

Tholen, H. J.
Persecuted Mexico
ADX 0545

859207

**PERSECUTED
MEXICO**

By

H. J. THOLEN

Hays, Kansas

DEDICATION

This study of the Mexican situation was prompted by an editorial appearing in the Emporia (Kansas) Gazette. It is not strictly confined to an answer to that editorial, but includes much other material, bearing on the Mexican persecution of religion in general and the Catholic Church in particular.

No claim of completeness is made, but the information contained herein is authentic and can easily be corroborated by any one.

To liberty loving Americans who believe in Freedom of Conscience, Freedom of Press and Freedom of Speech, we are pleased to dedicate this pamphlet in memory of the founders of this nation who secured for us this priceless heritage.

H. J. THOLEN.

MINDING OUR OWN BUSINESS

"Young Bill" White, in the *Emporia Gazette* and reprinted in the *Hays Daily News* on February 19, 1935, said:

"Josephus Daniels, the New Deal's Ambassador to Mexico, is under heavy fire in Congress and outside of it because of a speech he made several months ago in Mexico City. He took occasion to compliment the American system of free public schools. Continuing his rounded oratorical periods, he said they were the outgrowth of the ideals of Thomas Jefferson, and commended the principles of that great Democrat to the Mexican people.

Here it would have ended, had it not been seized upon and misrepresented by a section of the American religious press. The Mexican government for the past 10 years has been engaged in two campaigns, one to educate the people of that semi-illiterate country, and another campaign of bitter, ruthless, and, as it seems to us on this side of the Rio Grande, entirely unjustified persecution of the Roman Catholic faith.

"In defense of this policy, Mexicans argue that the Mexican Catholic church was for centuries the greatest enemy of popular education. They say that before the Revolution, when education was by law a monopoly of the church, not one Mexican child in a hundred could read. Now they claim that, as a result of the newly established Mexican free public schools, 25

per cent of the population is already literate.

"To our American eyes this would seem no reason for persecuting the Catholic faith, or for prohibiting religious schools. Whether or not, 20 years ago, the Mexican Catholic church was unwilling or unable to assume the burden of educating the peons is unimportant today. Under our American system, public and church schools exist side by side, each bearing a share of the common task, and people are free to send their children to either.

"On the other hand, things have come to a pretty pass if an American ambassador abroad can not point with pride to the school system of his own country and praise the ideals of Thomas Jefferson without being accused (as Mr. Daniels recently was by a volunteer congressional spokesman for the Catholic viewpoint) of "conspiring with the tyrants of Mexico to enslave the people.

"As an outgrowth of all this ruckus, Senator Borah, who is old enough to know better, has introduced a resolution calling for a senatorial investigation of the Mexican government's persecution of the Catholic faith.

"Such an investigation would prove what everyone knows, namely that such a persecution has existed for a decade, and is conducted with relentless brutality. But what business is this of the United States senate? Is it not, however misguided, purely a domestic affair of the Mexican people?

“Do we threaten to investigate or intervene when the Germans persecute the Lutherans or butcher the Jews, when the Turks have at their mercy Armenian Christians, when the Bolshevik Russians ship their middle classes into exile, or when the British slaughter the Hindus?”

“How would you feel about it if the French or Spanish government had officially investigated the activities of the old American Ku Klux Klan against the Catholics? Or if the British parliament appointed a committee to “investigate” southern lynchings or northern gang murders?”

“Senator Borah for 15 years has opposed the League of Nations on the highly questionable ground that it would permit foreign countries to meddle in American domestic affairs. If we want foreign countries to mind their own business, why don't we set an example by not butting into theirs?”

Several glaring errors occur in this bit of “wisdom” from the pen of “Young Bill.” The exact words of Mr. Daniels, which caused, according to White, “a section of the American religious press to misrepresent Mr. Daniels will be given in this record of events in Mexico. The other errors in Mr. White's statement will become evident from a careful perusal of all of what follows in this brief resume of the Mexican persecutions, covering not 20 but 100 years of misrule in that

unfortunate country. Space will not permit even a brief record of the 300 years of progress in culture and civilization made between 1524 and 1824, during which time the Catholic church had a free hand in the education and civilization of Mexico, and for which she offers no apology. Of the history of these 300 years, she may well be justly proud. This booklet will deal with the past 100 years in which the church has been hampered by the government and particularly the past 20 years for which the Revolutionary party in power is responsible.

Charges and counter charges are constantly being made regarding the persecution of the church in Mexico. Recent official statements by the president of Mexico and by the Mexican Ambassador at Washington deny the existence of religious persecution in Mexico. These denials were occasioned by the Borah resolution which called for a senatorial investigation of the Mexican Government's persecution of the church. For the purpose of clarifying the matter in the minds of the American people, we will present authoritative information in regard to the situation as it stands today.

Members of Protestant denominations who believe that the attack upon the church in Mexico is anti-Catholic instead of anti-God and anti-Religious in general, will find from a careful perusal of the laws which I will cite, that these laws are directed against all religions and not merely the Catholic religion. Recent acts of

the Government under General Calles also bear out the fact that the aim of the Government of Mexico is to destroy every vestige of religion and they are proceeding to do so along the same lines which have been followed in Russia for the past 15 years.

However, before offering our evidence on the present situation, let us go back to the very beginning of the trouble between the church and state in Mexico in order that we may view the whole matter in its proper setting. This background is necessary for a thorough understanding of the problems.

THE FIRST ATTACKS UPON THE CHURCH MADE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO

Let us examine the Constitution of 1857 and the Laws of Reform. From July 4, 1822, when the law was issued permitting the Government to take possession of the Philippine mission property, and of revenues from pious foundations which were not to be spent within the limits of the Mexican Republic, to the law of November 23rd, 1855, Article 42 of which abolished all ecclesiastical jurisdiction in civil matters, a series of laws were enacted by congress and the legislatures of the states clearly showing the anti-religious spirit of those who framed them. This spirit was at its height from 1857 to 1874. During the presidency of D. Ignacio Comonfort the famous Constitution of 1857, decreeing the separation of Church

and state, was promulgated, and in the years following Benito Juarez framed innumerable laws systematizing the provisions of the Constitution and enforcing the separation, and in 1874 President D. Sebastian Lerdo de Tejada raised many of the Reform Laws framed by Juarez to constitutional statutes.

THE CHURCH AND HER PRIVILEGES

Law of December 4, 1860: Art. 8—Right of asylum in churches is abolished and force may and should be employed in whatever measure it may be deemed necessary to arrest and remove according to law a declared or suspected criminal, without the ecclesiastical authorities having a right to intervene.

Art. 17—Official recognition formerly given to various ecclesiastical persons and corporations is withdrawn.

Art. 18—The use of church bells is to be regulated by police ordinance.

Art. 24—Public officials are forbidden in their official capacity to assist at any religious ceremony, or entertainment in honor of a clergyman, however high in rank he may be. Troops of soldiers are included in the foregoing prohibition.

Law of May 13, 1873—No religious rite or demonstration of any kind whatsoever may take place outside of the church building in any part of the republic.

Law of December 14, 1874, Art. 3—Nor shall the Government recognize in any manner whatsoever religious

solemnities. All days, therefore, that do not commemorate some exclusively civil event cease to be holidays. Sundays are set apart as days of rest for offices and public institutions.

Art. 5—No religious rite may take place outside the church building, neither shall the ministers of religion or any individual of either sex, of any denomination whatsoever, wear in public a special dress or insignia which would characterize him in any way, under penalty of fine of ten to two hundred pesos.

Constitution of 1857, Art. 5—The State cannot allow any contract, pact or agreement to go into effect that has for its object the impairment, loss, or irrevocable sacrifice of a man's liberty, whatever the cause may be, work, education or religious vows. Consequently the law does not recognize monastic orders, nor can it permit their establishment, whatever be their designation or object.

