

Rhetoric as a Revolutionary Tool
Anti-Catholic Propaganda During the American Revolution

by Tamara L. Steinert '92

May 1992

A senior thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for a B.A. degree in religion
at Swarthmore College.

Table of Contents

Abstract

Introduction, page 1

Chapter 1:

Anti-Catholicism in the Early Colonial Period (1607-1762), page 8

Roots of Anti-Catholicism in Europe

Anti-Catholic Legislation in the Early British Colonies

Protestant Visions of Catholic Nature

Anti-Catholicism and Early Colonial Catholic Demographics

Summary

Chapter 2:

***The Development of Anti-Catholic/Anti-Tyranny Rhetoric
(1763-1776), page 20***

The Changing Political Relationship between Britain and her Colonies

The Stamp Act

The Quebec Act

The Appeal to Canada

Summary

Chapter 3:

The Changing Political Life of Catholics, page 34

Catholics in the Political System

Spanish and French Cooperation in the War for Independence

Legislation and Constitutions

Summary

Chapter 4:

Conclusions, page 43

The Relationship between Anti-Catholicism and Catholic Political Opportunity

One Possibility

Endnotes, page 51

Bibliography, page 55

Abstract

During the British-American colonial era (1607-1776) anti-Catholic prejudice manifested itself in a political way, as Catholics were prevented from holding office and voting in the colonies. However, during the revolutionary period from 1763 to 1791, Catholics suddenly began receiving unprecedented political privilege despite the long history of religious and political conflict between Catholics and Protestants. This rapid change in the American political order can be partially explained by comparing pre-revolutionary era colonial documents with those that came afterwards, keeping in mind all the while the different political circumstances which motivated the documents.

Anti-Catholicism always held some political meaning for American Protestants of this period. However, the focus of anti-Catholic political rhetoric changed over time. Until 1763 anti-Catholic prejudice was based on the tangible political threat posed by the French and Spanish colonies which surrounded the British colonies. With the signing of the Treaty of Paris in 1763, the French and Spanish ceased to be an immediate threat, and anti-Catholic rhetoric took on a new focus. From 1763 to 1791 revolutionary propagandists used Catholicism to symbolize British tyranny, hoping to inspire popular support of the Revolution. In doing so, they appealed both to the Protestant religious heritage and to contemporary concerns about colonial autonomy.

Thus, anti-Catholic propaganda did not express fear of Catholic political power, but fear of domination by any one political body, including the British government. As such, Catholics *per se* were not a political threat, and could be admitted to the political process. Furthermore, the anti-tyranny message communicated in anti-Catholic propaganda helped revolutionary leaders formulate an understanding of religious liberty in which anything short of freedom for all groups meant risking tyranny by one.

Introduction

The United States has long praised itself for its constitutional principle of free worship. Histories of our country routinely stress that early colonists found escape here from the religious tyranny found in Europe. Ironically, however, colonial Protestants indulged in the same type of religious and political discrimination against Roman Catholics that they themselves had fled from in their mother countries. By the mid-eighteenth century, nowhere in the British colonies could a Catholic hold public office or vote. Many colonies also practiced other forms of institutional persecution against Catholics, imposing unusual tax burdens, for example, or outlawing ownership of guns by Catholics.

Religiously exclusive legislation provides a one-dimensional perspective of colonial prejudice against Catholics. Such evidence demonstrates the existence of bias, but does little to explain the rationale behind the laws. We find a fuller picture of anti-Catholicism detailed in contemporary letters, newspapers, sermons and pamphlets, which give us glimpses of the concerns which motivated legislation. An examination of sources from the period which began with the earliest British settlement in Jamestown in 1607 and which ends in 1791 with the Bill of Rights reveals that anti-Catholicism did not simply reflect doctrinal differences between Protestants and Catholics. Anti-Catholic rhetoric from this period consistently demonstrated strong political fears as well.

The thirteen colonies which formed the United States in 1776 were Protestant, British and European; each of these characteristics contributed in a

different way to the development of political antipathy toward American Catholics. Most obviously, their Protestant heritage endowed the colonists with a general contempt for all things Roman Catholic. As citizens of the British nation-state, the English colonists held a more particular grudge against the other two colonial superpowers, the Catholic nations of Spain and France. Finally, as Europeans, the earliest British colonists in America inherited a history of religious-political struggle which assumed, among other things, that religion should be a guiding principle of government. All of these factors made anti-Catholicism "the English colonists' most viable and deeply cherished prejudice."¹

That anti-Catholicism should be expressed through legislation and political exclusion seems only natural given its political roots. However, despite a long history of discrimination based upon religious prejudice in the New World, Catholics played influential roles in American politics during the period from 1763 to 1791. Among other things, they participated in the Continental Congresses and in the Constitutional Convention, although at the same time they were often denied suffrage in their home colonies. In addition, by the end of the revolutionary era, each of the United States had ratified the federal constitution guaranteeing freedom of religion, while new state constitutions were developed which guaranteed civil rights to Catholics along with their Protestant brethren. Whereas Catholics suffered political oppression before the Revolution, the American political process included them after 1791, only eighteen years later.

