

ATTITUDES TOWARD RELIGIOUS PLURALISM PRECEDING THE RESTORATION OF THE GOSPEL

David A. Pigott—Department of History

Editor's note: With a few alterations, the following was presented at the Sperry Symposium at BYU–Provo on 31 October 2004.

Considering the widespread religious intolerance and intense persecution during the formative years of the LDS Church, many may be surprised to learn that the United States in the early 1800s was a religiously tolerant place. The restoration of the gospel occurred at the dawn of an era when most people agreed that religious pluralism was a positive attribute to an increasingly complex society. Indeed, the increasing complexity of society led to the mandatory acceptance of religious toleration, making the United States in the early nineteenth century the most religiously diverse and tolerant nation on earth.

However, the widespread acceptance of religious toleration as a civic virtue is a relatively modern development. Barely two generations before Joseph Smith's first vision, religious toleration was the exception rather than the norm among the vast majority of Christians—both in America and in Europe, where the idea of toleration among a growing number of Christian faiths began.

Religious toleration is so fundamental to our own culture and so necessary to peace abroad, and yet few understand its precarious origins and the innumerable sacrifices made to contribute to its eventual acceptance. Nor do we fully understand the ideas of toleration within the context of the restored gospel.

The most striking reason for the widespread level of religious toleration in America around the time of Joseph Smith was the First Amendment, written by the founding fathers of the Constitution who, as we know through modern revelation, received divine inspiration in creating this nation: “And for this purpose have I established the Constitution of this land by the hands of wise men, whom I raised up unto this purpose” (Doctrine and Covenants 101:80). Men such as Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, and many others learned from and built upon liberal ideas percolating in Europe, specifically France and England, which argued for equality before the law, an end to feudal privilege, religious toleration, and the need for a secular government detached from religious affinity. It is the intention of this essay to sketch the gradual acceptance of religious toleration, and some of the major ideas that influenced these inspired men and others like them.

The widespread acceptance of religious toleration as a civic virtue is a relatively modern development.

Religious toleration today does not have the same meaning it did 500 (or especially 1500) years ago. Today it connotes a type of noble compassion, an acknowledgement of nonessential differences allowed to exist for the sake of civility: “to bear or endure; to nourish, sustain or preserve.”¹ This modern definition of toleration was only widely accepted in the late 1700s. Originally possessing negative connotations, the concept developed a more positive meaning in order to maintain social unity, at the expense of religious unity that had been shattered in the previous two centuries. Toleration had an ambiguous and indeterminable definition throughout the Middle Ages.

The medieval precept expressed by Pope Stephen V in 817 summed up the general mentality throughout the Middle Ages: *quaedum tolerantur, non imperantur* (whatsoever is tolerated, is not ruled).² Much as in the medieval tradition, centuries later during the Protestant Reformation, religious toleration was seen as a form of weakness and as tacit approval for illicit actions, or as religious historian Elisabeth Labrousse asserts, “a distasteful habit of lax complacency.”³

A consistent theme in studying the development of religious toleration within Christianity was the tendency for those institutions holding predominant power (either religious or political) to exercise prejudice towards dissenting ideologies. This tradition received imperial support when Emperor Constantine empowered Catholic bishops with judicial authority at the council of Nicaea (325 AD). From this point onward a pattern of intolerance can be discerned toward dissenting beliefs—especially within Christianity, but later targeted also toward non-Christians.⁴

This tradition continued largely unabated throughout the Middle Ages where persecution of dissident faiths, or alternative interpretations of scripture, was common. Among other methods of coercion for the sake of political and social unity, the various crusades against rival forms of Christianity in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries and the Inquisition (both Roman and Spanish) were established.

The situation changed, however, during the Reformation as new ideas—and the religions they spawned—became so widespread that resources proved insufficient to suppress them any longer. During the Protestant Reformation, attempts were frequently made to mitigate the growing hostilities between Protestants and Catholics by offering some form of legitimacy to the upstart religions, such as the Peace of Augsburg (1555), and later the Peace of Westphalia (1648), ending the Thirty Years’ War. However, these treaties proved more political truces, rather than long-term solutions to the problem of tolerating a minority religion, and hostilities resumed.⁵ This pattern was broken only after the Protestant Reformation proved too formidable an adversary, one which medieval Christianity could not overpower.