Art. 27—Religious institutions or corporations, whatever their character, name, period of existence and object, and such civil institutions as are under the patronage, direction, or administration of these, or of the ministers of any religious denomination, shall have no legal right to acquire title to or administer any property, but such buildings as are destined for the immediate and direct use of said corporation and institutions. Neither shall they have the right to acquire or manage revenues derived from real estate.

Law of July 12, 1859, Art. 5—All the

male religious orders which exist throughout the republic, whatever their name or the purpose of their existence, are hereby suppressed throughout the whole Republic, as also all archconfraternities, confraternities, congregations or sisterhoods annexed to the religious communities, cathedrals, parishes or any other churches.

Art. 6—The foundation or erection of new convents of regulars, archconfraternities, confraternities, congregations, or sisterhoods, under whatever form or name is given them, is prohibited, likewise the wearing of the garb or habit of the suppressed orders.

Art. 7—By this law the ecclesiastics of the suppressed orders are reduced to the conditions of secular clergy, and shall, like these, be subject as regards the exercise of their ministry to the ordinaries of their respective dioceses.

CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY

Art. 12—All books printed or manuscript, paintings, antiquities and other articles belonging to the suppressed religious communities shall be given to museums, lyceums, libraries and other public establishments.

Art. 13—All members of the suppressed orders who fifteen days after the publication of this law in their respective localities shall continue to wear the habit or live in community shall forfeit the right to collect their quota as assigned by Article 8, and

if after the term of 15 days designated by this Article they should reunite in any place and appear to follow their community life they shall immediately be expelled from the country.

Art. 21—All novitiates for women are perpetually closed. Those at present in novitiates cannot be professed.

Law of Feb. 26, 1863, Art. 1—All religious communities of women are suppressed throughout the republic.

Law of December 4, 1873, Art. 19—The State does not recognize monastic orders, nor can it permit their establishment, whatever their name or the object for which they are founded. Any orders that may be secretly established shall be considered unlawful assemblies which the authorities may dissolve should the members attempt to live in community, and in all such cases the superiors or heads shall be judged criminals infringing on individual rights according to Article 973 of the Penal Code of the District, which is declared in force in all the republic.

CHURCH PROPERTY

Law of July 12, 1859, Art. 1—All property which under different titles has been administered by the secular and regular clergy, whatever kind of property it may be, taxes, shares or stock, or the name or purpose it may have had, becomes the property of the State.

Law of September 25, 1873, Art. 3—No religious institution may acquire

property nor the revenue derived from property.

LEGACIES AND WILLS

Law of December 14, 1874, Art. 8—Legacies made in favor of ministers of religion, of their relatives to the fourth degree, or of persons living with said ministers where they have rendered any spiritual aid to the testators in their last illness, or when they have been their spiritual directors, are null and void.

HOSPITAL AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS

Law of Feb. 2, 1861, Art. 1—All hospitals and charitable institutions which up to the present time have been under ecclesiastical authority and managed by religious corporations are secularized.

Law of February 5, 1861, Art. 67—Charitable institutions that were managed by ecclesiastical corporations or committees independent of the Government are secularized and placed under the immediate supervision of the civil authorities.

Law of August 27, 1904, Art. 25—The ministers of any form of religion cannot act as the directors, administrators or patrons of private charity; neither can officials, dignitaries, or religious corporations, nor anyone, delegated by them, act in the same capacity.

PUBLIC OFFICE

Constitution of 1857, Art. 56—No member of the ecclesiastical body can be elected a congressman.

Law of Nov. 1874, Art. 58—Nominations for senator are subject to the same conditions as those for congressman.

PRESENT PERSECUTION BASED
ON CONSTITUTION OF 1917

President Cardenas of Mexico, on January 25th, 1935, issued a statement which was reiterated by the Mexican Embassy at Washington on January 31st. These statements said there is no religious persecution in Mexico. The same statement has been made by emissaries of the Government, scouting through our country for tourist traffic and for attendance at the Lions International and Rotary International Conventions which are to be held in Mexico City this year.

If the denial of the inalienable right of liberty of religious worship by its own citizens is not persecution, then what is it? By law, the Mexican Government prohibits training of students for the ministry; has closed and confiscated thousands of churches and has so limited the number of priests as to make religious worship practically impossible. By law, the Mexican Government confiscates at once and without the presentation of any further evidence any house or institution wherein a priest or minister has held any private religious service. The religious education of either children or adults

is prohibited. In denying the liberty of education, the Government has made mandatory the exclusion of the name of God from all schools, and made a necessary part of the curriculum the teaching of the tenets of the National Revolutionary Party. The Mexican Federal Government deprived the citizens within the Federal District of Mexico, numbering over one million Catholics, of the possibility of religious worship by reducing the number of priests therein to twenty-five. The Mexican Government has abetted and encouraged the different State governments to pursue this policy of persecution and by making public worship impossible, deprived the citizens of the exercise of the right to freedom of worship.

In 1926 after fifteen years of persecution, after all foreign priests had been expelled, it was estimated that there were 3,910 Catholic priests in Mexico, all Mexican citizens. The Catholic citizens of Mexico petitioned the National Congress stating that this number of priests was wholly inadequate in a nation of fifteen millions, more than ninety-five per cent of whom are officially recorded as Catholic. The Congress rejected that petition and State Legislatures were instructed to reduce further the number of priests.

LIBERTY OF WORSHIP DENIED

At present in Mexico by law no priest is allowed to minister in any way in fourteen of the thirty states and territories of Mexico. The Catho-

lics therein, numbering over six millions are persecuted and liberty of worship is denied them. Even when dying, they may not have the services of a priest. In the State of Oaxaca a population of more than a million Catholics is limited in its opportunity of religious worship, of receiving the sacraments, to one priest. In Durango a Catholic population of one million two hundred thousand, scattered over a region of nearly forty thousand square miles, with only primitive means of transportation, is limited in its opportunity of religious worship, of receiving the sacraments, to the services of two priests.

In the entire thirty States and Territories of Mexico a population of fifteen millions is limited by the laws of Mexico to the services of three hundred and thirty-four priests. Yet President Cardenas and the Mexican Embassy in the United States have the effrontry to state "there is no religious persecution in Mexico."

Among the provisions of the Constitution of 1917 affecting directly the question of religion, I wish to call attention to the following quoted in The outlook March 14, 1917, Vol. 115, No. 11, Page 455. You will note that the Catholic church is not singled out particularly, and that these Constitutional provisions apply alike to all religions:

"No religious corporations, no minister of any cult may establish or direct schools of primary instruction.

"Education shall be free but it shall be laical in the official educational in-

stitutions as in the primary, elementary and superior instruction given in the private schools.

"Private schools of primary instruction may be established only subject to official direction."

"In other words, both Catholic schools and instruction by priests and nuns, in any kind of schools are prohibited. Mexico, of course is a Catholic country.

"All church property passes at once to the nation. Many churches in Mexico are held by private citizens. These properties also pass to the nation.

Here from Article 130, is a grist of clerical reform:

"The power of intervention in the public worship belongs exclusively to the Federal powers.

"Congress may not dictate laws establishing or prohibiting any religion whatsoever.

"Marriage is a civil contract. This and other acts of the civil state of persons are the exclusive jurisdiction of the functionaries and authorities of the civil order, in the manner prescribed by the laws, and will have the force and validity that the same attribute to them.

"The law does not recognize any personality in the religious groups denominated churches.

"The ministers of the cults will be considered as persons who exercise a profession.

"The Legislatures of the States only will have the power to determine, according to the local necessities, the

maximum number of ministers of the cults.

"To exercise in Mexico the ministry of any cult it is necessary to be Mexican by birth." (Thus all the Spanish, French and Italian clericals in Mexico are barred; even American priests, Protestant ministers, and missionaries.)

"Ministers are forbidden to inherit property, to gather for political purposes, to take part in political gatherings, and to vote."