Even as Catholics began enjoying wider political privileges, however, anti-Catholic sentiment continued to surface in revolutionary era writings, just as it had for one hundred and fifty years before. The concerns illuminated in this literature, and the language used to express them, remained

similar to the concerns and language in earlier writings. Yet while earlier anti-Catholic propaganda had been accompanied by a decrease in Catholic political rights, anti-Catholic propaganda during the revolutionary era was contemporaneous with an increase in Catholic political opportunity. This situation leaves us to wonder what was happening during the revolutionary era that made such a turn-around possible.

One explanation of this situation hypothesizes that revolutionary era expressions of anti-Catholic feeling were a response to the growing political power of Catholics. This theory may provide a partial explanation, but it does not go far enough. The political leaders who spread anti-Catholic propaganda, including men like John Adams and John Jay, were the same powerful elites who formed and controlled the politics of the United States. Had they strongly opposed Catholic involvement, they could have prevented the inclusion of Catholics in the power schema of the Revolution. Instead, however, these leaders formed alliances with Catholic France and Spain, tried to engage Catholic Canada in the fight against Britain, and actively recruited Catholics to carry out diplomatic functions. Thus, not only did Protestant leaders not block Catholic political privilege during the Revolution, but in certain cases they invited Catholic involvement.

This analysis suggests that it was not a simple fear of Catholics as political actors that fueled anti-Catholicism during the Revolution. In this paper, I offer a different theory to explain how Catholics gained political privilege at the same time that the individuals with the authority to grant or take away such privileges espoused anti-Catholic propaganda. My hypothesis suggests that the colonial anti-Catholic rhetoric after 1763 represented broader concerns than it had previously. Catholicism became a symbolic representation of British tyranny which elite radicals used to engage the populace in the rev-

olutionary movement. Anti-Catholic propaganda was not meant primarily to prevent the growth of Catholic power, but to prevent domination by Britain or any other one group. The movement against British tyranny brought together the diverse religious population of the colonies. Each individual group came to realize that its own religious and political freedom depended on the maintenance of the same freedoms for the other groups. Entailed in this philosophy was Catholic freedom to participate in the political system. Thus, as the anti-tyranny movement gathered speed, the opportunity for Catholics to participate in political life also increased.

For the purpose of examining this argument, I divide colonial history into three time periods: the pre-revolutionary era from 1607 to 1762; the early revolutionary era from 1763 to 1776; and the late revolutionary era, from 1777 to 1791. Prior to 1763 the colonists saw their political and religious concerns as linked; European history had demonstrated that religious opponents were also political enemies. That political heritage carried over into the colonies, where the British competed with the Spanish and French for colonial territory. Surrounded by traditional Catholic enemies, the British colonists naturally lived in fear of domination.

With the end of the Seven Years' Wars in 1761 and the signing of the peace treaty between Britain and France in 1763, however, the British colonists identified a new "enemy." This enemy was not an foreign political threat. Instead, the Crown itself and the British parliament posed the threat to colonial autonomy. Unhappy about Britain's growing tendency to interfere with colonial affairs, the colonists described their new foe as tyrannical, absolute and arbitrary--all characteristics traditionally used to describe "popery." As the tension between the colonies and the Crown mounted throughout the 1760's and into the 1770's, comparisons between the Catholic

Church and the British government continued. Some propagandists even claimed that the pope and King George conspired together against Protestants, or, at the very least, that the king of Protestant England was becoming Catholic.

It was not just by chance that revolutionary leaders "found" connections between Catholicism and the Crown. By appealing to traditional religious fears, American elites hoped to inspire political support for the anti-Britain movement among the general population. In the 1760's and early 1770's the colonists were not yet considering independence; however, radical elites were intent on retaining a high level of autonomy. The historical fear of tyranny located in the religious and political struggle between Catholics and Protestants provided the perfect medium for colonial leaders to garner support for increased colonial autonomy. They wanted the average colonist to see the problems between the Crown and the colonies as similar to the struggle between Protestants and Catholics--that is, as a struggle against despotism. As such, anti-Catholic rhetoric symbolically represented anti-tyranny concerns. By the time the colonies were ready to declare independence, anti-Catholic/anti-tyranny propaganda had helped motivate broad-based support for a movement against Britain.