**From this point
onward a pattern of
intolerance can be
discerned toward
dissenting beliefs.**

Central to the development of religious toleration was the rise of secular governments, which were weary of the violence and destruction attached to religious dogmatism. Indeed, no such thing as religious liberty existed until Colonial America—and only then in the colony of Rhode Island established by Roger Williams, who insisted on the distinct separation of Church and State. Williams was cast out of the Massachusetts Bay Colony and labeled an atheist for his desire to take God out of government.⁶

Religious freedom was the primary reason behind the Mayflower expedition to the New World. True to the pattern mentioned above, once these freedoms had been attained through the establishment of a state church hierarchy, the Pilgrims promptly denied the same freedoms to those Europeans who followed, unless they were of the same religion.⁷ Nathaniel Ward, a pastor in the early years of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, proudly declared the general mentality of the American settlers of the seventeenth century: “God does nowhere in his world tolerate Christian states to give toleration to such aversaries [sic] of his truth, if they have power in their hands to suppress them.”⁸

Such was the general attitude toward religious diversity in a land destined to serve as a beacon to future nations on toleration and freedom. Each colonial government was closely linked to the majority religion which had founded it: Anglicanism in Virginia; Dutch Reformed in New York; Catholicism in Maryland; Congregationalism in Massachusetts, etc. Other than Rhode Island, only Pennsylvania showed any tolerance for immigrants of different faiths, as it was not linked to a state-owned church.⁹ Throughout most of the colonies, Catholics were particularly discriminated against. Indeed, the Massachusetts Bay Colony statute of 1647 specifically targeted Jesuits, priests, and missionaries to be “treated as ‘an enemy to the true Christian religion.’”¹⁰

Where did the Puritans who settled this continent get these ideas that tolerance was something to be avoided at all costs? From their homelands in Europe. We will begin here with the development of toleration theories stemming from the Protestant Reformation.

One of the earliest figures to understand the importance of religious toleration to the stability of society was the great humanist, Sir Thomas More. In his *Utopia* (1516) More described a land where “everyone was free to practise [sic] what religion he liked, and to try and convert other people to his own faith, provided he did it quietly and politely, by rational argument.”¹¹ More wrote *Utopia* just before society was torn apart in consequence of the actions of Martin Luther. More remained a devout Catholic his entire life and should not be considered a reformer, *per se*. However, his *Utopia* contains many elements of religious toleration and moderation that would later influence modern theorists on the subject.

Once these freedoms had been attained through the establishment of a state church hierarchy, the Pilgrims promptly denied the same freedoms to those Europeans who followed, unless they were of the same religion.

**Religious toleration
in the “Land of
Nowhere” (utopia)
stood in stark
contrast to the
long-held tradition
of religious
intolerance and
persecution of
medieval Europe.**

Religious toleration in the “Land of Nowhere” (utopia) stood in stark contrast to the long-held tradition of religious intolerance and persecution of medieval Europe. Although generally intolerant of dissenting religious beliefs and stalwart in his attempts to prevent Henry VIII’s Anglican Church from developing, Thomas More turned out to be one of the many “great religious reformers [who] began to throw off the rituals and dogmas that had been attached to Christianity during the dark ages and sought to return to the pure and simple truths of the New Testament” as Elder L. Tom Perry reminds us.¹²

Another of these was Desiderius Erasmus, who, in an attempt to return society to true Christian worship, devoted his luminous career to “opposing violence and fanaticism of any kind.”¹³ Writing to a colleague about the endemic violence erupting from Luther’s movement, Erasmus emphasized the need for continued vigilance in the pursuit of truth, “not by taunts and threats, not by force of arms and injustice, but by simple discretion...by gentleness and tolerance.”¹⁴ Erasmus’s most famous work, *The Praise of Folly* (1509), offered a satirical look at humanity’s weaknesses, in this selection poking particular fun at the many eccentricities that had crept into the various monastic orders while at the same time reminding the reader how far off course the current form of Christianity had deviated:

