STUDENTS of Pennsylvania history almost without exception have remarked about the religious diversity of colonial times. Not all, however, have emphasized its continuance as a feature of the social life of the commonwealth down to the present day. The purpose in this paper, therefore, is to analyze the fact, while presenting an explanation of the phenomenon and emphasizing the continued religious multiformity.

Pennsylvania is by no means the only state that has shown a high degree of religious diversity. Facts will be presented later to show its status in relation to other states in features which make for such differences. For the moment it will be sufficient to say that it may fairly be considered the best selected for such a study in view of having shown such diversity from the beginning of its history to the present. Further, Pennsylvania, in the 255 years of its separate and distinct existence, by virtue of its geographical and social situation, has been played upon by all the important forces which have gone into making the United States a unique nation. In turn, it has demonstrated within its limits of time and space the course of development of American civilization.

In pursuit of the present purpose to analyze this diversity and to explain the phenomenon, the following factors are presumed: First, the influence and effect of the ideals of William Penn, the Founder; Second, the entrance into the province, and later into the commonwealth, of large and influential groups of people of different racial and national origins; Third, the effect of provisions in the charters, laws, and constitutions favorable to the establishment and development of a high degree of variety in religious practice and organization; and Fourth, the existence of features in the religious composition of both the province and the common-

1 A paper read at the meeting of the American Society of Church History at Providence, Rhode Island, December 29, 1936.
wealth which resulted in the creation of a number of new religious denominations.

The reasons and explanations for the evident religious variety in Pennsylvania are to be found in the sum total of these factors or forces. One alone could not have caused it, but all joined together combined to create a situation in which religious diversity was possible and out which it emerged. From a situation which developed in colonial times was created a condition which made possible and indeed invited and encouraged nineteenth and twentieth century development along the very same lines.

Before giving consideration to these decisive factors, it will be well to present some figures to demonstrate the fact of the diversity of religious faith and practice in Pennsylvania. Reversing the historical order, attention will be given first to the present situation, or more accurately, the situation as portrayed in the Report of the Bureau of Census on Religious Bodies, 1926, which for all practical purposes illustrates the present situation. In that Report, 212 religious denominations were included, of which there were represented in Pennsylvania 102 denominations, and also 46 churches classified as "all other denominations," having a total membership of 8,286. The total number of churches of all denominations both classified and unclassified was 13,843, with a total membership of 5,213,023 out of a total population in 1926 of 9,200,000. Making up the total of 102 denominations in Pennsylvania, all major bodies to be found in the United States and many minor ones were represented. This is illustrated by the following representative examples: Methodist Episcopal, 2167 churches; Roman Catholic, 1,730; United Lutheran Church, 1,443; Presbyterian Church, 1,177—all representing the church bodies with more than 1000 churches. In the second class, representing bodies with less than 1000, but more than 500 churches, are mentioned the Reformed Church in the United States, 867; Baptists (Northern Baptist Convention), 690; Evangelical, 544; Protestant Episcopal, 535; United Brethren in Christ, 533. In the third class, representing bodies with less than 500 and more than 100 churches, are selected Negro Baptists, 303; Jewish, 293; Church of the Brethren, 169; Church of God, General Eldership, 164; Disciples of Christ, 162. In the fourth class, representing bodies of less than 100 churches, the following are chosen at ran-
Congregational Churches, 98; Spiritualists, all bodies, 63; Christian Science, 64; Mormons, two bodies, 20; Pilgrim Holiness Church, 32; Polish National Catholic Church, 29; Russian Orthodox, 79; Universalist, 17; Moravian, 20; Reformed Episcopal, 13; Schwenkfelder, 6; Stauffer Mennonite Church, 4, and the Church of God as Organized by Christ, 3.

The diversity of religions in Pennsylvania is more clearly evident when some comparisons are made between it and certain other states which stood out in presenting a variety of religious faith and practice. Illinois was first in the number of denominations represented within the state. It had 103, with Pennsylvania coming second with 102, and Ohio third with 97. New York which alone led Pennsylvania in the total number of church members, having 6,799,145, had only 93 denominations. Texas was first among the states in the number of churches with 15,062, Pennsylvania coming second with 13,843, as previously mentioned.