Thus, politics continued to be a factor in religious prejudice during the Revolution, as it had since the earliest colonial settlements. However, revolutionary era anti-Catholicism focused on a new enemy; while anti-Catholic propaganda might sound the same, it actually intimated different concerns in each period. Evidence for this theory can be found by examining primary documents of pre-revolutionary (1607 to 1762) and revolutionary (1763 to 1791) British America with an eye toward both their literal meanings, as well as their historical context. Although the language and imagery of anti-

Catholic propaganda appears to be somewhat constant throughout both periods, the political, social, and demographic circumstances which inspired anti-Catholic fears in the early colonial period changed substantially over time.

Among the implications of the "new" anti-Catholicism was a growing toleration which made Catholic political involvement more acceptable. Prior to 1763, the fears of a foreign Catholic enemy were based in the geo-political situation. The political exclusion of Catholics at that time was pragmatically based in the perceived potentiality of Catholic dominance in America. After 1763, the anti-Catholicism protest was not based in a specific fear of Catholic power, but in a more general concern about "popish government." The anti-tyranny movement reached its height in the mid-1770's, at the same time we begin to see Catholics entering the political arena. Anti-Catholic/anti-tyranny propaganda tapered off by about 1779, but political opportunity for Catholics continued to grow, culminating in 1791 with the Bill of Rights, which formally legislated freedom of religion for all citizens.

I will develop four major lines of analysis to illustrate how anti-Catholic rhetoric and Catholic political privilege were related in the revolutionary period. In Chapter One, I examine anti-Catholic laws and propaganda from the period 1607 to 1762, uncovering how the words and the context of the documents demonstrate the nature of anti-Catholicism at that time. This exploration sets the stage for Chapter Two, where I compare propaganda from the early colonial era with that of the revolutionary era. Here we see that the main thrust of anti-Catholicism during the 1760's and 1770's was not against followers of the Roman Catholic Church, but rather against a "popishly" tyrannical British government. I look to the revolutionary era change in Catholic political involvement in Chapter Three. This section shows that the realities of Catholic political life support the conclusion that anti-Catholicism

was not finally directed at Catholics. Finally, in Chapter Four I provide a short analysis of the relationship between anti-Catholic rhetoric in the revolutionary era and the growth of Catholic political opportunity.

Chapter 1

Anti-Catholicism in the Early Colonial Period (1607-1762)

Roots of Anti-Catholicism in Europe

Anti-Catholicism in America sprang from European religious and political conflict. Throughout most of Christian history, the Roman Catholic Church had dominated the political state of Europe. In fact, "by 1492, virtually every section of Western Europe paid homage to...Rome."² However, the rise of nationalism and the Protestant reformation broke the political and spiritual hold that the pope held over Europe. After centuries of papal hegemony, nationalistic religious leaders arose, establishing Protestant and Catholic state religions. The result was a continent delineated by religious affiliation as well as by ethnic and cultural factors.

Anti-Catholic prejudice developed in response to the potential political threat presented by the pope and his allies to national autonomy. Protestant monarchs feared that "the superior allegiance" afforded the pope would inspire their Catholic citizens to revolt against the monarchy in the name of the Church.³ Fears that the Catholic Church might again aspire to its hegemonic role led to strong anti-Catholic sentiment. "Anti-popery came to provide a peculiarly religious definition of national security in terms of defensive conflict with all the real and imagined agents of the Church of Rome."⁴ One solution to these concerns was to deprive Catholics of their civil liberties and political rights. Catholicism lost its right to exist in some countries, while the fear of persecution drove other Catholics to seek haven elsewhere.

Although the European monarchs distanced their rules from the papacy, the concept of the divine right of kings continued to hold sway. By claiming that their governments received sanction from God, Protestant and Catholic rulers alike could maintain the legitimacy of their rule without the authority of the pope. Not only did monarchies derive power from God, but they had a responsibility to uphold the faith of the country. Religion and rule still went hand in hand, only without papal intervention.