One monk will point to his paunch, distended by eating every conceivable variety of fish; another will pour forth psalms by the bushel. Another will number up his myriads of fasts, and account for his bursting belly by the fact that he eats only one meal at midday. Another points to his huge pile of ceremonies performed, so many they couldn’t be laden on seven naval transports. Another brags that for sixty years he has never touched money except with fingers protected by two pairs of gloves. Still another wears a cowl so dirty and slimy that no sailor would let it touch his body. Another boasts that for more than half a century he has led the life of a sponge, always fixed to the same spot... But Christ, interrupting their boasts (which otherwise would never end) will ask, “Where did this new race of Jews come from? I recognize no law but my own, and about it I hear nothing whatever. Long ago, speaking openly and using no intricate parables, I promised that my father’s kingdom would be granted, not to cowls, prayers, or fasts, but to works of faith and charity.”¹⁵

Sadly, Erasmus’s message of reform within Catholicism often fell on deaf ears, and he became embroiled in the religious controversies that shook European life to its very foundations. An early supporter of Martin Luther’s actions in Germany, Erasmus saw Luther become increasingly dogmatic and intolerant toward differing interpretations of Scripture. As a result, Erasmus distanced himself from the German reformer and

father of the Reformation and remained wholly devoted to changing Christian devotion from within the Catholic Church.

Usually, when one thinks of the great leaders of the Reformation, Martin Luther and John Calvin are the first to come to mind. Ironically, mature leaders of the two most powerful Protestant movements (Lutheranism and Calvinism), both Luther and Calvin, proved just as intolerant—and in the case of Calvin, perhaps more so—as the Catholic Church had been toward their reforms. Early in Luther’s career as a reformer, his attitude toward heretics was mild, condemning the killing of heretics to solve the problem of discord—he was, after all, a heretic himself in the eyes of the Catholic Church. Indeed, in 1523 Luther argued that no authority, other than God himself, can hold sway over a man’s beliefs: “Since, then, belief or unbelief is a matter of everyone’s conscience; and since this is no lessening of the secular power, the latter should be content and attend to its own affairs and permit men to believe one thing or another, as they are able and willing, and constrain no one by force.”¹⁶

This and similar references to the separation of the secular from the religious have led many to interpret in Luther the seedlings of the eventual separation of church and state, and he did remain consistent on his views that no authority can force a person to believe what that person does not want to believe voluntarily. However, for Luther, the freedom afforded the Christian was purely spiritual. Put bluntly, one could believe anything but could not act on those beliefs unless they were consistent with societal, political, and religious conventions.

Luther’s early views on the role of secular authority contrast sharply with his later writings after his movement had taken shape and he had plenty of support by the German nobility in his struggle against Rome. Shortly after Luther had witnessed the violent uprisings in Germany (after 1524) following his official break with Rome and the many sects that followed his lead and formed their own communities (specifically the Anabaptists), his attitude toward religious dissenters echoed that of his Catholic rivals.

Due to continued frustrations at establishing the kingdom of God on earth, by 1536 Luther insisted in his typically vitriolic tone that “secular authority is held to reprimand blasphemy, false doctrines, and heresy, and to inflict corporal pain on those who support such.”¹⁷ We should not read too much into Luther’s refusal to condone a religiously pluralistic society. As a product of feudal Germany, Luther still retained the medieval concept that Christian society must be unified—that the Christian princes of Western Europe held a fundamental obligation to uphold the Christian faith, naturally as Luther interpreted how that faith should be practiced. With few exceptions the rest of Europe generally agreed. The separation of church and state, a value held dear today, was inconceivable. The idea

Luther’s early views on the role of secular authority contrast sharply with his later writings after his movement had taken shape and he had plenty of support by the German nobility in his struggle against Rome.

of religious coexistence, that one could be a subject of the sovereign and still be of a different religion, was considered too radical a notion for the vast majority of sixteenth-century society. With few exceptions the vast majority of Protestants, themselves a product of Catholicism in more ways than not, enforced conformity on their various members just as Catholics had done for centuries previously.