A satisfactory picture of the religious situation in Pennsylvania at the middle of the last century is to be found in the Compendium of the Census of 1850. In this, there are 21 denominations listed, each in its own column, and 89 churches, or “minor sects,” as they are called, combined in one column. Pennsylvania is credited with having representation in all but one of the 21 separate denominations. Credit is also given for representation in the bodies listed in the combined column but there is no way of telling from the tables themselves how many of the 89 groups so listed were then in Pennsylvania. Evidence from other sources, however, confirms the opinion that the percentage of these was high. In the number of churches in 1850 New York led with 4169, Ohio was second with 3939, and Pennsylvania was third with 3596.

Diversity in colonial Pennsylvania has been so frequently mentioned and so clearly indicated that it seems unnecessary to cite facts in support of the view. However, in order to present fully the whole case, it seems wise to include a few facts illustrating it. By 1775, as the colonial period drew to a close and as Pennsylvania had come to full development as a province, the following religious groups were present: The Quakers, the Swedish Lutherans, the Anglicans, the Baptists, the major German churches, Lutheran and Reformed, the minor German churches, the Mennon-
ites, the German Baptists, the Schwenkfelders, and the Moravians, the Presbyterians, the Roman Catholics, and the Jews.

Robert Proud whose work, *The History of Pennsylvania in North America*, was published in 1798, wrote thus of religious conditions in 1780:

There is a great number of different religious societies in this province, than, perhaps, in any other, throughout the British dominions besides; and in regard to disputes, on religious subjects, and the consequences of an universal toleration of all the varieties of opinion, in religion, though so widely different, and so contrary and opposite to one another, elsewhere much dreaded, it is apprehended there is not more real harmony anywhere known, in this respect, even under the most despotic hierarchies than in Pennsylvania. Here are the Quakers...; the Episcopalians, according to the manner of the Church of England; and the German and Swedish Lutherans; the Presbyterians and Independents, of various kinds, or sects; and the German Calvinists; the Church of Rome and the Jews; the Baptists of different kinds; with those among the Germans, called Mennonites, and Dunkards, or Dumphers; the Moravians and Schwenckfelders [sic], besides the Aborigines of America, etc.

It should be plain from what has been set forth that Pennsylvania presents the best example which can be selected from among the states as an illustration of religious diversity. Certain other states, as shown by the census of 1926 also illustrate diversity; some of them in proportion to the population an even greater degree than does Pennsylvania. But these, notably Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Iowa had no colonial history while other states which today show diversity, relatively or absolutely, as shown for example by New York, Virginia, Georgia, and New Jersey, did not show any notable degree in colonial times. Pennsylvania began its history with an illustration of unusual variety and it has continued down to the present in the same manner, differentiating still more as her population has grown. It is now in order to consider the factors which were presumed as explaining the phenomenon of the diversity.

First is considered the influence and effect of the ideals and acts of William Penn. His purpose to establish in his province a
practical operation of the principle of religious liberty was based on sincere convictions which he once expressed as follows:

We must give the liberty we ask and cannot be false to our principles though it were to relieve ourselves, for we have good-will to all men and would have none to suffer for a truly sober and conscientious dissent. . . .

His first experience as a colonial proprietor was in connection with West Jersey in which at first he expected to establish a place of refuge for the persecuted Quakers of England. But conditions there did not fully satisfy the requirements for the experiment of a commonwealth such as he had long cherished. Yet even there, according to the unknown author of *The Present State of the Colony of West-Jersey*, 1681, he had been able to see something of his desired arrangement take shape. This author says:

There is likewise certain Provision made for the Liberty of conscience, in Matters of Religion, that all Persons living Peaceably, may enio[y [sic] the Benefit of the Religious Exercise thereof without any Molestation whatsoever.

Penn's opportunity to realize this desire came when, capitalizing upon King Charles' indebtedness to his father and upon the king's friendship to himself, he received on March 4, 1681 a charter for a great grant of land in North America over which he was constituted "true and absolute proprietary." He was then ready to exploit Pennsylvania after the manner of which he wrote to James Harrison in August, 1681:

For my country I eyed the Lord in the obtaining of it, and more was I drawn inward to look to Him and to owe it to His hand and power, than in any other way. I have so obtained it, and desire that I may not be unworthy of His love, but do that which may answer His kind providence, and serve His truth and people; that an example may be set up to the nations; there may be room there, though not here, for such an holy experiment.

