinaciously denies any of the truths which are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith, or if he doubts the same, he is a heretic. If he departs entirely from the Christian faith, he is an apostate. If finally he will not be subject to the Supreme Pontiff or refuses to associate with members of the Church subject to him, he is a schismatic.’ In each case, the assumption is that the person acts knowingly and culpably, which excludes all baptized non-Catholics in good faith who may be as we say, materially but not formally (or sinfully) heretical, apostate, or schismatic” (Hardon, S.J, 216-7).

I would add that a heretic is not someone who entertains private doubts, but publicly and vocally disagrees with some established truth. In other words, if you are choosing to call yourself Catholic, you should believe in the truths of the Catholic faith. If you want to call yourself a “freethinker” that is fine as long as you don’t call yourself

Catholic and lead others into errors. The Church has the right to defend the deposit of Faith handed down to it from Jesus Christ. This is not condoning all methods that officials used. Heresies have plagued the Catholic Church since its beginning days. Read a good history of the Catholic Church.

Another concern is the description of the Catholic Church. I am sure you will be surprised to learn that “The Pope lived in Rome in a great palace called the Vatican. That was, and is, the control center for the entire Roman Catholic Church (My underlining). The Pope is elected by bishops [Sorry, although they are bishops, they are Cardinals] of the Catholic Church” (2:51). Not only does this literal definition of the Church create a misunderstanding of the structure of the Catholic Church, but the connotations of the words “control center” are quite grievous. Additional problems with the text include consistently negative pictures of the Catholic Church. This is especially troublesome for anyone who might pick up the book and just page through it.

If you turn to the index, the first reference to Catholics is a pen and ink picture of the Inquisition (1:101). It involves human torture and is intended to horrify and perpetuate the myth of “The Black Legend.” There is a sarcastic comment next to the picture. “As you can see, the court had some imaginative ways of doing this.” The reader or the viewer should ask, “Who drew this picture?” Was it someone who hated the Spanish? What is the intention of this picture? What was the Inquisition really like? Please see the numerous articles written by scholars at Catholic Educator’s Resource Center “Inquisition.” < [www.catholiceducation.org](http://www.catholiceducation.org) >. Also, Dossier Nov/Dec 1996 is devoted to the Spanish Inquisition on Catholic Net < [www.catholic.net](http://www.catholic.net) >. To quote Ellen Rice, “The Inquisition Myth, which Spaniards call ‘The Black Legend,’ did not arise in 1480. It began almost 100 years later and exactly one year after the Protestant defeat at the Battle of Muhlberg at the hands of Ferdinand’s grandson, the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V. In 1567 a fierce propaganda campaign began with the publication of a Protestant leaflet penned by a supposed Inquisition victim named Monanus This character (Protestant of course) painted Spaniards as barbarism who ravished women and sodomized young boys. The propagandists soon created ‘hooded fiends’ who tortured their victims in horrible devices like the knife-filled Iron Maiden (which was never used in Spain). The BBC/A&E special plainly states a reason for the war of words: the Protestants fought with words because they could not win on the battlefield” (Rice).

Another negative picture is of a Cuban Indian who is being burned at the stake and refusing to convert. The caption reads: “When he was about to be burned at the stake, a friar begged him to become a Christian in order to save his soul. Hatuey said he would rather go to hell than convert” (1:139). What is the child thinking after seeing this picture? Why would the child want to belong to such a viscous, cruel religion? First of all, there is no background information about the man in the picture. The reader is not offered any resources to substantiate it or tell us the circumstances surrounding the event or even who this person is, so that we may further research it. Did he lead an insurrection against the Spaniards? Let me also repeat that at no time did the Church or the Spanish crown ever approve of forced conversions. Once again there is no balance of information. Yes, there were forced conversions, but how many more were not? As I said before, we

never see pictures or one word about the thousands of people who converted to the Catholic faith, freely and joyfully. If all conversions were like this, then there would not be the massive conversions of the indigenous people of the world. The purpose of this picture appears to be to create a negative impression of the Church on young and impressionable minds.

Another negative picture about the Church concerns the Huguenots. The caption reads: “French Protestants flee as Catholic soldiers interrupt their church service. Do you see the soldier who is stealing from the Huguenots’ poor box? (It says *Donnez aux povres*—‘give to the poor.’)” (2:141). There is not one word about the Huguenots’ persecution of Catholics. This picture is propaganda. We have no idea if this particular incident occurred.