Just as the Saints in the early years of the Restored Church, so too, persecuted sects of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries interpreted the intolerance toward their beliefs as a sign of election. The New Testament is replete with the Lord's description of persecution being a hallmark of the true church: "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you" (Luke 6: 22); "And ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake" (Mark 13: 13; Luke 21: 17, etc.). What is alarming compared to the persecutions inflicted on members of the Restored Church in the midnineteenth century was that the Reformation churches tended to return the abuse in kind—hatred for hatred, resentment for resentment—against the Catholic Church trying to stem the tide of religious change as well as with breakaway sects from within Protestantism. Nephi saw this era in his vision of "the great and abominable church which slayeth the saints of God" (1 Nephi 13: 5).

There were during these times of trouble, however, a few calmer minds who felt that even the Church had no right passing judgment on a man's conscience; only Christ personally held that power. One of the earliest defenders of man's inherent right to "the privilege of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of [his] own conscience," as we read in the eleventh Article of Faith, was Sebastien Castellio, a man of great historical significance when studying the development of religious toleration. The life of Castellio (1515-1563) is inseparably linked to that of John Calvin, the great father of the Reformation then occurring in Geneva, which within a few decades spread to France, the Netherlands, Scotland, and finally to America under the Puritans.

Castellio gained some acclaim in his attack of the methods Calvin used to govern in Geneva, organized in such a way that it functioned as a theocracy, with Calvin at its head. (Rival Catholics across the border in France called Calvin the Pope of Geneva.) In 1553 Calvin ordered the execution of Michael Servetus, with whom Calvin had corresponded for years. Servetus was extremely outspoken in his beliefs, doubting the divinity of Christ, the relationship between Him and the Father, as well as other heresies. For these beliefs, the last few years of Servetus' life were spent fleeing the Inquisition, living in secret as he was pursued by both Protestant and Catholic authorities alike. He passed through Geneva on his way to seeking refuge in Italy, only to be recognized, imprisoned, tried, and executed by being burned at the stake at Calvin's order.¹⁸

**For these beliefs,
the last few years
of Servetus's life
were spent fleeing
the Inquisition,
living in secret as
he was pursued by
both Protestant
and Catholic
authorities alike.**

Immediately following Servetus's painful death, Castellio published an attack on the methods used to convict him, accusing Calvin's church, and all religions, of participating in a thousand years of hypocrisy and intolerance, correctly noting that after the pagans stopped persecuting Christians in the Roman era, the Christians, emboldened by imperial support, began to persecute pagans and other Christians; the tradition had only worsened since the Reformation:

I can discover no more than this, that we regard those as heretics with whom we disagree. This is evident from the fact that today there is scarcely one of our innumerable sects that does not look upon the rest as heretics, so that if you are orthodox in one city or region, you are held for a heretic in the next.¹⁹

A consistent theme throughout Castellio's refutation of Calvin was that all people believe in the truth of their religion and that one's beliefs are personal, as are the interpretation of scripture. Joseph Smith took a similar stance in the heat of severe persecutions against him when he declared: "If any man is authorized to take away my life because he thinks and says I am a false teacher, then, upon the same principle, we should be justified in taking away the life of every false teacher, and where would be the end of blood?"²⁰

Castellio concluded his tract against Calvin by asserting that constraint in religion forces people to pretend to believe so as to avoid public condemnation and that the Lord hated hypocrisy more than any of man's vices. In a time when priesthood authority was taken from the earth and men and women were left to search for the truth using only their limited understanding of scripture, Castellio advocated charity and tolerance in the name of peace. In this respect he anticipated our modern governments.

In our modern and "enlightened" society, Castellio's ideas seem obvious, even puerile. However, put in a sixteenth century context, his views on toleration were revolutionary. His idea that a person's religion did not necessarily infringe upon his loyalty as subject to the king had a great influence on future mediators in the widening religious conflict, especially in France, which had experienced nearly forty years of continuous religious bloodshed, beginning in 1562. Shortly before these Wars of Religion in France, the small minority of religious moderates known as the *politiques* and led by Chancellor Michel de l'Hôpital, realized that what was at stake with the Huguenots' (French Calvinists) insistence on worshiping freely was "not a question of constituting a religion, but of constituting a republic; and some can be citizens without being [Catholics]: even the excommunicate do not cease to be citizens."²¹ L'Hôpital's ability to separate religion from government anticipated the *philosophes* of the Enlightenment by over two centuries!