As evidence that the provisions of the Constitution of 1917 are being applied and made use of by the Government, I refer you to an Associated Press dispatch of June 23, 1934, which among other things, says:

"At Villa Hermosa in Tabasco, two widows and two girls were arrested and held in jail for ten hours because they had visited a cemetery and put flowers on the grave of the husband of one of the widows. They were finally released on the payment of fines. A recent decree by the Governor provided that all tombstones must be removed from cemeteries and all graves be without any sacred adornment or flowers."

General Calles, at Guadalajara in July, 1934, emphasized the view of the Revolutionary party toward the youth of Mexico. "They must" he said, "wrest youth from the claws of the clergy. The child and the youth belong to the community and it is the Revolution that has the obligation of doing away with prejudices and developing the new national soul. For

this reason I urge all the Governments in the Republic, all the authorities and all the revolutionary elements, that they go into whatever fields it may be necessary to go, because the child and the youth must belong to the Revolution." "America Vol. LI No. 19, Aug. 18, 1934" (Note especially these last four words, *Belong To The Revolution*; not even to the State as in Russia but to the dominant party—the Revolution.

There is no longer any doubt at all if there ever was any, that it is the determined design of General Calles and the military dictatorship of which he is the boss to crush out every vestige of religion from the Mexican people.

The campaign has proceeded with diabolical ruthlessness and singleness of purpose. Following the agreements made with the church, the attack shifted from the Federal Government to the States. There the number of priests allowed to function was reduced from time to time to a pitifully small number, utterly inadequate except for only a small fraction of the people, and finally in many states no priests at all are allowed. Then at the beginning of June, 1934, under the pretext that they were not being used (It was forbidden to use them) church after church was confiscated. From an official list before us, between June 2 and July 28 no less than twenty seven decrees were issued taking over as many properties. In the middle of this came the elections, and nothing but even darker days were

promised by the result, for the predestined candidate, General Cardenas, left no doubt of his desire to please the fanatical aims of his master, Calles. After the elections, Calles himself returned publicly to the scene and announced a program which was radically socialistic; the principal item of this program as stated above was that the child belongs to the Revolution.

FREEDOM OF EDUCATION ABOLISHED

"Calles made a speech at Cuernavaca in which he set forth the six-year plan which he designed for his creature, the new President. In the course of this speech, made in the name of his political party, which is a military camarilla, he announced his purpose of amending Article 3 of the Constitution which guarantees freedom of education, by abolishing that freedom and putting all education in the hands of his anti-religious party. He continued: "We must enter into and take possession of the minds of the children, the minds of the youth." What this meant was clear to everybody who heard him: the National Revolutionary party, dedicated openly to the destruction of all religion in Mexico, must possess even the souls of youth, as it now controls its bodies." *America* Vol. LI No. 21, September 1, 1934.

In its issue of August 11, 1934, the *Living Church*, an organ of the Protestant Episcopal Church, sounded an alarm against the new law that is

to be passed abolishing all private education whatsoever in which any religious training is given. Other representative journals of religious opinion according to Archbishop Curley, Baltimore, quoted by the Literary Digest on March 2, 1935, which have unanimously condemned the Mexican situation as a major scandal in world affairs are: "The Christian Century", "The Christian Science Monitor" "The American Hebrew" as well as Baptist, Presbyterian and Methodist publications.

Regarding the question of education in Mexico there is a very enlightening article on this subject in Volume 35, Number 4, April 1935, St. Francis Home Journal, by Hon. Dr. John Jos. Correll. Among other things he says:

"At the very beginning of the seventeenth century, Samuel Champlain, for whom Lake Champlain was named, declared that he was surprised beyond words at the beautiful buildings of a public character, official residences, cathedrals, churches, hospitals and universities he saw in Mexico.

Dr. Correll continues: "There were schools for Indians, that is trade schools and industrial schools that we would call technical schools, of many kinds. Every church, and even the poorer mission stations, had a school for Indians and besides being taught to read and write they were schooled in the art of using their eyes and hands. We have come to such schools here in America only in very recent times.

"The University of Mexico was established in 1551. The Spanish crown was so much interested in this enterprise that it allowed from the revenues of the Viceroy a sum of money, approximately two hundred thousand dollars, for the salaries of the professors. It is sometimes said that our own bluestocking Harvard was the first school established in America. The fact of the matter is Harvard was not founded until 1638. At this time, it was little better than a high school, and before the year 1700, had scarcely one hundred students and did not become a university until the nineteenth century. The University of Mexico became a full-fledged university within twenty-five years after its founding.

"In short, just eighty-three years before our proud and stately Harvard, was founded, Mexico had a university licensed to give baccalaureate degrees by the Spanish government. Two hundred years before Harvard had a school of Medicine, the University of Mexico had its medical college. Eighty-six years before Hunter opened the first school of dissection in England, Mexico had initiated the study of surgery and dissection. Humboldt, by no possible stretch of the imagination a friend of the Catholic church, was not one whit stingy with his praise of what he saw in Mexico when he visited it in 1808 for he wrote: "No city of the new continent, not even excepting those of the United States, can display such great scientific establishments as the capi-

tal of Mexico. Does this look like the Catholic church was "for centuries the greatest enemy of popular education?"

"One of the most interesting books on education in Mexico has been written by Professor Bourne, of Yale University, under the title, "Spain in America" In this book, Dr. Bourne has this to say relative to the educational development of Mexico during the sixteenth century: "Not all the institutions of learning founded in Mexico in the sixteenth century can be enumerated here, but it is not too much to say that in number, range of studies and standard of attainments by the faculties they surpassed anything existing in English-America until the nineteenth century." In effect Dr. Bourne tells us that education in Mexico was three hundred years ahead of education in English-America.

"Some idea of the growth of education and the thoroughness of the teachings of the Franciscan monks may be gathered from a letter of Geronimo Lopez to the King of Spain in which he bitterly complains that the clergy taught the Indians "all to faithfully and thoroughly even to the point of making them excellent writers and latinists." This was in 1540.

The claim has frequently been made, that the first book printed in America was the Massachusetts Bay Psalm Book printed in Boston in 1638. Fully a century earlier the La Escala Spiritual (The Spiritual Ladder) was printed in Mexico along with scores

of other books before the end of the sixteenth century. In 1570 the first medical book "Secretos de Chirúrgia" (Secrets of Surgery), printed in the New World appeared and by 1575 there were no less than 6 printing presses running in Mexico. From this we must conclude that the Mexican Indian could read, else why the printing presses?"

THE DANIELS INCIDENT

To the stupefaction of all Mexicans, Mr. Daniels on July 26, 1934, in the course of a speech on education, said this: "The spirit of the Mexico of today was clearly and succinctly stated last week in Guadalajara by General Calles in as brief a sentence as that employed by Jefferson decades ago. General Calles, speaking for the ear of all patriotic Mexicans, and particularly those entrusted with leadership, said: "We must enter in to and take possession of the mind of childhood, the mind of youth.' To the carrying out of that aim, which alone can give Mexico the high place envisioned by its statesmen, the Government is making the rural school a social institution."

"Now of two things, one is true: either Mr. Daniels knew what Calles meant, or he did not. If he did know, he was guilty of an unwarrantable interference in Mexican politics, on the side, too, of the anti-Christians. If he did not know, then he should not be in Mexico as our Ambassador. "America" Vol. LI, No 21, Sept 1, 1934.

What Calles meant by his words he made abundantly clear, and it is inconceivable that Mr. Daniels did not know what he meant. It was, and was known to be, the opening gun in a campaign to strike out of the Constitution the last vestiges of educational liberty, and to place all education whatsoever in the hands of the propagandists of his own radical revolutionary party. The doctrine consecrated by our own U. S. Supreme Court in the Oregon decision June 1, 1925, that the child belongs to the home and the family he calls a "selfish doctrine, because children and youth belong to the community, they belong to the collectivity, and it is the Revolution that has the inescapably duty to take possession of consciences, to drive out prejudices, and to form the new soul of the nation, children and the young must belong to the Revolution." This is indeed "the spirit of the Mexico of today," which Mr. Daniels lauded, that is, the spirit of those who tyrannize and make no secret of tyrannizing over the souls of the people and its young.