Another negative caption is under Queen Mary. “Mary I of England persecuted the Protestant church her father had founded” (2:140). There is no subheading under any picture about the persecution of Catholics by Henry VIII, or Elizabeth I, or any other person.

Throughout the text, Spanish, Franciscan, and Jesuit missionaries as well as French, and Spanish Catholics, Catholic missions, and Popes are portrayed inaccurately. Basically, anything concerning the Church, even remotely, should be checked with a reliable reference. There are some positive comments. The text speaks positively about Marquette, but only concentrates on him as an explorer, not a missionary, and Escalante and Dominguez, focusing on them as explorers, not missionaries. The text also does have one paragraph about the positive influence of the Spanish (1:117). Yet, it hardly makes up for the continual complaints. Also, concerning the persecution of the Catholic Acadians, the text does not offer the full picture (3:34). An interesting minor detail about Florida is missing. Ponce de Leon landed in Florida on Easter Sunday and called it *Pascua Florida*, which means “The Easter of Flowers” (Bunson, *Faith in the Wilderness* 25). The text just says “In Spanish, *florida* means ‘flowery’” (1:113).

### **Catholic Information**

Since this is a secular text, the reader doesn’t necessarily expect to see some topics. Some of the topics listed here, however, would be found in secular texts. These topics that were not mentioned in the text are of concern to Catholics. The text does not mention: Queen Anne’s War or The War of the Spanish Succession (1702-12), Quebec Act, Pope’s Day parade (“A figure representing the Holy Father was carried in mockery through the streets of Boston and other New England Colonies and finally burned in a gigantic bonfire. Everyone gathered for the burning in a holiday mood. Some years there were two or three figures of the Pope carried through the streets. When they met on the corners of a crossroads, the “Popes” battled it out, with the men carrying the figures beating one against the other. Howling mobs yelled and jeered the Pope and the Church in these parades”—Bunson, *Founding of Faith* 83), religious intolerance of Catholics, Abenaki Indian raids of the Puritans whose captured daughters were later rescued by

French missionaries and eventually became Ursuline nuns, and Protestant attacks on Spanish missions, e.g. St. Augustine—"In 1702 the English looted and destroyed St. Augustine, and in the following year they returned to create even more havoc in the surrounding territory. Priests were murdered, the missions destroyed, and between ten and twelve thousand Indians taken into slavery" (Perko, S.J. 20).

Likewise, you don't expect to see saints. However, there are some Catholics, for example, Fr. De Smet, Fr. Gibault, and John Barry, who greatly contributed to this nation, were highly respected by their peers, and are usually found in secular textbooks, but are overlooked in this text. Also, the disadvantage of reading a secular text is that you miss out on a Catholic perspective of history as well as the Catholics who contributed to history. Furthermore, if you read the Chronology of Events at the back of each book, you will be missing most missionary activity. I would suggest using or supplementing it with Marcia Neill's *Catholic World History Timeline and Guide*.

Since this is a secular text, the reader will have to find alternative sources for these Catholics. Catholics missing in action: St. Brendan, St. John Neumann, Pierre-Jean De Smet, St. Jean de Brebeuf, Mother Cabrini, Rose Hawthorne, St. Katherine Drexel, nuns during the Civil war, Bishop Flaget and other missionary priests, St. Rose Duchesne, Simon Brute, Sr. Blandina, John Barry, Kateri Tekakwitha, Isaac Jogues and companions, Our Lady of Guadalupe, Fr. Gibault, Frances Allen, Daniel Carroll, Thomas Fitzsimons, Thomas Sim Lee, William Gaston, Roger Brooke Taney, Orestes A. Brownson, Fr. Damien, the Leper priest, Casimir Pulaski, early missionary priests, and other notable Catholics.

Also there are some Catholics mentioned in the text that are not identified as Catholics. Thaddeus Kosciusko, known as the "Father of the Army Engineers," was Catholic as well as Rouchambeau, and Marquis de Lafayette. When the text does mention a Catholic contribution, like Charles Carroll, it is minimized, not elaborating on the full extent of that person's contributions. Carroll was much more than the only Catholic to sign the Declaration of Independence. He was responsible for pushing for religious freedom in the Bill of Rights. The same can be said of Las Casas. His Catholic Faith is downplayed.