As part of the Great Law, or The Body of Laws, passed by the provincial assembly at Chester in December, 1682, after Penn's
first arrival in the province and at his desire, there is the famous provision for the liberty of conscience in Section (Chapter) I in the following words:

Be it enacted by the authority aforesaid, That no person, now, or at any time hereafter, Living in this Province, who shall confess and acknowledge one Almighty God to be the Creator, Upholder and Ruler of the World, and who professes, him, or herself Obliged in Conscience to Live peaceably and quietly under the civil government, shall in any case be molested or prejudiced for his or her Conscientious persuasion or practice. Nor shall hee or shee at any time be compelled to frequent or maintain anie religious worship, place or Ministry whatever, Contrary to his, or her mind, but shall freely and fully enjoy his, or her, Christian Liberty in that respect, without any Interruption or reflection.

And if any person shall abuse or deride any other for his, or her different persuasion or practice in matters of religion, such person shall be looked upon as a Disturber of the peace, and shall be punished accordingly.

This established and protected the free exercise of religious choice but Section (Chapter) 2 of the code placed a restriction on absolute religious liberty and equality when it provided:

That all officers and persons Commissioned and employed in the service of the government of this Province, and all Members and Deputies elected to serve in the Assembly thereof, and all that shall have the right to elect such Deputies, shall be such as profess and declare they believe in Jesus Christ to be the son of God, the Saviour of the world, And that are not Convicted of ill fame, etc.

As a result of this provision all Unitarians, Jews and atheists were effectively denied a share in the government, but not in the exercise of the liberty of their consciences and of worship. For all practical purposes, especially under the conditions of the day, this was a restriction more apparent than real. As a result of the provisions of Section (Chapter), I a recent writer is entirely justified when he says, "Only in Rhode Island was religious liberty equally secure."

Thus was the tradition of freedom of conscience established in Pennsylvania by the Founder. This could not but be effective in
the development of the province and particularly in the influence which it came to have upon the growth of population and the variety of people who came to look upon Pennsylvania as "The Promised Land," a place of refuge from persecution in the Old World. That William Penn was denied the satisfaction of seeing his liberal ideas finally and fully operative was no fault of his. Their full operation was later modified as will be shown, but the tradition had been established and the freedom which he believed in, once having been made effective could never be fully denied, and the modifications were indeed only slight. Pennsylvania remained in large measure pointed in the direction of the wishes of its first great benefactor.

In the second place, in noticing the factors which explain the phenomenon of religious diversity in Pennsylvania, consideration is now given to the entrance into the province, and later into the commonwealth, of large and influential groups of people of different racial and national origins.

In this connection, Professor Dunaway's observation is very much to the point when he says:

> The heterogeneous character which the population of Pennsylvania has maintained from the beginning of its settlement has profoundly affected the life of the commonwealth and furnishes a clew to much of its history. In no other colony was there such racial and religious diversity. In no other section does one find the people divided into three major racial groups sharply differentiated from each other by geographical environment as well as by religious beliefs, customs, and traditions.²

Before William Penn came into possession of the area to be known as Pennsylvania, racial diversity had already been a fact in the presence of Swedes, Finns, Dutch, English, French, and Germans. It was, however, when he began to develop the province that the influence of racial diversity began to be truly evident in the large immigration of several of those elements and the smaller immigration of several others. The dominant groups were the English, the German, and the Scotch-Irish. Dunaway further says:

> These three elements, locating in predominant numbers in three sections, were responsible for establishing the

three Pennsylvanias of colonial times, each with its distinct population, life, and institutions.\(^3\)

What is more, two of these three by reason of their inherent natures developed great divergencies in religious ideas and practices. These were the English and the Germans. The Scotch-Irish presented a much higher degree of homogeneity. The lesser racial groups to come into colonial Pennsylvania were the Welsh, the Swiss, the French, the pure Scotch, the pure Irish, the Jews, and the Negroes. While Indians were present throughout the whole period their numbers consistently declined and they need not be considered as having had any influence worth mentioning in the present interest. No other colony even approximated this condition of variety of racial groups in appreciable numbers.