In Great Britain, the dual role of monarch and head of the English Church came to rest most decisively on the head of Elizabeth I. Religious battles had waged in her country since her father, Henry VIII, had declared himself the head of the Church in England in 1534. Elizabeth's assumption of the title of leader of the Anglican Church in 1558 brought religious and political tensions to a head, leaving Catholics with very few rights. The failed attempts to put Catholic Mary Stuart on the throne only exacerbated religious tensions.

After Elizabeth's death, the tug-of-war between Catholics and Protestants continued with the Stuarts. Seventeenth century political and religious intrigues like the 1605 Gunpowder Plot led by Guy Fawke and the 1679 "Popish Plot" added to an atmosphere of mutual distrust. Battles between the Episcopalians and the Puritans in England also contributed to the religious turmoil, ultimately resulting in the Puritan migrations to the New World.⁵

As in other European nations, anti-Catholicism in Britain was politically based and played out in a political way as well. "...Anti-papist prejudices [were] incorporated into law, education, and social patterning."⁶ The Oath of Supremacy, passed in 1559, declared that the English monarch was also the head of the Church in England. Required of all people taking public office, the oath violated fundamental Catholic beliefs about the pope's role as leader

of the Church. No good Catholic could take the oath; those who refused to take it were excluded from public office; thus, English politics became a Protestant domain. With the introduction of this oath "loyalty to Protestantism in England was linked to patriotism..."⁷

Anti-Catholic Legislation in the Early British Colonies

Despite the fact that English Protestants in America had often fled religious persecution themselves, they typically did not intend to establish a religiously diverse or tolerant society, nor were they looking to separate Church and State. With the exception of William Penn in Pennsylvania and Roger Williams in Rhode Island, colonial leaders "assumed that the pattern of religious uniformity would of necessity be transplanted and perpetuated in the colonies. And all took positive steps to insure this..."⁸ They fully expected that religion would--and should--continue to dominate and shape their societies. "Just as English lawyers had Sir Edward Coke's *Institutes of the the Laws of England*, English Puritans had the *Institutes* of John Calvin."⁹ Civil government, like everything else, sprang from God.

Furthermore, political structures served religious purposes. As a result, in some colonies, only those of "approved congregations" could serve as leaders. One 1634 colonial document spelled out very clearly that "none shall be admitted to be free burgesses...butt such...are members of...the approved churches of New England, nor shall any butt such...have any vote...nor shall any power or trust in the ordering of any civill affayres, be att any time putt into the hands of any other than such church members [sic]..."¹⁰ There was some amount of toleration, but it was still denominationally controlled. In New Hampshire, for example, religious freedom was extended in 1680 "unto

all protestants," but "the Church of England shall be particularly countenanced and encouraged [sic]."¹¹

In none of the colonies, however, were Catholics treated as political equals to Protestants. The earliest example of anti-Catholic prejudice in the colonies appeared even before Catholics began migrating to the New World. Dissenters from Anglicanism and Roman Catholics alike had encountered persecution in Britain. However, while British Protestants were allowed to travel to America in search of religious, and, consequently, political freedom, Catholics were for a time forbidden the same escape. The Charter of New England stated explicitly that "[Because] Wee would be loath that any Person should be permitted to pass that Wee suspected to affect the Superstition of the Ch[urc]h of Rome, Wee do hereby declare that...none be permitted to pass, in any Voyage...into the said Country, but such as shall first have taken the Oathe of Supremacy [sic]."¹² As noted above, this oath contradicted Catholic doctrine and was used to exclude Catholics from public office. Now in the age of colonialism it also prevented Catholic migration to America.

Given their antipathy toward the Church of Rome, why would the British prevent Catholic migration to the colonies? The answer lies at least partially in Britain's foreign policy problems with France and Spain. A 1647 Massachusetts anti-priest law justified its promulgation by

...taking into consideration the great wars, combustions and divisions which are this day in Europe, and that the same are observed to be raised and fomented chiefly by the secret underminings and solicitations of those of the Jesuitical order, men brought up and devoted to the religion and the Court of Rome, which hath occasioned diverse states to expel them from their territories...¹³

Political concerns are explicitly noted in this case. The law further states its purpose as the "prevention whereof among ourselves" of the type of unstable politics brought on by Catholics.¹⁴

The colonial successes of France and Spain further exacerbated traditional European political rivalries. Fears of an extended papal empire in the New World haunted the British. Even as discrepancies between different Protestant groups were becoming apparent, Protestant leaders agreed that "Spain must be thwarted in her colonial empire....The preservation of the Protestant faith and the English realm depended [on this]..."¹⁵ Thus, colonization was not just a political rivalry, but a religious one as well. William Warren Sweet argues that the entire English colonization movement in America was a "Protestant crusade against Roman Catholics."¹⁶ While it is difficult to determine the extent to which this attitude shaped colonialism, the point remains that British colonists felt compelled to pass preventative measures to keep Catholics out of their communities.