### **Abortion**

When referring to the Roe v. Wade decision, the text says that "Anti-feminists said that abortion was murder and at odds with traditional religious values" (10: 143). Word choice, once again, is very important. There are two faulty ideas presented: "anti-feminists" and "traditional religious values." Although many feminists support abortion, this issue is more than a right to someone's body. There is a reason people say pro-choice instead of pro-abortion. It doesn't sound as gruesome. Furthermore, I do not consider myself "anti-feminist," but rather "pro-life." Through the use of language, a negative image is created of those who support life. Also, this changes the issue. The focus is no longer on the baby, but on the mother. Personally, pro-life people are concerned about the mother. How many women have died from botched abortions? You won't find that

in a history book! Also, it is more than a “traditional religious value.” Although it is mostly people with “traditional religious values” who are against abortion, that is not what makes it right or wrong. By doing so, this takes the issue out of the arena of fundamental facts and basic biology. Abortion is murder, because it has everything to do with when life begins. You don’t have to believe in God to know when conception begins. But you do have to have a correctly formed conscience to recognize right from wrong and feel sorrow and guilt.

Also concerning abortion, there is no mention of Clinton signing pro-abortion legislation on the first day he took office. But the reader is informed that he plays the saxophone.

### **Family Life**

The text denigrates family life, both the mother and the father’s role. The Father is belittled with the comment on a 50’s advertising photo that “The 50’s ideal: Mom and daughter look on admiringly as their lord and master mans the barbecue” (10:138). My underlining. Through both negative pictures and remarks, the text attacks mothers at home. First, the text fails to admit that perhaps many women in the 50’s enjoyed being at home. Instead, we read, “The reality of the ‘50s was that most middle-class white women—like it or not—did stay home” (10:138). There is also a very negative picture of a woman bending over with a crying child on her hip while trying to maneuver a roast out of the oven while two children look on. The text also compares women at home with the character Lucy from the TV show *I Love Lucy*, who “didn’t work, was kind of bored, and was always getting into mischief” (10:137). Any number of other TV role models at that time could have been chosen.

Also when speaking of family life, the text does not mention the negative consequences of feminism. The text fails to mention how divorce has devastated the family, or how many women work because of financial reasons, not prestigious job positions. The text also supports the modern attitude of work being a career. This is an attitude shift. Before, the father worked to support his family. The mother stayed at home to care for her family. Today the message is that both should have a career; however, the reality is that both are often stressed out caring for and supporting the family.

## **Concerns about Unnecessary Nudity**

There are several, unnecessary, nude pictures: pen and ink pictures of bare-breasted female pirates, a color picture of an immodestly dressed woman who represents America on the cover of Bk. 5, a nude drawing on the inside cover papers of hardcover Bk. 2, and others. By subjecting children to unnecessary nudity, are we desensitizing our children to modesty? You may wish to discuss these pictures with your children.

## **Comments about Religion and Puritans**

There are several troublesome comments on religion. In closing the chapter on Santa Fe, the text says “These are civilizations in conflict. If there is a way for them [to] live in harmony, no one seems wise enough to have found it (2:91). Yes, there is. Christianity is the answer, but a vibrant one. Mankind is always struggling against original sin. If anything, these problems confirm original sin. “Looking back, today, it seems as if people and nations were acting just like silly little kids. Each one was saying, ‘My religion is better than yours’” (2:141). Another comment on religion; “Unfortunately, the clash between Protestants and Catholics led to centuries of hate and violence in Europe” [this is true]. “Instead of talking calmly about their differences, Protestants and Catholics fought about them” (2:100). That would be fine, except that Calvin was not interested in dialogue.

Some more comments. “In some ways, however, we are all descendants of the Puritans... But it’s true. If you are an American, you are a descendant of the Puritans—at least a little bit—because many American laws and ideas come from Puritan laws and ideas and they are some of the best we have” (2:76). First of all, I am not a descendant of the Puritans, as most Americans are not. Second of all, our laws are based on English laws, not Puritan laws. Third of all, many Puritan laws were terrible. For example, laws condemning priests to death.

The description of the Puritans and Rev. Cotton Mather is a little too glowing and full of excuses (2: 76-80). Cotton Mather was not such a wonderful man. For example, “Goodwife Ann Glover, hanged as a witch on Boston Common in 1688 after reciting for Cotton Mather the Lord’s Prayer in Latin, Irish, and English (“But she could not end it,” he noted)... She died forgiving her enemies and executioners and told the magistrates: “I die a Catholic” (Hennesey, S.J. 37).