The plan to revise Article 3 of the Constitution so that education would be completely under the control of the ruling party, and exclude all possibility of any religious education, soon met with opposition. In the University of Mexico, which won its autonomy in 1933, after a series of violent revolts, the Mexican Federation of University Students adopted a resolution by a vote of 8 to 1, denouncing the proposed changes, on the ground

that they would again destroy academic freedom, and would substitute an obligatory doctrinaire Socialist education for the secular education now prevailing there. The resolution protests against "any attempt that may be made to subject the institution and its members to rules of thought and action not adopted freely by the University itself." The protest was concurred in by the Rector of the University himself.

PERSECUTION DEFINED

Quoting from "America" Vol. LI No. 23, September 15, 1934—"What are the people doing about it? The people, not the politicians. They are doing what devout Christians have done under similar conditions, in every age of the world. They are defying persecution, and prison, and banishment, and setting up secret altars where they gather to make their devotions. Sometimes, at untold hardships, they make long pilgrimages to places where they may worship openly in the churches without fear. It has been estimated that several thousand of those dusty, foot-sore pilgrims marched in the Corpus Christi procession at El Paso, Texas.

"For the most part worshipers at those hidden altars are unmolested, but once in a while a Judas collects his pay. The story is told of a young man, a frequenter of the cock-pit and the gambling room, who having a run of hard luck, cast about for some easy money, and remembering the

fifteen pesos paid to any informer who revealed the place of one of those secret altars, he led the law enforcement officers to the place and waited outside. He had to wait in order to collect his money. When he saw his mother slip out of the door into the clutches of an armed soldier he realized the enormity of what he had done, and went half mad with remorse. He fought with the soldiers until they had to knock him senseless and take him to jail also."

PRIESTS MUST MARRY

"In Yucatan a decree, not yet promulgated, has provided that for the entire State only three priests will be allowed; further, that these three must marry before they will be permitted to exercise their office. Catholics massed before government headquarters on September 26 to protest this decree and were shot at by policemen in plain clothes, and many were injured." *America*, Vol. LI, No 26, October 6, 1934.

CONFISCATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY

"On September 10, 1934, the Secretary of Hacienda reported to the Federal Congress on "the nationalization of the property of the clergy," giving the following figures: "238 preliminary investigations, 68 consignments to the Attorney General of the Republic, 1,102 judgment procedures, 58 occupations of rural and urban properties. "He also reported

that three churches "gave way to the widening of streets, and six were "disaffected to be used for Federal public service." At the same time there were increasing evidences of rifts within the Calles party, since the President-elect General Cardenas, apparently began to show himself too independent of party dictation, under the impression that he had been chosen by the whole people and not merely by his own dominant politico-military organization." *America* Vol. LI, No. 26, October 6, 1934.

In the diocese of Guadalajara alone twenty priests have laid down their lives for their Faith. Many other priests and Sisters have suffered imprisonment or death, or both, and the world will probably never even hear of their names. But others are taking their places constantly, and the Catholic Church has no intention of abandoning its rights before God of carrying religion to an oppressed people, any more than in the past it did it in Poland or Ireland." *America* Vol. LII, No. 1, October 13, 1934.

SOCIALIST EDUCATION IN MEXICO

"The proposed amendment to Article 3 of the Mexican Constitution was reported to the Chamber of Deputies on September 26. It stated that the education in all its types and grades belonged to the Federation, the State and the Municipalities, and that it "shall exclude all religious education." Education "shall be scientific and socialistic." Members of Religious

Orders or any one "directly or indirectly connected with the propagation of a religious creed shall not intervene in any form in the education here treated." The amendment, as well as eliminating religious education in public and private schools, also would give the State arbitrary control over private institutions without allowing the latter recourse to legal action. (If this is not persecution what is it?) On October 4, three persons were killed and eight wounded in Puebla in a demonstration against the closing of St. Teresa's Catholic school. The local government had decreed it State property. "America" Vol. LII, No. 2, October 20, 1934,

PERSECUTION CONTINUES

"It is not as if persecution in Mexico had just broken out anew; it has never ceased all these years. It is merely that in recent months it has put on greater intensity and ferocity, as the Mexican people itself has become aroused at ever-increasing exactions and tyrannies, Riots, followed by callous shooting by the police, have occurred all over the country fanned by student outbreaks over the determination to impose on all schools a system of education which the Government itself calls "Socialistic." These student demonstrations have no specifically Catholic character; they are a normal and natural revolt in favor of academic liberty. It was into the midst of this delicate situation that the nice old man who has

represented us in Mexico put his inept oar. The dominant military party which has the country by the throat proposed to amend Article 3 of the Constitution by making Socialistic Education by name compulsory in all schools. This is the famous Article 3 which begins: "Education is free, "pero" (which means "however") (These peros in the Constitution have long been the joke of the lawyer fraternity in Mexico.) This particular pero, like the others, of course, nullified the right guaranteed by the first clause, but it was proposed to go still further and put Socialism into the Constitution as a compulsory form of education.

An inconspicuous Associated Press dispatch of October 10, 1934, said: "Disregarding public opposition, the Chamber of Deputies voted unanimously in favor of amending Article 3 of the Constitution so as to make Socialistic education compulsory in all schools except the universities. The Senate is expected to act favorably shortly on the proposal."

This is the most deadly blow yet aimed at religion in Mexico. The physical property of the Church has been wrenched from it, often with violence and bloodshed. Now the souls of Mexicans will be possessed, as Calles boasted and Daniels echoed. Calles in his speech made it perfectly clear that by Socialism he meant atheism. He still possesses the army and so he still can make the country swallow his medicine. But it is in-

tolerable that he should have the support of our own country.

"In spite of continued opposition by the people, the Government expressed its determination to institute socialistic education in all secondary schools. The bill for this was passed by the Chamber of Deputies and sent to the Senate, where it was assured of approval. More than 10,000 persons paraded in Mexico City on October 12 in protest against the bill. Police using teargas bombs attacked the marchers, and more than 100 were injured.

Because of the many protests against Ambassador Daniels' speech endorsing the Mexican plan of education, Acting Secretary of State Phillips on October 17 telephoned him for a statement. Mr. Daniels said he had no idea his remarks could be interpreted as having any relation to controversial Mexican matters.—
"America" Vol. LII, No. 3, October 27, 1934.

This is a weak excuse for all the unfavorable comment caused by Mr. Daniels' ill timed and ill informed laudation of Calles's educational policies last July which led to a widespread demand for his recall as Ambassador to Mexico.

Did this protest cause him to abate his unfortunate attitude?

It did not, Mr. White's smoke screen to the contrary notwithstanding.

He first offered a lame excuse for his action. Then he took Senator Reynolds to make a laudatory speech to the Deputies in the very midst of

their vote to call on the President to expel all the Catholic Bishops. He saw Calles and after his visit gave out a statement acknowledging him as boss of Mexico then told the official paper he was glad to give this statement to it, "because it knew so well how to interpret the Revolution in Mexico." He then dined the Governor of Puebla on the very day that resolutions were being passed exalting that worthy as one who had most ruthlessly carried out the Anti-religious program.

Is this folly or is it malice?

HOW THE BRITISH REGARD DANIELS

From the London Tablet as quoted in the Josephium Weekly Vol. XXI, No 9, March 2, 1935:

"On this point, our opinion is that although trained diplomats ought not even once to offend against impartiality, we might overlook a single indiscretion just as we allow a dog one bite. But the Daniels intervention has been continuous. The sans-Dieu Mexican paper, El Nacional, might fairly be called a personal organ of Mr. Daniels, in which he encourages anti-Catholic decrees and activities. When the Chamber of Deputies approved the action of the Governor of Puebla in closing all the churches in that State, Mr. Daniels immediately and ostentatiously invited the Governor to luncheon. This old ambassador has also fawned upon Sr Garrido Canabal, the Red-Shirt Minister whose men shot down the Government's critics. An American, now in London, to whom

we have posed a question based on these facts, lamely replied that if Washington recalled Mr. Daniels just now, it would look like a surrender to the Catholics. We retorted that, in the eyes of good men, it would look still more like an assertion of necessary discipline, and a repudiation of anti-Catholic activities with which the United States ought to have no sympathy at all."