**In a time when
priesthood
authority was taken
from the earth and
men and women
were left to search
for the truth using
only their limited
understanding of
scripture, Castellio
advocated charity
and tolerance in
the name of peace.**

**The French Wars
of Religion lasted
nearly 40 years
and devastated
Europe's most
powerful kingdom.**

The French Wars of Religion lasted nearly 40 years and devastated Europe's most powerful kingdom. Hostilities temporarily ended at the signing of the Edict of Nantes (1598), allowing limited toleration of the estimated one million Huguenots (French Calvinists) living in France.²² The Edict of Nantes was relatively short-lived and was revoked under the absolutist rule of Louis XIV in 1685 for the sake of religious and political unity. Huguenot ministers were given the choice of exile or death; laypeople were required to convert to the French Catholic Church (often at gunpoint) or die for their faith. Virtually all did so publicly, while continuing to worship in the Calvinist tradition in secret. Although prohibited, an estimated 200,000 skilled Huguenot craftsmen and merchants fled France for lands where they could worship without persecution; Holland, England, America, Prussia, and even South Africa profited from this exodus. The France of the Sun King was a far cry from the France of the Enlightenment of the following century: Jacques-Benigne Bossuet, the great Catholic apologist under Louis XIV, boasted in 1691 that Catholicism was the least tolerant of all religions.²³

Louis' infamous "Revocation of the Edict of Nantes" inspired one of the greatest contributors to the eventually accepted notion that peace can be attained amidst religious diversity: John Locke (1632-1704). When news spread of the "Revocation," Locke was living in exile in Holland. Locke, a Puritan, had fled the resurgent Catholic monarchy in England. He had already gained significant recognition in England and France as a philosopher and would become one of the founding fathers of the Enlightenment. After the widespread distribution of Locke's works, the ideas formulated by men like Castellio in the sixteenth century would come to maturity and general acceptance by the educated minds of Europe.²⁴

Locke's *A Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689) was the culmination of decades of deep reflection on the role of the magistrate in religious matters and was influenced by the political and religious uncertainties taking place in England under the overtly Catholic James II. Locke wrote the *Letter* while in exile in Holland, which at that time was a haven for exiles because of its liberal policies toward religious dissidents. Although the constitution in Holland still officially maintained a state-sponsored church (Dutch Reformed), the Low Countries were perhaps the best example in early-modern Europe of religious coexistence because dogmatism and intolerance were overlooked in the name of peace and commerce. Locke begins his *Letter* with a summation of its message: "I esteem that toleration to be the chief characteristical [sic] mark of the true church...for everyone is orthodox to himself."²⁵ He defends this point throughout: "The toleration of those that differ from others in matters of religion, is so agreeable to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and to

the genuine reason of mankind, that it seems monstrous for men to be so blind.” Locke was clearest of any of his predecessors in expressing the need for separating church and state, and he anticipated Doctrine and Covenants 134 concerning the relationship between religious institutions and civil government:

It is not my business to inquire here into the original [sic] of the power or dignity of the clergy. This only I say, that whencesoever their authority be sprung, since it is ecclesiastical, it ought to be confined within the bounds of the church, nor can it in any manner be extended to civil affairs; because the church itself is a thing absolutely separate from the commonwealth. The boundaries on both sides are fixed and immoveable. He jumbles heaven and earth together, the things most remote and opposite, who mixes these societies, which are, in their origin, end, business and in every thing, perfectly distinct and infinitely different from each other.²⁶

Therefore, according to Locke, the sovereign was required to tolerate all religions that did not threaten the civil government. In Locke’s view, toleration was much more effective at safeguarding the people than was repression, which bred recriminations and long-standing rivalries detrimental to the general prosperity. Harking back to Castellio’s argument, a government that mandated conformity to one religion merely reinforced hypocrisy among its subjects.²⁷ Along these lines, Locke echoed the sentiments of Roger Williams in Colonial America and foreshadowed the First Amendment of the Constitution, advocating religious toleration for all within the bounds of civil law.