Hennesey also makes the comment that the Quakers “suffered bitterly” too, because of the Puritans. Furthermore, because of Puritan hatred for Catholics, there were very few Catholics outside of Maryland. If the text wants to give credit to the Puritans, it should be for anti-Catholicism, which still exists today. As Hennesey states “...but Catholic settlement was effectively prevented and foundations laid for the anti-Catholicism which observers have noted as endemic to the American scene” (37).

Ellis comments, “the proscription against Catholics in the colonial charters and laws is too well known to require emphasis, and the sermons, religious tracts, books, and gazettes of the period with monotonous regularity bore the same spirit and intent” (19).

In the *New England Primer*, young Puritans memorized such verses as:

“Abhor that arrant whore of Rome  
And all her blasphemies;  
And Drink not of her cursed cup;  
Obey not her decrees.”

(Hennesey, S.J. 63).

Margaret and Stephen Bunson do not have kind words for the Puritans. “The intolerance demonstrated was not only based on religion but on nationalities as well, with the Irish and French targeted as enemies of all Puritans. These Puritans [Puritans from the New England colonies] held to two distinct and yet connected views of Catholics and Native Americans, and as a result both groups were condemned and eradicated whenever possible...” (Bunson, *Faith in the Wilderness* 31).

### **Misconstrued Topics**

The truth is misconstrued on several topics by not offering the whole or accurate picture: Galileo (2:16), Spanish Inquisition (1:101, 139), Queen Isabella (1:133, 138-139) Queen Mary Tudor (1:140-141), Queen Elizabeth (1:154), Henry VIII (1:140; 2:51), Huguenots, St. Bartholomew Day Massacre, Gunpowder Plot (see *Christ the King, Lord of History*), Spanish Colonization of America (1, 2), Reformation, Catholic Church position on slavery and treatment of Indians (1, 2) (The impression is that all Indians were forced to convert, and were mistreated by the Church), Witchcraft (2: 76-80) (The topic is jested about and the Protestant Europe’s persecution of witches is omitted. The Pope did NOT issue orders to burn witches, but issued a bull condemning witchcraft. See *Catholic Encyclopedia*), Aztecs and Cortez (Human sacrifice is made light of (1:108), Feminism and family life (10), communism (9, 10) (The numbers of men threatened with the loss their jobs or beaten up, if they did not join the communist workers union is omitted—My grandfather can tell you about that.), and religious intolerance against Catholics.

For alternative sources, see Anne W. Carroll’s *Christ the King, Lord of History*, and *Christ and the Americas*, H. W. Crocker’s *Triumph*, James Hennesey’s *American Catholics*, Marc Simmons’ *New Mexico, A Bicentennial History*, and other works cited in the bibliography.

## A Few other Concerns

One concern that I do have is the lack of footnotes, works cited, or a bibliography for the reader to check on the sources of information.

A final concern is with the recommend reading or the “More books to Read” section. Although there are many fine books appropriate for this age audience, “*Strawberry Girl, Johnny Tremain, and Amos Fortune,*” there are many other titles that would be more appropriate for high school or even college, including “*Inherit the Wind, A Farewell to Arms, and I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings*” and others.

## Summary

Because there are 10 volumes in this series, your child will be spending quite a bit of time reading this. There are numerous errors that need to be rectified. The majority of errors that I have pointed out are in books 1, 2, and 10. Any book your child spends time with is your child’s teacher. Every author has a point of view. What is this series teaching your child? How often do we read a negative comment or see a negative picture of the Catholic Church, while ignoring all the good it has done, as well as, all those who have suffered for it? “Furthermore, we had always been saying that a man becomes what he reads: he reads mush and you can pour him through a keyhole; he wrestles with giants and becomes a king (Wallace, S.L. ix).

By reading this book, is your child going to recognize trivia for what it is or think that it is fascinating information? Can a young child sift out the important information? Who cares about Thomas Jefferson’s mammoth cheese? Does that tell us that he was a good leader or statesman? Sometimes we do not even read any important information. What do we learn about Fr. Serra after reading this series? Almost nothing. Even the state of California recognizes the value of his contributions to the founding of this country. They placed a statue of him in the National Statuary Hall in Washington D. C.