From an "A B C of Mexican Politics" by P. S. M. Ridland, I quote the following:

"To the uninitiated observer the political organization of Mexico shows a solid democratic facade which, in the orderly arrangement of the divers architectural elements, closely resembles that of the United States of America. Mexico is of course a Federal Republic, and the President, his Cabinet, the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Supreme Court, the State Governors and Legislatures are all there. The proportions are smaller, but in other respects the frontages are so much alike that whole parts might be interchanged without affecting the structures.

"The successive revolutionary administrations which have governed, or misgoverned, Mexico since 1917 point to the Constitution promulgated in the course of that year as their legal fountainhead. In other words, the Constitution of 1917 is, at the present moment, the fons et origo of authority in Mexico which professes to be a democratic country. Yet there is an

extremely curious thing about the Mexican Constitution. It is the work of a single party, the Revolutionary party. The revolutionaries had previously conquered the land by force of arms and Senor Carranza, who was at that time head of the Revolutionary party, solemnly decreed (September 14, 1916) that all its opponents should be rigorously excluded from the Constituent Congress which was to frame the Constitution. This was duly carried into execution, so that all the non-revolutionary elements simply had no say in the matter. Yet the Constitution purports to be a truly democratic document.

"As I have already pointed out the Mexican Congress is divided, like the American, into two houses, the Senado and the Camara de los Diputados, and the members are elected in similar fashion, nominally. Now, in accordance with Article 60 of the Constitution it is they who decide about new elections and the validity of the claims of their would be successors: moreover the same article lays down that this decision must be considered final. Of course it would all be quite acceptable if, in each particular case, the members limited themselves to elucidating the number of votes secured by rival candidates at the polling booths, and then admitted the man who had secured the highest number.

"But they do not. Votes in fact, are now about the last thing a Mexican needs if he wishes to be elected to Congress. It has been an accepted

principle in Mexican politics that, in every single case, the so called *criterio politico* should be applied to the claims of candidates. The *criterio politico* is a very mockery of the basic principle underlying any democratic regime since it simply means that, regardless of the number of votes secured, the candidate whose political views prove most acceptable to the party in power be immediately admitted, even if his rival really proved successful at the election.

“Let us take a concrete example. At the present moment it has to be entirely hypothetical, as for many a long year the non-revolutionary opposition has more wisely abstained from taking part in such farcial proceedings. Two candidates, A and B, stand for a given constituency. The constituency is almost entirely Catholic. A is also a Catholic: He secures 20,000 votes. B is a revolutionary and only secures 2,000. The case comes up for revision before the *Camara* which, by applying the *criterio politico* invalidates under any pretext, the 20,000 votes cast for A and declares B “legally” elected. B takes his seat and will, needless to say, vote in favor of all the anti-Catholic bills together with the rest of the members, many of whom have been previously “elected” in precisely the same fashion.

“One would think that the above ought to be more than sufficient to satiate the revolutionary appetite for unlimited power. But it is not. Although the revolutionaries have held

undisputed sway over Mexico ever since 1914 there have been serious rifts and divisions among them at different times. Unanimity, as regards the non-revolutionary opposition, had already been obtained by processes like that already described. But not many years ago the Obregon-Calles clique decided that it was necessary to secure uniformity as well. Hence the Partido Nacional Revolucionario, the National Revolutionary party which at present, under what one might call the "super-presidency" of Senor Calles (the president of the party is nominally a somewhat obscure politician by the name of Ramos) controls Congress and, in consequence, controls the whole nation.

"This control is so thorough that at the time of this writing every single Senator, every single diputado (with one solitary exception) every single State-Governor belongs to the P. N. R. as it is generally called. Its leaders discuss all bills at headquarters and then send them down perfunctorily to the Senate and the Camara for "legal" sanction: a minor matter, as the Senate and the Camara are little better than branch offices of the all-powerful P. N. R.

"The P. N. R. derives additional strength from the financial support given it, whether they will it or not, by all Government employes, regardless of category. Every person entering the service of the Administration is ipso facto enrolled as a member of the P. N. R. and he must surrender to it one day's pay if the month has

thirty-one days. The fee is deducted from his pay check by the Treasury Department without even consulting him; and the Treasury Department hands the moneys to the proper officer of the P. N. R. where it is applied to purposes specified by the leaders of the party who do not even go to the trouble of consulting the other members about it. This means millions a year spent in propaganda.

"These are the broad principles upon which the Mexican "democracy" rests at the present moment. When well-meaning journalists admonish us to be very careful about not wounding the sensibility of the Mexican people they must in fairness tell us precisely whom they mean by "the people." If they refer to the P. N. R. and consider it the people, I do not think one Mexican in ten thousand would agree with the definition.

"Any inquiry into the Mexican situation would be incomplete if it does not take into account everything that has been outlined above and fails to go very carefully into the question of whether, in upholding Senor Calles and his P. N. R. (which, whatever international theorists may say, is the practical outcome of recognition of the present Mexican Government), Americans are not proving false to the principles which lie at the base of their own Constitution."

Under the caption "Mexico Outlaws Religion," Robert H. Murray writing in the magazine "Today" Vol. 3, No. 25, April 13, 1935, says:

"Catholics say that their church, their religion, and their coreligionists in Mexico are being persecuted. The Mexican government insists with vehemence that they are not. I say they are. I say this as a Protestant, although admitting my hesitation to set myself up as an authority on Mexican affairs. I have spent twenty-five years there. If I could stretch out that period to half a century, possibly I might aspire to a title as an authority on what is going on there, speaking or writing as assuredly as the starry-eyed folk who ride into Mexico on a fifteen-day excursion ticket and emerge as experts and expounders, ready to write books and give lectures and interviews.

"I know that ruthless religious persecutions are in full swing. So do the Catholics. So do Plutarco Calles and his surrogates, the big, middle and little jacks in office of his factional Revolutionary government who are running things below the Rio Grande as they please and telling the world including the bewildered and distraught officials in our own Department of State, where to go if they don't like it.

.....The unbiased observer cannot believe that religion in general and the Catholic church in particular must be rigidly restricted or wholly destroyed in Mexico to enable the Mexican people to be "rescued" by the self-proclaimed Revolutionary "redeemers of the liberties and rights of the people."

The Revolutionary Constitution of 1917, Art. 24, provides:

"Every man is free to profess the religion of his choice and to practice the rituals, devotions or acts of the respective creed in the churches or in his home, providing they do not constitute a crime or an offense punishable by law."

"But is every man in Mexico free to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience "in the church or in his home"? He is not. Every official and violent means is being exerted by the government to prevent or discourage him from doing it. The manner in which this article of the Constitution is being applied by Calles and his agents makes it completely meaningless, the deadest of all the scores of dead letters that embellish the statute books of Mexico.

"Although the current persecution campaign is primarily directed against the Catholic Church it is in opposition to all churches, all creeds, all religion. The Catholics say that it is simply the product of anti-religious hatred on the part of those in power. Some of the non-Catholic observers assume that the persecution is the result of avarice on the part of officials who find it profitable."

I submit Mr. Murray's findings as fair and unbiased and certainly more authoritative than if they came from a writer with little or no actual experience in Mexico, or one with either personal or political interests at stake.