This heterogeneous status was true not only in colonial times. Beginning in 1790, through the medium of the ten-year census, accurate figures are available. In 1790, the condition which had developed in later colonial times was described and since that time exact comparisons can be made. On the basis of these Dunaway is led to conclude: “After 1790, the population increased with great rapidity, and its racial diversity became still more marked.”\(^4\)

For a period of twenty-five to forty years after the beginning of the war for independence the flow of immigration slackened. To 1840, such immigration as there was—and in the 1820’s and 1830’s there was considerable—came from Great Britain and Ireland. After 1840, a new wave began to flow into Pennsylvania, greatly exceeding in volume that of an earlier period. Between 1840 and 1890 the Irish formed the largest element and in 1890 they constituted the largest number of foreign-born in the commonwealth. The second largest element was the German, with the English third and smaller numbers from Wales, Scotland, Sweden, France, Russia, Italy, and Austria-Hungary. This means that up to about 1890 the preponderance of immigration came from northern Europe and the British Isles.

After 1890, the character of the immigration changed radically, that from northern Europe diminishing while that from southern and eastern Europe greatly increased. The predominant strains were Italian and Slavic, with lesser numbers coming from every

\(^3\) Ibid., pp. 73-74.
\(^4\) Ibid., p. 600.
country in Europe including those countries which had been the chief sources of the older immigration. This is illustrated in a careful study entitled *Anthracite Coal Communities*, by P. B. Roberts. Martin and Shenk in commenting upon this work say:

The study of the population of the Pennsylvania coal fields is a study of immigration to America. The population of the mining regions is a cross section of the foreign population of the country.\(^6\)

Mr. Roberts gives this interesting information:

The foreign born people forming about 32 per cent of the total population of our area [the anthracite area] represent 26 different nationalities. They are English, Welsh, Scotch, Irish, German, Swedes, French Swiss, Dutch, Poles, Sclavonians, Austrians, Hungarians, Bohemians, Tyrolese, Russians, Lithuanians, Greeks, Italians, Hebrews, Negroes, Arabs, Cubans, Mexicans, Spaniards, and Chinese. The last seven mentioned form an insignificant portion of the total population. The Sclaves and Italians would form about 15 per cent, the Anglo-Saxons and Germans 17 per cent, and the remainder 68 per cent native born. If, however, we classify the native born of foreign parentage with the foreign born we have over 70 per cent of the population in that class.

After 1904 and until the closing of the national gates against the annual flood of immigrants, the same tendencies not only continued, but increased in force.

The obvious deduction from the above in relation to religious life is that diversity, already existent, was greatly advanced. As the tide of immigration flowed, not only were the churches increased in membership, but new churches and divisions of old churches—new denominations in the terms of the census—were established. The Roman Catholic Church developed in the nineteenth century from a position of insignificance to its present commanding position; the Lutheran Church grew to be the largest Protestant group, while both of these suffered divisions, separate denominations arising from the divisions. Other new denominations were established to take care of new-comers in their own languages

and after their preferences. An outstanding example of this last result were the Eastern Orthodox Churches of which there are in Pennsylvania the Roumanian, the Greek, the Russian and the Syrian.

In addition to the racial diversity through European immigration, there has also been the further diversification through the increase of the Negro population in Pennsylvania. In 1790 the number in the state was 10,274; in 1930 there were 431,257, giving Pennsylvania the twelfth place among the states in Negro population, Georgia leading with 1,071,125. This has resulted in the great growth of membership of churches already established and has produced at least seven new denominations in Pennsylvania.

The third factor in explanation of the phenomenon of religious diversity in Pennsylvania which is now noticed is the effect of the provisions in the charters, laws, and constitutions favorable to the establishment and development of a high degree of variety in religious practice and organization.