More than any other event, the eventual acceptance of religious toleration was from the long-lasting effect of the Protestant Reformation. The creation of several rival religions in short succession made it impossible for the Catholic Church to suppress them, as it had successfully done before. What made the Protestant Reformation different from previous schisms within Christianity was the rapid growth in converts made possible by the effectiveness of the printing press, invented the previous century. Greater access to printed materials made it impossible for the Church to control the growing number of readers of inflammatory pamphlets attacking the clergy. Luther’s *Ninety-five Theses* was only one of many dozens that soon followed, attacking clerical abuses and fomenting rebellion.²⁸

As the number of sects grew, so too did the need for peaceful coexistence among them and for a government that was above the fray of disputes. Enlightenment thinkers such as Montesquieu, Voltaire, Jefferson, Franklin, and Thomas Paine all insisted on the innate freedom to follow one’s conscience unrestrained by political pressures or state-sponsored churches. Some of these great leaders were antagonistic toward any form of organized

More than any other event, the eventual acceptance of religious toleration was from the long-lasting effect of the Protestant Reformation.

religion but fought vehemently for the freedom to believe according to one's conscience, even if they did not agree with those beliefs.

Thus, the centuries of religious conflict resulted in the development of a healthy skepticism as to the veracity of any one religion over another—healthy because without this skepticism by the founding fathers, it is likely that the newly formed United States would have continued in the tradition of state-sponsored churches, thus perpetuating intolerance and the sectarian violence it so often creates. Voltaire, perhaps the greatest writer of his day, commented insightfully on the need for religious diversity. Concerned over the atrocities being committed against Huguenots worshiping clandestinely to avoid persecution and prosecution, Voltaire defined religious tolerance as “the endowment of humanity. . . the first law of nature.” Advocating greater, not less religious diversity, he continued: “If there are two religions in your country, they will cut one another's throats; if there are thirty of them, they will live in peace.”²⁹ (Could we apply Voltaire's observations 250 years ago to the current political divisiveness following the most recent election?)

Through the eventual acceptance of Enlightenment ideals such as those espoused by Voltaire, secular government—the distinct and permanent separation of church from state interests—was able to develop. Thus, secularization was a positive development in advancing the idea of religious toleration. This secularization was also a necessary environment for the gospel to be restored. If there were only one state religion in America in the early 1800s, Joseph Smith's efforts would have had a much more concentrated opposition. That there were dozens of “sects” allowed the restored gospel to take root. This is not to minimize the harsh persecutions experienced by the early Saints. However, it could have been worse. As we have seen, when there are only two religions, they will usually become rivals; when there are many religions a climate of toleration is much more likely.

**When there are
many religions
a climate of
toleration is much
more likely.**



Religious intolerance generally stems from the belief in the superiority of one's own religion to that of another's. Collectively, we as Latter-day Saints are often more guilty of this than we may want to admit, as we assert the veracity of the restored gospel. This attitude, taken to its extreme, is at the heart of the fundamentalist movements worldwide—Islamic, Jewish, Christian. We must remember that as we proclaim the truth of the gospel we must do so in the spirit Christ intended: through “gentle persuasion and love unfeigned” (Doctrine and Covenants 121:41) and always respecting the God-given gift of moral agency: as Elder Neil A. Maxwell teaches, “God cares too deeply about our moral agency to force things—even things He desires.”³⁰

Religious coexistence—the peaceful harmony among differing faiths—has been a common theme in several of the most recent addresses of the General Authorities. President Hinckley has maintained a consistent word of counsel to “cultivate a spirit of tolerance for those of varying religious and philosophical persuasions” confirming that it is “possible to disagree without being disagreeable.”³¹ Applying this idea to our surroundings, Elder Russell M. Nelson stated that this “broadly includes neighbors in our own family, our community, our nation, and our world.”³²

There is little challenge in loving those with whom we agree, as Christ taught in His Sermon on the Mount: “For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? do not even the publicans the same?” (Matthew 5:46). The challenge is the reverse: to love those with whom we disagree. Tolerance is a form of compassion and it rests within the doctrine of charity. It is not an endorsement of “the other’s” beliefs. Rather, it is a confirmation of the dignity of Man and an affirmation that we are all God’s children, all in need of His divine inspiration and love, for “he maketh the sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust” (Matthew 5:45). Thus, tolerance is a moral virtue which allows us to love those with whom we might differ. This is a central gospel principle and is often overlooked in our increasingly polemical society, namely to “pray for them which despitefully use [us], and persecute [us]” (Matthew 5:44).