Most importantly is the presentation of the facts. Is there a fair presentation of the Church? Would it truly have been better for the Aztecs to continue human sacrifice? Is your child able to discern and defend the truth? Does he know what a heretic is? This is not to say that the Church is perfect or that all missionary activity was done in a Christian manner. Nor am I saying that we don’t tell them about negative events or people. They need to hear the whole truth. Why did Isaac Jogues and other missionaries sacrifice their lives to share their faith? Why did Kateri Tekakwitha endure incredible hardship to become a Christian?

Few of us, including myself, are experts when reading history. Will your child recognize the errors or take the time to do further research to find out the correct facts? This is troublesome, because there are times when some of the facts are correct, but the context within which the information is stated is biased. Also, there are times when the

information is distorted and/or missing. For example, Margaret Sanger is praised. We do not hear the full story about her. I suggest you visit the website of Human Life International. [www.hli.org](http://www.hli.org) or read *Margaret Sanger: Father of Modern Society* by Elasa Drogin published by New Hope Publications. Worst of all, there are times when Hakim states something that is simply not true.

This series is aimed primarily for a younger audience. But the content and context within which some of the information is given is definitely not appropriate for a younger audience. They need to be old enough to discern issues. Certain issues require critical thinking and logic. This author is not shy about imposing her viewpoints on your child. Some issues need to be discussed.

In addition to discussing with the student the facts of the text, the parent will also want to point out the inappropriate tone of voice. For examples of the sarcastic tone of voice see Galileo, King Henry VIII, Inquisition, etc.

Most parents do not have the time or the energy to correct each and every error or wish to sit down and discuss all the moral problems within the text. For some topics, I had to research several sources before I could find all the details. This process took me several weeks and I did not cover many issues, including her political slant.

Yes, we want our children to read entertaining textbooks, but we should not stop there. We should want something more. We should want them to think critically to search for the truth, to seek all that is noble, beautiful, and true. “Your thoughts should be wholly directed to all that is true, all that deserves respect, all that is honest, pure, admirable, decent, virtuous, or worthy of praise” (Phil. 4:8). Does this series satisfy those requirements?

## Works Cited

I do want to comment that I do not necessarily agree with the interpretation of Catholicism in recent history by some American Catholic historians found in the library, but the historians listed here presented useful information on early American Catholic life.

Library sources are not listed as Out of Print.

OP indicates Out of Print.

Arias, Bishop David, *Spanish Roots of America*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1992. OP.

Bunson, Maggie. *Founding of Faith, Catholics in the American Revolutionary Era*.

Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1977. OP

Bunson, Margaret, and Stephen. *The Story of the Catholic Indian Missions, Faith in the Wilderness*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 2000.

Burke, Rev. James T. '*This Miserable Kingdom*'...*The Story of the Spanish Presence in New Mexico and the Southwest from the Beginning until the 18<sup>th</sup> Century*. Santa Fe, New Mexico: Cristo Rey Church, 1973. OP?

Carroll, Anne W. *Christ and the Americas*. Rockford: Tan, 1997.

Carroll, Anne W. *Christ the King, Lord of History*. Rockford: Tan, 1994.

Catholic Church. *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1994.

Catholic Educator's Resource Center <[www.catholiceducation.org](http://www.catholiceducation.org)>. articles, history,

"Inquisition." Several articles.

Catholic Net. <[www.catholic.net](http://www.catholic.net)>.Magazines, *Dossier* Nov/Dec 1996, The complete issue is devoted to the Spanish Inquisition. Some articles are also available on Catholic Educator's Resource Center.