THE TEXT OF THE BORAH
RESOLUTION, JANUARY 31, 1935

Whereas serious anti-religious outbreaks have occurred in Mexico under the regime of the National Revolutionary party, and

Whereas the persecutions of Christians of all faiths now being practiced in Mexico have aroused indignation and protest throughout the civilized world, and,

Whereas American citizens of the Christian faiths have been outraged and reviled, their homes invaded, their civil rights abridged, and their lives placed in jeopardy; and

Whereas the vindictive anti-religious policy of the present Mexican government has arbitrarily and unwarrantably restricted the number of ministers, priests and rabbis permitted to officiate in some States within the boundaries of Mexico and has in other States entirely forbidden and prohibited the ordinary spiritual administration of clergymen of all creeds thus resulting in the complete denial of the rights of the people to practice the religion of their own choosing; and

Whereas it has been the national policy of the government and the dominant Revolutionary party of Mexico to discourage religious profession and obliterate religious worship; and

Whereas the present Mexican Government prohibits the time-honored practice of private religious instruction and education of children

and compels parents as an only alternative to ignorance to educate their children in schools teaching hostility to orthodox religion; and

Whereas such anti-religious activity in Mexico is contrary to the tradition of freedom of conscience and liberty of religious worship which are the cherished attributes of all civilized governments; and

Whereas many distinguished leaders of the Protestant, Jewish and Catholic faiths as well as outstanding religious and interdenominational organizations and societies have emphatically denounced and registered protest against such policies of the present government of Mexico; and

Whereas the government of Mexico has even encouraged an economic boycott against those sincerely professing and practicing the Christian religion; and

Whereas Christians are expelled from public office and driven from professions; and,

Whereas Christian residents of Mexico who complain of such intolerance are flagrantly mistreated and abused; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the Senate of the United State in Congress assembled deems it fitting and proper to protest the anti religious campaign and practices of the present rulers of Mexico; and that it views with the gravest concern such ruthless persecution of helpless men and women who have become the innocent

victims of anti-religious persecution; be it further

Resolved, that it strongly condemns the cruelties and brutalities that have accompanied the campaign of the present Mexican Government against the profession and practice of religious beliefs by our nationals of all religious faiths now domiciled in Mexico; and be it further

Resolved that it calls upon the government of Mexico in the name of humanity to cease denying fundamental and inalienable rights to those of our nationals who may be resident in Mexico, regardless of religious convictions; be it further

Resolved that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate or a subcommittee thereof be authorized to conduct hearings and receive such evidence as may be presented relating to religious persecution and anti-religious compulsion and agitation in Mexico for the purpose of determining the policy of the United States in reference to this vital problem and in that way we may best serve the cause of tolerance and religious freedom.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Seventy-fourth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise

the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The Mexican Embassy in a statement of January 31st, 1935, said:

"There is no religious persecution in Mexico. The resolution in regard to this matter which was presented at the senate today is probably due either to partial or incomplete information.

"Catholic clergymen, as well as those belonging to other faiths who have complied with the laws are exercising their ministry in Mexico City and throughout the republic without being molested in the least.' Please note the phrase "who have complied with the laws,' the trick loophole used by Calles and his tribe when cornered by facts which they cannot deny.

Representative William P. Conery, Jr., of Massachusetts, in a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives on February 8, 1935 said:

"I believe that the Honorable Joseph Daniels and other representa-

tives of the American Government in Mexico who for some unknown reason are cooperating with the tyrants of Mexico to enslave the Mexican people, should be summoned back to the United States and forced to tell the truth of the conditions which exist in that country at this time."

Representative Connery, continued: "The question may be pertinently asked, What right have we the people of the United States, or the Government of the United States, to interfere with what might seem to be entirely a Mexican domestic problem?"

"In the first place," he said "if we wish to be consistent, we have only to look back to the time of the Mexican revolution, to the agreement entered into by Mr. Lansing, the Secretary of State under President Wilson and the defacto Mexican Government, which was asking at that time recognition of the United States. The United States demanded as a condition precedent to recognition by this country that the Mexican Government should grant absolute freedom of worship to all of the Mexican people. To this the Mexican Government agreed without any reservation; it was not a question of interfering in the domestic affairs of Mexico; it was a question as to what liberty they should grant the Mexican people if they desired such recognition. Mr. Speaker, that agreement has been violated. In honor of ourselves, in behalf of the guaranty of liberty of

conscience which the Mexican Government agreed their people would always have if they secured the recognition of the American Government, it is the duty of Congress, the duty of the State Department, to notify the Mexican Government that they, having violated the agreement they made with the Government of the United States, we on our part, to be consistent, are forced to withdraw further recognition and to withdraw from that country any representatives we may have there."

In the New York World-Telegram, February 20, 1935, Frederick Vincent Williams said:

"They've taken God out of the sky down there, and you newspapers up here haven't heard about it.

He and Mrs. Williams have returned after investigating the surveillance the ruling regime enforces.

"A surveillance that would make your hair stand up if you knew about it," he explained.

"Here is how God stands in the town of Chihuahua. I was there, I was at the opening of school heard the children say, in salutation:

'Teacher, there is no God.'

"My child," the teacher said, "there never was any God."

That sort of data the former West Coast star reporter, hobo short story writer, has brought back, and this week he presented, at Washington, information to Senator William E. Borah and other Senators supporting the resolution for an investigation

of the Mexican situation to determine the propriety of severing diplomatic relations.

"In the heart of Mexico City," he said, "I saw one night 2,000 rebels gathered in a patio around the body of a comrade who had been killed by the soldiers. Agents for twenty-five blocks around guarded them against being found out. They had to pay tribute in secret to the martyr, and as his body lay on the catafalque, they knelt and chanted:

"Viva Christo Rey." (Long live Christ, the King.)

It is the Third Internationale of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that has thus made a Mass a secret rite, he said, and made school children raise their hands in pagan obedience.

"Russia has spent \$18,000,000 in communist propaganda down there," he said.

"Ammunition for the populace opposing the government has been coming in for months. It still is coming. There is going to be fighting that you haven't dreamed of.

"In fourteen of the twenty-eight states there are no priests allowed, or rabbis or Protestant ministers. The people will not stand it any longer than they have to wait for enough guns and bullets with which to arm and the order to go forward."

Speaking at a mass meeting of protest against the war upon religion in Mexico, Dr. Edward Lodge Curran of Brooklyn, New York, said:

"In the columns of the New York Times and Herald Tribune on Saturday, January 26, 1935, appeared certain statements given by Lazaro Cardenas, President of Mexico, during an interview with foreign correspondents in Mexico City,' Dr: Curran said: "Such statements, for the most part, were an insult to the intelligence of any informed correspondent and a tissue of historical and hysterical falsehoods.

"The President of Mexico was wrong when he said that the aims of the existing Constitution go no further than those that most of the advanced countries of Europe and America are seeking. If the Mexican President intended to include our own American Constitution in the category of those with which he dared compare the tyrannical and godless Constitution of Mexico, then he has insulted the American Constitution, the American Government and the American people, and our Federal Administration should demand an absolute and uncompromising apology.

"In the United States the Constitution is the safeguard of the rights of humanity. The American Constitution includes freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assemblage and freedom of religious worship. The Constitution of 1917, on the basis of which Mexico is governed or rather misgoverned today boldly and brazenly states that the Mexican people are to possess only

those rights which the Constitution itself is pleased to grant them. In other words the Mexican Constitution is supposed to be superior to humanity and to God.

“The President of Mexico was wrong again when he stated that ‘It is untrue that the Government, or any institution connected with it, persecutes citizens because they profess the Catholic or any other religion.’ A government that permits no more than 500 priests to minister to 14,000,000 Catholic Mexicans is a persecuting government. A government whose brutal soldiery has slain innocent people for harboring priests or for permitting religious services to take place in their homes, is a persecuting government. A government that refuses to allow the existence of private schools wherein religion may be taught is a persecuting government. A government that has confiscated all property ever devoted to religious purposes, whether owned by religious organizations or by private persons, and without compensation is a highway robber as well as a persecutor. A government that claims ownership of the conscience of children as well as of their teachers and text books and school buildings is a persecuting government.’ Our Sunday Visitor February 10th, 1935.

