

México, 1922) with R. Ricard's *Le Conquista Espiritual de México* (México, 1947); and the recent writings of Canon Angel María Garibay, too numerous to cite here. Again, I am proud to be numbered among the early students of that great pioneering anthropologist, Msgr. John M. Cooper. His teachings and orientation were in my mind when I founded and helped to organize the department of anthropology at Mexico City College in 1948-1949. The quality of work done by teachers and students there during my years as vice-president and president (to 1961), is a matter of record and a clear refutation to any charge that I am an "enemy" of anthropologists.

Following his method of picking out a partial quote to attack—but without balancing it with opinions or sources of his own—Mr. Padden says my "formula for the appraisal of the Church" is ". . . we should judge the institution by its results, turning to the Biblical phrase that a bad tree does not give forth good fruit; and since so much good fruit came from the Mexican Church there is no doubt at all that it was a good tree" (pp. 83-84). Here I am paraphrasing Fr. Mariano Cuevas, S. J., Mexico's most important Church historian; but I make his judgment my own. I think there are enough facts in the book for the general reader—or even a trained reviewer—to judge for himself and then register charitable disagreement if he is so inclined.

Mr. Padden's parting shot is: "In his closing remarks the author gives birth to yet another contradiction. After depending upon non-objective, unscholarly, and sometimes irrational methodologists, Mr. Murray makes a plea for 'objective scholarship' and acceptance of his vision of a Mexico at religious and political peace with itself. Can he be serious?"

Yes, I am "serious" and I hope for a school of scholars dedicated to Mexican church history. I believe I have been fair in answering Mr. Padden's "non-objective, unscholarly, and sometimes irrational methodologies"—his own words against me—in his review. Nowhere in it did he cite chapter and verse to prove me wrong. If he cares to do so I shall certainly give his corrective view the most careful and serious consideration.

PAUL V. MURRAY

*México, D. F.*

Nov. 30, 1967

Dear Father Kiemen:

I must apologize for your long wait for this note. It had slipped my mind until our meeting in Dallas at the recent Ibero-American Conference.

I have read Mr. Paul V. Murray's long and pained response to my review of his book. I stand by that review. The response does, however, set me straight about Mr. Murray: It is apparently inconceivable to him that a practicing historian could read his book and find it wanting and say so in a frank and honest review. Hence he looks for personal reasons for such a review. There are none. The book is the thing.

ROBERT C. PADDEN

*St. Norbert College,  
West De Pere, Wisconsin*