- Crocker III, H. W. *Triumph, The Power and the Glory of the Catholic Church, A 2,000-Year History*. Roseville, CA: Forum, 2001.
- Drogin, Elasa. *Margaret Sanger: Father of Modern Society*. New Hope, KY: New Hope.
- Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience, A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Ellis, John Tracy. *American Catholicism*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1969.
- Hakim, Joy A. *A History of Us*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Hardon, S.J. John. *The Catholic Catechism*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.
- Hennesey, S.J., James, *American Catholics, A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Human Life International <[www.hli.org](http://www.hli.org)>.
- Huonder, A. "Reductions of Paraguay," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917 <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12688b.htm>>.
- Kent, Deborah, *New Mexico (America the Beautiful 2nd series)*. New York: Childrens Press, 1999.
- Knott, A. Leo. "Maryland," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917 <[www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org)>.
- Leek, James R. *The Evangelization of the New World, Hispanic Influence in American History*. St. Paul's Pub., 1987.
- Metzger, S.J., Charles H. See "United States, History of the," Subarticle: "Catholic Participation in the American Revolution," *The Catholic Encyclopedia for Home and School*, 1965.
- Neill, Marcia. *Catholic World History Timeline and Guide*. Irvine, CA: Marcia, 2001
- Nevins, M. M., Albert J. *Our American Catholic Heritage*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1972. OP.
- Papenfuse, Jr. Dr. Edward C. *An Act Concerning Religion, April 21, 1649* <[www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/speccol/sc2200/sc2221/000025/html/toleration.html](http://www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/speccol/sc2200/sc2221/000025/html/toleration.html)>. *An Interpretation and Tribute to the Citizen Legislators of Maryland* by Edward C. Papenfuse, Jr., Archivist of Maryland, adapted and expanded from an essay by Gerald W. Johnson.

Papenfuse, Jr. Dr. Edward C. *Two Acts of Toleration*,  
[www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/speccol/sc2200/sc2221/000025/html/intro.html](http://www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/speccol/sc2200/sc2221/000025/html/intro.html)  
This site offers an historical perspective of the Toleration Act. More commentary  
by Dr. Edward C. Papenfuse, Jr., Archivist of Maryland.

Perko, S.J., F. Michael. *Catholic and American, A Popular History*. Huntington, IN: Our  
Sunday Visitor, 1989. OP.

Rice, Ellen. "The Myth of the Spanish Inquisition" Catholic Dossier Nov/Dec 1996  
<[www.catholic.net/RCC/Periodicals/dossier/1112-96/article4.html](http://www.catholic.net/RCC/Periodicals/dossier/1112-96/article4.html)>.

Simmons, Marc. *New Mexico, A Bicentennial History*. New York: Norton, 1977. Turner,  
William, "Bruno Giordano," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917  
<[www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org)>.

Wallace, S.L., Sr. M. Imelda. "Introduction," *Outlaws of Ravenhurst*: Kirkwood, Mo.:  
Catholic Authors Press.

West, Albert B. "Rhode Island," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917  
<[www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org)>.

## Bibliography

- Arias, Bishop David. *Spanish Roots of America*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1992. OP
- Belloc, Hilaire. *How the Reformation Happened*. Rockford: Tan, 1992.
- Belloc, Hilaire. *Characters of the Reformation*. Rockford: Tan, 1992.
- Belloc, Hilaire. *The Great Heresies*. Rockford: Tan, 1991.
- Belloc, Hilaire. *Europe and the Faith*. Rockford: Tan, 1992.
- Bunson, Maggie. *Founding of Faith, Catholics in the American Revolutionary Era*. Boston: Daughters of St. Paul, 1977. OP.
- Bunson, Margaret, and Stephen. *The Story of the Catholic Indian Missions, Faith in the Wilderness*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 2000.
- Burke, Rev. James T. 'This Miserable Kingdom'...*The Story of the Spanish Presence in New Mexico and the Southwest from the Beginning until the 18<sup>th</sup> Century*. Santa Fe, New Mexico: Cristo Rey Church, 1973. OP?
- Carroll, Anne W. *Christ and the Americas*. Rockford: Tan, 1997.
- Carroll, Anne W. *Christ the King, Lord of History*. Rockford: Tan, 1994.
- Carroll, Dr. Warren. *The Cleaving of Christendom, A History of Christendom, Vol. 4*. Front Royal: Christendom Press, 2000.
- Carroll, Dr. Warren. *The Glory of Christendom, A History of Christendom, Vol. 3*. Front Royal: Christendom Press, 1993.
- Carroll, Dr. Warren. *Isabel of Spain: The Catholic Queen*. Front Royal: Christendom Press, 1991.
- Carroll, Dr. Warren. *Our Lady of Guadalupe and the Conquest of Darkness*. Front Royal: Christendom Press, 1983.
- Catholic Church. *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*. Washington, DC: United States Catholic Conference, 1994
- The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917<[www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org)>.