Washington, Feb. 27, 1935—(N. C.)
—Taking issue with statements attributed to Francisco Castillo Najera new ambassador of Mexico to the United States to press reports of a

few days ago. Representative John P. Higgins of Massachusetts declared that he, "as well as every other informed American," was surprised by remarks which signalled the arrival in Washington of the new Mexican ambassador. Representative Higgins letter tells Senor Najora in his statement, 'the agitation is outside Mexico not in Mexico is indeed startling to the American public which has been reading for months in the press reports from Mexico of the unspeakable religious persecution and the numerous murders of religious teachers and citizens of Mexico as well as the confiscation of religious property of all Christian denominations and the exiling of teachers of all religions.'

"Fairminded, unprejudiced witnesses who have been in Mexico more recently than you, declare under oath that men women and children are being persecuted pitilessly for conscience's sake, the letter continues Many Mexicans entirely loyal to their native land, are willing and anxious to testify to the murders, confiscations' and corruption that have disgraced the regime of the millionaire socialists who are exploiting Mexico.

"If, as you, Mr. Ambassador, claim Mexico is quiet, indifferent, why is the government press daily full of vicious attacks and slanders on the Christian clergy and laity? Why was it necessary for the government to organize anti-God demonstrations

and try to compel attendance of federal employes under penalty of dismissal? Why, within a few weeks were numerous internes in many hospitals in Mexico discharged for this refusal and thus restrained from continuing the training required for their profession? Why did nurses in government owned hospitals suffer the same fate? Is the ambassador from Mexico unaware that all the national press services in the United States carried this news and that it has never been officially denied?

"Incidentally, the new ambassador might explain why the government of France recently protested the closing of schools in Mexico conducted by French citizens. If you really believed what you have said, I challenge you to publish in the United States the solemn atheistic delaration which every teacher in Mexican schools (public and private, including American institutions) must take in order to hold his or her job. If you fail or refuse to acquaint the public with this oath I will supply the authentic text and again challenge you to deny it."

The pledge required of every teacher in the State of Yucantan when being appointed to teach in an official school referred to by Representative Higgins is as follows:

I....., before the board of federal education, solemnly declare without reservation of any sort, the program of the Socialistic school and to be a propagator and defender

of it, I declare myself an atheist, and irreconcilable enemy of the Roman Apostolic Catholic religion and that I shall strive vigorously to destroy it, ridding the conscience of all religious beliefs and being ready to fight against the clergy in the field whenever this may be necessary. I declare myself to be ready to take a principal part in the campaign for the defanaticization and to attack the Catholic Apostolic and Roman religion wherever there is need shown. I also declare that I will not permit in my residence religious practices of any sort, nor will I permit the existence of images; nor will I permit any member of my family under my control to be present at any act of religious character."

Mexico City Correspondent, N. C., Feb. 28, 1935.—The theory advanced by General Calles in his speech at Guadalajara on July 19, 1934, in which, assailing the church he proclaimed we must now enter into and take possession of the consciences of the children, of the consciences of the young, because they belong and should belong to the Revolution." has become more tangible with the recent dissemination in Mexico City of a circular urging children to despise and hate their parents, and the pledge required by teachers in the official schools of Yucatan.

GHASTLY LENGTHS

Since the announcement by President Cardenas that all propaganda re-

garding Socialistic education and other features is to be directed by the executive of the six-year plan committee of the National Revolutionary party, the Bloc of Revolutionary Youths has come into existence. Since this circular has to do with Socialistic education, and has not been repudiated by the National Revolutionary party, it is assumed that this party has gone to ghastly lengths—that of advising children to despise and hate their parents and to deprive them of that most natural devotion, filial love.

In reproducing the circular in its issue of February 14, Omega carried a black-faced banner headline: "Fails to Counsel 'Kill Your Parents' in Order to Round Out the Liberator's Decalogue."

The handbill, addressed to "Child or Youth," says:

"If your tyrannical parents prevent your attendance at the schools that the Revolution has prepared for you, despise them. Neither favor nor gratitude is due them, for you were not the fruit of suffering but of vile pleasure. They want to keep you always in the fanatical and egotistic darkness of their despotic care: they want you to follow like an abject slave their stupid caprices as they did those of their retrograde ancestors; hate them.

"Look over the schools of your town and you will find in them many children or youths like yourself who have obtained complete liberation from those called parents. Take an example from us who have succeeded in de-

stroying the brutal and inhuman yoke of our exploiters, our progenitors, and of those hypocrites, the pastors. Your parents and your pastors have been allied in oppressing and exploiting you. Unite with the Revolutionary teachers in our schools and they, with their Socialistic orientation, will teach you to be free. The schools are crowded with children and youth who hunger and thirst for proletarian justice. "Do not remain behind the times: break the bestial yoke of your so-called father or your so-called mother and hasten to join with your free companions who, in the schools of the revolution, are making common cause with their protectors, the socialistic teachers."

FREEDOM OF PRESS

"The President of the republic has promulgated a decree changing the laws on the general means of communication so that use of the mails will be prohibited to correspondence that involves the propagation or diffusion of any religious doctrine. President Cardenas has issued this decree by virtue of "extraordinary faculties granted the executive by congress by decree of Dec. 29, 1933," although the presidential decree is in violation of article 25 of the constitution of 1917, which says: "Correspondence which under cover, circulate through the mails shall be free from search, and its violation shall be punishable by

law."—The Denver Register, Marsh 3, 1935.

The new decree has been issued because "one of the "ideological tendencies of the present government is to combat fanaticism and religious prejudices by all legitimate means, with the firm purpose of carrying out the spiritual liberation of the people," and "to accomplish this object it is proper to dictate all those methods of a legal character which tend to facilitate free governmental action."

"For these reasons," the decree says, "it is requisite to amend the dispositions relative to the law on general modes of communication so as to prevent the acceptance or circulation in the mail of publications, printed matter, and correspondence in general which involves the propagation or diffusion of any religious creed. Since the mail is one of the most powerful auxiliaries in the work of spreading culture, it would be unsatisfactory to allow the use of this public service for the traffic of ideas contrary to the desired cultural development."

El Universal, a Mexican newspaper, in its issue of Feb. 16, 1935, attacked the constitutionality of the decree which requires an "irregular explanation whether it is considered from the legal viewpoint, or from the social or purely administrative."

The journal cites article 6 of the constitution, which provides:

"The expression of ideas shall not be the subject of any judicial or executive investigation, unless it offend

good morals; impair the rights of the third parties, incite to crime, or cause a breach of peace." This wording is retained from the constitution of 1857 in that of 1917.

Article 7, El Universal points out, provides that "freedom of writing and publishing writings on any subject is inviolable. No law or authority shall have the right to establish censorship, require bond from authors or printers, nor restrict the liberty of the press, which shall be limited only by the respect due to private life, morals, and public peace." To say what publications shall or shall not be circulated by mail, El Universal remarks, is equivalent to censorship and violates the freedom of writing and publishing writings." But, what is a constitution between friends?

PRIESTS HUNTED, JAILED IN MEXICO

El Paso.—Specific instances of the persecution of religion in Mexico are furnished in affidavits of three priests now resident here and the contents of a letter sent to a Mexican layman by a municipal president in the state of Chihuahua forbidding religious teaching "either in the temple or in private homes."

The letter, signed by Alfredo Elias, municipal president of Rosales, Chihuahua, was sent to a citizen of Rosales whose son is an official of a Catholic organization. It said:

"I take the liberty to advise you that superior authorities have com-

municated to this presidency that it is prohibited to give religious or doctrinal teaching in view of the fact that it constitutes a violation of article 3 of the general constitution of the republic. Religious doctrine cannot be taught either in the temple or in private homes.