We must remember, however, that toleration should not spill over into complacency. As Elder Dallin H. Oaks has stated, “Carried to an undisciplined excess, love and tolerance can produce indifference to truth and justice.”³³ We must never compromise our beliefs in an effort to fit in. Nor must we appear self-righteous and judgmental toward the beliefs and practices of those with whom we may disagree. As Joshua told the elders of Israel: “choose you this day whom ye will serve. . . but as for me and my house, we will serve the Lord” (Joshua 24:15). It is indeed possible to disagree, without being disagreeable. The true application of religious toleration can only be achieved under the direction of the Holy Ghost as we try to understand those with whom we may not see eye-to-eye.

We are indeed “a chosen generation. . . a peculiar people” (1 Peter 2:9). Our peculiarity in a historic sense will be manifested when we achieve a majority in numbers or economic power (already present in some areas) and still remain tolerant of dissenting beliefs, rather than falling into the age-old trap of persecuting or intimidating others simply because we can through our majority. (Perhaps that lonely Democrat in our ward is not such a bad person, after all.) As the prophet counsels: “We can be a little more tolerant and friendly to those not of our faith, going out of our way to show our respect for them. We cannot afford to be arrogant or self-righteous.”³⁴ ☪

We must remember, however, that toleration should not spill over into complacency.

NOTES:

- 1 The Oxford English Dictionary defines toleration as “the action of allowing.” *Oxford English Dictionary, Abridged Version* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), “toleration.”
- 2 Quoted in Mario Turchetti, “Une question mal posée: La qualification de ‘perpetuel et irrévocable’ appliquée à l’Edit de Nantes” *Bulletin de la société de l’histoire du protestantisme français* vol. 139 (1993) 68.
- 3 *Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, ed. Philip P. Wiener, 4 vols. (New York: Scribner’s, 1973) 4: 113. See also Edmond Huguët, *Dictionnaire de la langue française du XVIème siècle* 12 vols. (Paris: Didier, 1961, vol. 7, p. 1026.
- 4 In addition to the examples given on medieval and early modern attitudes toward tolerance, one could offer ample illustrations of religious fundamentalism in all of its variations today: Christian, Islamic, Jewish, etc.
- 5 Augsburg gave princes authority to declare the religion of their subjects (either Lutheran or Catholic). Augsburg was a step in the right direction, but we should remember that no concept of religious toleration existed in 1555, as Catholics were forced from Lutheran lands and vice-versa, according to the declared religion of the feudal prince. Rather, Augsburg is remembered for “legitimizing” Lutheranism. The Peace of Westphalia hastened a long trend of separating religious from political interests. However, religious persecutions continued thereafter well into the eighteenth century. See Jeffrey Parker, *The Thirty Years’ War* (London: Routledge, 1984); De Lamar Jensen, *Reformation Europe: Age of Reform and Revolution* (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1992), 88, 152, 215.
- 6 For a brief overview of religious toleration in Colonial America see George M. Marsden, *Religion and American Culture* (NY: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1990).
- 7 The most well-known example is the state church established by the Massachusetts Bay Company in 1629-30 under the auspices of John Winthrop. See his “Little Speech’ on Liberty” in Paul Johnson, *A History of the American People*, (New York: Harper Collins, 1997), 41-46.
- 8 Quoted in *Ibid.*, 41.
- 9 Quakers were, however, the majority faith in Pennsylvania and wielded the bulk of the political and economic power of the colony. See Marsden, 23.
- 10 Ralph Pyle and James D. Davidson, “The Origins of Religious Stratification in Colonial America” *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 42: 1 (2003), 60. My thanks to John Thomas in the Religion Department for leading me to this article.
- 11 Thomas More, *Utopia*, trans. Paul Turner (London: Penguin, 1965), 119.
- 12 Elder L. Tom Perry, “God’s Hand in the Founding of America,” *New Era*, July 1976, 45.
- 13 Perez Zagorin, *How the Idea of Religious Toleration Came to the West* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 54-5.
- 14 Quoted in Johann Huizinga, *Erasmus and the Age of Reformation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), 152.
- 15 Desiderius Erasmus, *The Praise of Folly and Other Writings*, Robert M. Adams, ed. (New York: Norton, 1989), 63.
- 16 Martin Luther, *Secular Authority: To What Extent It Should Be Obeyed*, in *Martin Luther: Selections from His Writings*, ed. John Dillenberger (New York: Doubleday, 1961), 385.