- The Catholic Encyclopedia for Home and School. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Crocker III, H. W. *Triumph, The Power and the Glory of the Catholic Church, A 2,000-Year History*. Roseville, CA: Forum, 2001.
- D'elia, Donald. *The Spirits of '76, A Catholic Inquiry*. Front Royal: Christendom Press, 1983.
- Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience, A History from Colonial Times to the Present*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- Drogin, Elalah. *Margaret Sanger: Father of Modern Society*. New Hope, KY: New Hope.
- Ellis, John Tracy. *American Catholicism*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1969.
- Furlong, Most Rev. Philip J. *Our Pioneers and Patriots*. Rockford: Tan, Reprinted 1997.
- Goebel, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edmund J., et al. *American History*. Post Falls, ID: Lepanto Press (Our Lady of Victory), Reprinted, original date, 1966.
- Hakim, Joy A. *A History of Us*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Hardon, S.J. John. *The Catholic Catechism*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975.
- Hennesey, S.J., James, *American Catholics, A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Human Life International < [www.hli.org](http://www.hli.org)>.
- Huonder, A. "Reductions of Paraguay," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917 <<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/12688b.htm>>.
- Kamen, Henry. *The Spanish Inquisition*. New York: New American Library, 1965.
- Kamen, Henry. *The Spanish Inquisition: a historical revision*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998.
- Kent, Deborah, *New Mexico (America the Beautiful 2nd series)*. New York: Childrens Press, 1999.
- Knott, A. Leo. "Maryland," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917 <[www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org)>.
- Kranson, Stephen M. *Catholic Makers of America*. Front Royal: Christendom Press, 1993. OP.

- Leek, James R. *The Evangelization of the New World, Hispanic Influence in American History*. Olathe, KS: St. Paul's Pub., 1987.
- Lord, Bob and Penny. *Tragedy of the Reformation*. Robert and Penny Lord, 1997.
- Maryland Toleration Act, several web pages have the entire document.
- Maynard, Theodore. *Great Catholics in American History*. Garden City, NY: Hanover House, 1957.
- Metzger S. J., Charles H. See "United States, History of the," Subarticle: "Catholic Participation in the American Revolution," *The Catholic Encyclopedia for Home and School*, 1965.
- Myers, Rawley. *American Women of Faith*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor 1989. OP.
- Neill, Marcia. *Catholic World History Timeline and Guide*. Irvine, CA: Marcia, 2001
- Nevins, M.M., Albert J. *American Martyrs from 1542*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1987. OP.
- Nevins, M.M., Albert J. *Builders of Catholic America*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1985. OP.
- Nevins, M.M., Albert J. *Our American Catholic Heritage*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1972. OP.
- Papenfuse, Jr. Dr. Edward C. *An Act Concerning Religion, April 21, 1649*, [www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/speccol/sc2200/sc2221/000025/html/toleration.html](http://www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/speccol/sc2200/sc2221/000025/html/toleration.html)  
*An Interpretation and Tribute to the Citizen Legislators of Maryland* by Edward C. Papenfuse, Jr., Archivist of Maryland, adapted and expanded from an essay by Gerald W. Johnson.
- Papenfuse, Jr. Dr. Edward C. *Two Acts of Toleration*, [www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/speccol/sc2200/sc2221/000025/html/intro.html](http://www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/speccol/sc2200/sc2221/000025/html/intro.html)  
This site offers an historical perspective of the Toleration Act. More commentary by Dr. Edward C. Papenfuse, Jr., Archivist of Maryland.
- Perko, S.J., F. Michael. *Catholic and American, A Popular History*. Huntington, IN: Our Sunday Visitor, 1989. OP.