"As you probably have some person in your family who is participating in such acts, I would appreciate that you take the necessary steps to refrain from doing so in order that I may not be forced to punish the infraction and assess the corresponding punishment."—The Denver Register, March 3, 1935.

One of the priests, the Rev. Arturo Balderrama, has made affidavit to the persecution to which he was subjected. As pastor of the Church of the Sacred Heart at Madera, Chihuahua, he was informed by the landlord of the house in which he was residing that the latter had been directed to "tell Father Balderrama to leave this town, as I understand there is an official committee from the central government of Chihuahua coming here to investigate and see if a Catholic priest is practicing his ministry." The message, Father Balderrama's affidavit says, came from the municipal president. This was about June 4, 1934.

The priest then went to Matachic, a mission of Madera, where, he says, he ceased practicing his ministry, as it was forbidden there by law. "I had been in Matachic three or four days," he continues, "when I received a let-

ter from the presidente municipal, asking me to come to his office. I answered his call immediately, and he personally told me: 'I have been advised that you have been administering here and you have therefore violated the law, and I want you to leave this jurisdiction immediately.' He added: 'I have strict orders from the central government in Chihuahua that we be on the watch for priests and not to allow priests here.' I then returned to Madera."

He then went to another mission, where he received information that Jose Blanco, municipal president of La Junta, had gone to Guerrero City to place a complaint against him, charging that Father Balderrama had been administering in the mission of Basuchil. The priest then fled to Chihuahua City.

"From about the middle of September, 1932, to Nov. 19, 1934, when I crossed to the United States," Father Balderrama said, "life was unbearable and miserable. I was always hounded and watched, so I decided to come to the United States as a refugee."—Denver Register, March 3rd, 1935.

And yet we are told there is no persecution of religion in Mexico. These few instances can be multiplied by the hundreds and thousands, even from the meager information which trickles past the censors out of Mexico. But, if the whole truth could be learned concerning the inhuman butchery going on at our very door, it would make our government withdraw

its recognition or insist upon the original conditions of recognition being observed.

From the *Houston Chronicle* we quote an interview by M. E. Walter with Portes Gil, until recently, Attorney General of Mexico) who told him a man could wear a Roman Collar in Mexico and that the Catholic Church could conduct seminaries there to train future priests. Walter continues:

"That evening I had dinner with a group of foreign correspondents and, of course, described the talk I had had with Mr. Gil.

"They laughed raucously.

"'He said any priest could walk on the streets wearing a clerical collar?' they asked.

"'Yes,' I answered.

"'Well here is 100 pesos that you can't turn your collar around and go two blocks without landing in the jug.'

"'How about the seminaries?' I asked.

"'There are none,' they all answered. 'They may not be specifically forbidden but they would come under the heading of a private school and you can't operate a private school without a government permit. Just try and get a permit for a seminary. Furthermore, if you operated one without a permit the property would be subject to confiscation by the government since it would be used for religious purposes. You can be sure of one thing. There isn't a seminary running in the country.'"

A PROMINENT BUSINESS MAN'S VIEW

The next man I talked with was a prominent business man and incidentally a Mason.

"Conditions in Mexico today are a crying shame," he declared. "The government does not have even 10 per cent of the people behind it. But what can the masses do. They are unarmed and a thousand men can do little before a couple of well armed soldiers. If one military leader ever threw his weight to the other side the whole government in Mexico City would flee before the revolters got within 100 miles of the place.

"FORCE OF ARMS"

"I am not a Catholic, but I think it is a disgrace the way a small minority has been able to oppress them."

"How is such a small minority able to hold control?" I asked.

"By force of arms. They have a garrison in every city. Any revolt that might start would be nipped in the bud. And the United States is behind the government.

"So long as it refuses to allow anyone except the government to buy arms and ammunition it is actually supporting the government and should feel responsible for its acts."

"How about elections Can't the opposition party do something in them?"

"The elections are conducted by the revolutionary party. They count the

votes. That ought to answer your question," he replied.

"The American ambassador here is a nice kind old man, but he doesn't know what it's all about. He likes to make everyone happy so he pats everyone on the back that comes to see him and agrees with anything he says."

NINETY PER CENT CATHOLIC

"But is it true that 90 per cent of the population is Catholic? Are they actually Catholics or only Catholics in name?"

"They are Catholics. After the conquest many Indians were taken into the Church that were not adequately instructed. They were Christians in name but pagans in reality. But the missionaries finally got them instructed. This talk you hear back in the States about the Indian being a pagan in reality while professing to be a Christian is all bunk."

"What do you consider the biggest mistakes the Church has made in the last few years? Say in the last half a century. Since the government is so bitter against it there must be some reason?"

The man thought for a moment with a puzzled frown on his face.

"I can't think of any," he finally said. "That is, I can't think of anything that would be a mistake in a free country. It's true that when a government official would stand up and announce that he was an atheist

and that he did not believe in God or religion some priest or bishop would condemn him. And when some other official would stand up and say that a country can not exist without religion, that civilization is impossible without the restraints of religion, some bishop or priest would praise him. That was probably a mistake down here. But it would not be in the United States or any free country."

CHURCH LEADERSHIP

"What about the leadership in the Church?" I asked.

"Most of the bishops have been exiled or expelled from their dioceses.

"However, Archbishop Diaz has been able to hold on and the fact that he is still in Mexico shows he is a politician of no small merit. Diaz is a full blooded Indian, but he is a highly educated, a cultured gentleman and a real Mexican. He has done a great deal to keep down revolt. He has appealed to his followers to resort to legal methods only and not allow the country to go through the horrors of a civil war.

The curse of Mexico is its passion for experimenting with government. Every president we have had since Porfirio Diaz has been a little more radical. Everyone has had to try out something new.

"Maybe that is our hope. I can't imagine them stopping their experimenting and it seems that they have gone about as far in radicalism as

they can go. Maybe the next experiments will be in conservatism."

REAL "IRON MAN"

"Is Calles really the iron man of Mexico?"

"No question about it. The rest of the party follows him like a bunch of sheep. If he were to take a rosary in his hand and start out tomorrow on a pilgrimage to Guadalupe, before he got there every member of the government would be following on his heels trying to look sanctimonious."

"Why is he so bitter against religion?"

"I don't know. Nobody knows. And nobody knows what are his real sentiments. Maybe all this anti-religion campaign is just for political effect. Maybe it's being done to hold his party together. So long as there is bitter opposition, they have to stick together. If that fear died down they would begin trying to cut each other's throats.

"Calles was a Catholic, but he left the Church to become a Mason, and he is as poor a Mason as a Catholic. Masons are required to believe in a God. He professes atheism.

"When he went to the States for his operation (last fall) he went to a Catholic hospital and insisted on having the Sisters take care of him. Yet back here no hospital can be operated by a religious denomination and no woman may become a nun.

GRANDCHILD CATHOLIC

"When his grandchild was baptized a Catholic he was its godfather.

"Yet he is behind the educational laws that require children to be given atheistical training."

This sketch of conditions in Mexico has been prepared in order to give publicity to the little known facts about that unfortunate country. The secular press for the most part has been silent even in the face of most horrifying conditions. By its silence, it has lent comfort to the enemy, which it may some day regret. Soviet Russia is backing the anti-religious campaign in Mexico and has already announced that the United States is next in line after the complete overthrow of religion in Mexico. She has long been active in our Colleges and Universities and has made alarming gains in producing a generation of radical socialists among our intellectuals who will be the leaders of tomorrow and willing tools of Russia when the command to revolt is given. This is not a vague dream nor is it the wild imagination of an alarmist, but a simple warning based on incontrovertible evidence of the activities of the most diabolical organization, the "Third Internationale", the world has ever known.

The result of the recent Literary Digest Poll, showing nearly 17% of 112,200 students of our Universities and Colleges who answered the questionnaire, as stating that they would

not bear arms for their country even if our borders were invaded, is evidence to me that that 17% are already Communists. Think it over.

H. J. THOLEN.

May 1st, 1935.