Contrary to common opinion and notwithstanding the example and ardent desires of William Penn, described above, absolute religious liberty together with the enjoyment of full political rights for all persons regardless of religious views did not obtain in Pennsylvania for the greater part of the colonial period. While what is now about to be said might seem to prove the opposite of the present contention, this was not actually so. For all practical purposes there was religious liberty throughout the history of Pennsylvania but accuracy demands that certain limitations to liberty in the form of political disabilities for certain people be recognized and explained.⁶

Although William Penn was a very influential individual in social life of England in his day, circumstances which were too powerful for him to combat successfully developed, before which he had to give way. After the flight of James II, whose personal friend Penn was, the latter fell into serious political disadvantage with the result that he not only had to be very careful how he opposed the dominant trends of English opinion, but also even suffered the suspension of his proprietorship. Further, although

he had been given wide powers for the governance of his province, he was still under certain limitations of power as set forth in the charter from Charles II. This charter has properly been judged to have represented the acme of the colonial administrative experience of Charles II and consequently it is not strange that there is contained therein a more careful definition of proprietary powers and more strict assertion of royal rights and interests than could be found in the earlier charters. There was therefore a provision reserving to Parliament the right of taxation and of legislation in general, regarding the province, and a further provision requiring copies of provincial laws to be submitted to the Crown within five years of their enactment, with the right of disallowance by the Privy Council within six months after their reception. It is plain that any law which differed from the established policy at home would be in serious threat of disallowance. Furthermore, in view of Penn's precarious political position after 1688 any radical policy, as expressed in law, would bring sure opposition. For these reasons the liberal enactment in the Great Law did not have much chance of long-continued functioning.

As a matter of fact, it continued to function for just about ten years in the colony when Penn's proprietorship was temporarily suspended and Benjamin Fletcher, royal governor of New York, become also "Captain-General and Governor-in-Chief" of Pennsylvania, under the commission of William and Mary in April, 1693. In the commission issued to him he was directed to summon a general assembly, the members of which were to take oaths prescribed by the Toleration Act of 1689. The declarations and tests required by this act had been intended to secure for Dissenters the freedom of worship in England. But in Pennsylvania they became by virtue of the construction which Fletcher chose to put upon them indispensable qualifications for holding any office, or post of honor, trust or emolument in the province. From that time to the Revolution they were (with the exception of that relating to the Holy Trinity) imposed indiscriminately upon all intending office-holders except for a brief interlude in the beginning of the eighteenth century.

In 1694, the province was restored to Penn. He intended to set out again for America immediately, but was detained in England by the troubles of the time and so appointed William Markham
deputy-governor, which position the latter had held also under Fletcher. In 1696 a new charter, known as Markham’s Frame, was issued by the deputy-governor in which the same declarations and tests required by Fletcher were imposed. This Frame, Penn himself never formally sanctioned. The religious section was clearly contrary to his ideas, but he allowed its enforcement until he came for his second and last visit in 1699. As fervent as ever in his belief in the desirability of freedom of conscience he proposed in 1700, “The Law concerning Liberty of Conscience,” under which both voters and officeholders needed only a belief in God and faith in Jesus Christ for qualification. In 1701 he gave his third and last charter, the Charter of Privileges, in which the provisions in regard to religious tests were precisely as in the Great Law of 1682. He also provided that the article in the Charter, providing this liberty of conscience, should be kept without alteration inviolably forever. This may be taken as his last and best expression in this matter.

But it did not remain inviolate long, for in 1702 Queen Anne issued an order that all who held public office in any colony should take the tests and make the declarations according to the Toleration Act of 1689. In 1703 all members of the assembly had qualified, after having objected that the Law of 1700 had specified the members’ qualifications in a different manner. In 1705 the Privy Council disallowed this Law of 1700. When word came of this disallowance, the assembly passed a new law in conformity with the Toleration Act and with certain other laws, especially disabling Roman Catholics. The effect of all this, and also of some later legislation, was to reserve the rights of office-holding and of voting to orthodox Protestants, according to the standards of orthodoxy which then prevailed, to allow such alone to hold church property, and to specify that no Roman Catholic could be naturalized. It is clear that all of this was in direct contradiction of the clearly expressed will and purpose of William Penn.

However, it still may be said, notwithstanding these laws, that liberty of conscience and complete freedom of worship were enjoyed in Pennsylvania throughout the remainder of the colonial period, practically without restraint. Some of the laws were inoperative. For example, German Catholics held land and had
churches without evident attempts to hinder them. Irish Catholics had the same freedom. Jews were to be found in several parts of the province, apparently going freely about their business and even meeting for worship. But, it is true, these suffered political disabilities. It may be concluded that while the ideals of Penn were not fully effective, his influence was not entirely lost.