- Religious Toleration in Maryland,  
[www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/stagser/s1259/123/html/mdayremarks.html](http://www.mdarchives.state.md.us/msa/stagser/s1259/123/html/mdayremarks.html)  
*Citizen Legislators and Toleration* remarks by Dr. Edward C. Papenfuse, Jr., State Archivist, to the House and Senate of Maryland, March 25, 1999.
- Reninger, Illeen. *The Catholic Faith Comes to the Americas*. Front Royal: Seton, 2000.
- Rice, Ellen. "The Myth of the Spanish Inquisition" Catholic Dossier Nov/Dec 1996  
< [www.catholic.net/RCC/Periodicals/dossier/1112-96/article4.html](http://www.catholic.net/RCC/Periodicals/dossier/1112-96/article4.html)>.
- Seton Staff. *American History for Young Catholics*, Gr. 1. Front Royal: Seton, 1998.
- Simmons, Marc. *New Mexico, A Bicentennial History*. New York: Norton, 1977.
- Sr. Elizabeth Ann. Sisters of St. Joseph the Worker, *Heroes of Virtue, A Timeline-Manual of New World Saints and Blesseds*. CHC, 1999.
- Spanish Inquisition *Catholic Dossier*, Nov. /Dec. 1999  
<[www.catholic.net/RCC/Periodicals/Dossier/1112-96/intro.html](http://www.catholic.net/RCC/Periodicals/Dossier/1112-96/intro.html)>.
- Turner, William, "Bruno Giordano," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917,  
<[www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org)>.
- Wallace, S.L., Sr. M. Imelda. "Introduction," *Outlaws of Ravenhurst*: Kirkwood, Mo.: Catholic Authors Press.
- Walsh, William Thomas. *Characters of the Inquisition*. Rockford: Tan, 1987.
- Walsh, William Thomas. *Isabella of Spain*. Rockford: Tan, 1930.
- West, Albert B. "Rhode Island," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1917  
<[www.newadvent.org](http://www.newadvent.org)>
- Williamson, Hugh Ross. *The Beginning of the English Reformation*. Long Prairie: Neumann Press, 1984.

Works Cited by Marc Simmons in *New Mexico*

Hammond, George P. and Agapito Rey, eds. and trans. *Don Juan de Onate, Colonizer of New Mexico, 1595-1628*, 2 vols. (Albuquerque: U. of New Mexico, 1953).

Ayer, Mrs. Edward E., translator, *The Memorial of Fray Alonso de Benavides 1630* (Albuquerque: Horn and Wallace, 1965).

Scholes, France V. "Church and State in New Mexico, 1637-1641," *New Mexico Historical Review* 11 (1936).

Hackett, Charles Wilson ed. *Revolt of the Pueblo Indians of New Mexico and Otermin's Attempted Reconquest, 1680-1682*, 2 vols. (Albuquerque: U. of New Mexico, 1942).

Suggested Further Reading on Galileo

*Copernicus, Galileo, and the Catholic Sponsorship of Science*. Available from [www.rchistory.com](http://www.rchistory.com).

"*The Galileo Controversy* [www.catholic.com/library/galileo\\_controversy.asp](http://www.catholic.com/library/galileo_controversy.asp)

*Dossier*, July/Aug 1995, "Galileo"

Lay Witness, Vol. 14, No.7, April 1993, "Galileo."

Catholic Educator's Resource Center <[www.catholiceducation.org](http://www.catholiceducation.org)>. articles, history,

Galileo. Several articles.

Crocker III, H. W. *Triumph, The Power and the Glory of the Catholic Church,*

*A 2,000-Year History*. Roseville, CA: Forum, 2001.

### Suggested Further Reading on the Spanish Inquisition

Catholic Educator's Resource Center <[www.catholiceducation.org](http://www.catholiceducation.org)>. articles, history, "Inquisition." Several articles.

Catholic Net. <[www.catholic.net](http://www.catholic.net)>.Magazines, *Dossier* Nov/Dec 1996, The complete issue is devoted to the Spanish Inquisition. Some articles are also available on Catholic Educator's Resource Center.

Carroll, Dr. Warren. *Isabel of Spain: The Catholic Queen*. Front Royal: Christendom Press, 1991.

Crocker III, H. W. *Triumph, The Power and the Glory of the Catholic Church, A 2,000-Year History*. Roseville, CA: Forum, 2001.

Kamen, Henry. *The Spanish Inquisition*. New American Library, 1965.

Kamen, Henry. *The Spanish Inquisition*, a historical revision, Yale University, 1998.

Peters, Edward. *Inquisition*. New York: Free Press, 1998.

Rice, Ellen. "The Myth of the Spanish Inquisition" Catholic Dossier Nov/Dec 1996

< [www.catholic.net/RCC/Periodicals/dossier/1112-96/article4.html](http://www.catholic.net/RCC/Periodicals/dossier/1112-96/article4.html)>.

Walsh, William Thomas. *Characters of the Inquisition*. Rockford: Tan, 1987.

Walsh, William Thomas. *Isabella of Spain*. Rockford: Tan, 1930.