- 17 Quoted in Henry Kamen, *L'éveil de la tolérance trans*. Janine Carlander (Paris: Hachette, 1967), 41.
- 18 Calvin based his judgment to execute Servetus on an anachronistic reading of Roman Emperor Justinian's seventh-century law mandating the death penalty for those who denied the official Church doctrine of the Trinity and for those who rejected the practice of infant baptism. See Zagorin, 93-99. Servetus, Castellio and many others like them who criticized Christian orthodoxy (either Catholic or Protestant) and the authority of religious leaders were usually labeled as heretics, an ironic word of Greek origin meaning one "able to choose"—ironic because of the fundamental role choice (or agency, as we call it) plays in the Divine Plan of eternal progression. See Walter W. Skeat, ed. *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961), 238; see also the *Oxford English Dictionary*. Although central to the divine plan as explained in the Restored Gospel, in times past one's freedom to choose was not only at the personal level but also at the communal level and was directed by those leaders charged with not only keeping order but also orthodoxy. Individualism, what we might consider a social norm today, would not become visible for the historian until the Renaissance humanists reintroduced it beginning in the midfourteenth century.
- 19 Quoted in *Ibid.*, 107.
- 20 *Teachings of the Prophet Joseph Smith*, 344.
- 21 Quoted in Donald Nugent, *Ecumenism in the Age of the Reformation: The Colloquy of Poissy* (Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1974), 26.
- 22 See Philip Benedict, *The Huguenot Population of France, 1600-1685: The Demographic Fate and Customs of a Religious Minority* (Philadelphia: Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 1991); Elisabeth Labrousse, *L'édit de Nantes et sa révocation: histoire d'une intolérance* (Paris: Seuil, 1985); Warren C. Scoville, *The Persecution of the Huguenots and French Economic Development, 1680-1720* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1960).
- 23 Philip P. Wiener, ed., 4: 112.
- 24 Several other influential authors wrote on religious toleration in the late seventeenth century. Most notable besides Locke was Pierre Bayle, an exiled Huguenot living in Holland at the same time as Locke. Bayle's most influential work was his *Philosophical Commentary on Christ's Words 'Compel them to Come,' (Commentaire philosophique sur ces paroles de Jesus-Christ 'contrains-les d'entrer'* 4 vols. [Amsterdam, 1686-1688]) in which a rising tone of secularism can be discerned.
- 25 John Locke, *A Letter Concerning Toleration*, John Horton and Susan Mendus, eds. (London: Routledge, 1991), 15-16.
- 26 *Ibid.*, 26.
- 27 At his death, Locke reportedly had in his library works from Castellio, as well as anti-Trinitarian works that would have made him sympathetic to Michael Servetus's beliefs and worthy to be burned at the stake in John Calvin's Geneva. See John Harrison and Peter Laslett, *The Library Catalog of John Locke* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965).
- 28 See Elizabeth Eisenstein, *The Printing Press in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

- 29 Voltaire, *Philosophical Dictionary*, trans. Peter Gay, 3 vols. (New York: Basic Books, 1962) 2: 482, 485.
- 30 “Unto This Very Purpose” Clark Memorandum: J. Reuben Clark Law School (Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 2004), 6.
- 31 Quoted in Sheri L. Dew, *The Biography of Gordon B. Hinckley: Go Forward With Faith* (Salt Lake City: Deseret Book, 1996), 536.
- 32 Elder Russell M. Nelson, “Teach Us Tolerance and Love,” *Ensign*, May 1994, 70.
- 33 Dallin H. Oaks, “Our Strengths Can Become Our Downfall,” *Ensign*, Oct. 1994, 12.
- 34 Gordon B. Hinckley, “Thanks to the Lord for His Blessings,” *Ensign*, May 1999, 88.