This condition prepared the way for the provisions of the Constitution of Pennsylvania of 1776. Section Ten declared:

> And each member, before he takes his seat, shall make and subscribe the following declarations, viz: ‘I do believe in one God, the creator and governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and the punisher of the wicked. And I do acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by Divine Inspiration.’

> And no further or other religious test shall ever hereafter be required of any civil officer or magistrate in this State.

In the Second Section of the “Declaration of the Rights of the Inhabitants of the Commonwealth or State of Pennsylvania,” which was attached to this first constitution, is the guarantee of freedom of worship for all the people in the following words:

> That all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences and understanding: And that no man ought or of right can be compelled to attend any religious worship, or erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any ministry, contrary to, or against, his own free will and consent: Nor can any man, who acknowledges the being of God, be justly deprived or abridged of any civil right as a citizen, on account of his religious sentiments or peculiar mode of religious worship: And that no authority can or ought to be vested in, or assumed by any power whatever, that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner control, the right of conscience in the free exercise of religious worship.

On such a broad basis of freedom the commonwealth of Pennsylvania as a free and sovereign state established itself. Just as soon as the restraining influence of the English government was removed the ideals of William Penn were restored to operation. The final basis, after some liberalization, under which the religious
liberty of the people of Pennsylvania has been guaranteed these many years was set up in the 3rd and 4th sections of Article 9 of the Constitution of 1790 and was repeated verbatim in the Constitutions of 1838 and 1873 as follows:

All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any ministry against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship.

No person who acknowledges the being of a God, and a future state of rewards and punishments shall, on account of his religious sentiments, he disqualified to hold any office of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

In conclusion there remains a brief discussion of the fourth factor which helps to explain the phenomenon of religious diversity in Pennsylvania, namely, the existence of features in the religious composition of both the province and the commonwealth which resulted in the creation of a number of new religious denominations. Conditions have been favorable not only to the entrance and development of religious bodies already conceived or fully organized, but they have contributed to the conception and full organization of a number of new bodies, some very small and some very large. Only an elaborate study of the whole history of denominational organization and diversification could be sufficient to give a final judgment in this matter. Enough, however, is known to justify the generalization herein made and a hasty study supplies sufficient data to warrant inclusion here.

Notice is given first to formal organizations of religious bodies which were already organized in other parts of the world, generally Europe, but which either could not or would not function in Pennsylvania. Examples of these are the first American Presbytery, the German Reformed Coetus, the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania, the first Baptist Association, the organizations of the Dunkers, the Mennonites, and the Moravians. Secondly, are noticed certain organizations which developed in Pennsylvania out of other established bodies, as for example, the German Seventh
Day Baptists, the River Brethren, the Hicksite Quakers, the Amish, the United Presbyterians, and the African Methodist Episcopalians. Thirdly, are noticed those which developed along new lines but out of older organized forms, examples of which are the Evangelical Church, the Church of God, General Elder-ship, and the Disciples of Christ. A superficial examination of denominational beginnings places more than 30 of the 212 denominations listed in 1926 as having been organized in Pennsylvania, largely if not entirely drawing their organizers from that area.

This does not, however, exhaust the evidence which would further aid in explaining this factor in relation to diversity. Information generally and readily accessible shows that Pennsylvania also exhibited diversity in the part which it played in organizing and developing denominations which can not be said to have been the contribution of it alone to American religious complexity. Examples of such denominations are the Protestant Episcopal Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, and the Eastern Orthodox Churches.

It seems to be a fair conclusion which the religious history of Pennsylvania so clearly supports that division breeds division, and diversity breeds diversity, and that from it all comes complexity.

The American religious structure is made up of many parts; it is an aggregation of diverse elements. To this diversity no unit, geographical or political, has made as much of a contribution on the whole as has Pennsylvania, for it has contained within itself the same effective forces which have dominated the situation throughout the whole United States. Not the least of these has been the existence of a free spirit. To paraphrase a famous adage, "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," it may be said that, "Religious diversity is the price of religious freedom."