Catholic missionaries to the Native Americans added to the perceived political threat. Since the Spanish and French were engaged in missionary activities among the Native Americans, the British sought to counter the growing Catholic influence in America.¹⁷ The 1662 Charter of Connecticut cites as the "only and principal End" of British settlement the goal to "win and invite the Natives of the Country to the Knowledge and Obedience of the only true GOD..."¹⁸ Similarly, the 1609 Second Charter of Virginia announced "the principall Effect which we can desire or expect of this Action, is the Conversion and Reduction of the People in those Parts unto the...Christian Religion..."¹⁹ The British simply did not consider Catholicism among the "Christian Religions."

Subsequent history provides little evidence that the primary objective of British colonization was missionary activity. The religious goals of English settlement were limited to maintaining a political balance with France and Spain. British colonists feared that Catholic converts would swell the enemy ranks. Legislation passed in the colonies demonstrates this fear. The 1700 Massachusetts "Act Against Jesuits and Popish Priests" charged that "Jesuits, priests and popish missionaries...by their subtle [sic] insinuations industriously labour to debauch, seduce and withdraw the Indians from their due obedience unto his majesty, and to excite and stir them up, to sedition, rebellion and open hostility against his majesties government."²⁰ As with the 1647 Massachusetts law cited above, the British colonists here are concerned with the political consequences of Catholic settlement and treat Catholicism as a political rather than a religious entity.

Sandwiched between the French and Spanish, the British colonists lived in dread of a Catholic conquest--and thus did not welcome Catholics into their communities. While this was particularly true in New England, where British-Americans experienced the Indian wars at close hand,²¹ it was true throughout the other colonies as well.²² One colonial Pennsylvanian complained in the 1750's about the

extraordinary indulgence and privileges granted to Papists...privileges plainly repugnant to all our political interests considered as a frontier colony, bordering on the French and one half of the people an uncultivated Race of Germans, liable to be seduced by every enterprising Jesuit, having almost no Protestant clergy among them to put them on their guard and warn them against Popery...²³

Fears such as these were the justification for laws which prevented Catholics from gaining power within the British colonies. For example, the 1642 Virginia "Act Against Catholics and Priests" stated that "no popish recusants

should at any time hereafter exercize the place or places of secret councilors...surveyors or sheriffe, or any other publique place...and further...none should be admitted into any of the aforesaid offices...before he...had taken the oath of allegiance and supremacy [sic]."²⁴

The "Act Against Catholics and Priests" and the "Massachusetts Act" were but two of many laws excluding Catholics from colonial communities. Similar legislation was passed in other colonies which put limitations on property ownership, restricted or suppressed Catholic religious practice, and prohibited Catholics in government office, either explicitly or implicitly.²⁵ For instance, a 1742 law made the Catholic ministry illegal in Connecticut, while New Hampshire penalized individuals housing Jesuits.²⁶

Although it can be argued that there were exceptions to this pattern, particularly in the Middle Atlantic states, they were few and brief. Cecil Calvert, the founder of Maryland (1632) and the second Lord Baltimore, originally intended to fulfill his father's dream of creating a Catholic colony in the New World. However, so few Catholics responded to Calvert's call for investors that he had to include Protestants if he wanted the colony to succeed. The extension of toleration to Protestants in Maryland was thus a practical decision.

Maryland maintained political freedom for Catholics only until the 1680's, when Puritans took control of the colony. By 1715, Catholics in Maryland could not vote, hold public office, or inherit or purchase land.²⁷ By the early eighteenth century, laws even existed which permitted Catholic children to be taken away from their parents.²⁸ Nowhere in the colonies was there such a broad disparity in the history of toleration as in Maryland.

New York kept a relatively open attitude toward Catholics until the 1688 Glorious Revolution provided Protestantism a victory in religiously di-

vided England. At that point Catholicism became illegal.²⁹ Rhode Island, often noted for its eccentricity, held a less condemnatory attitude toward Catholics, but still denied Catholics citizenship after 1664 and did not extend the franchise to Catholics until the period of the Revolution.³⁰

Pennsylvania and Delaware possessed the more tolerant Quaker attitude toward religion. Indeed, many Catholics from Maryland and New York came to Pennsylvania when their home colonies became oppressive.³¹ However, by the time of the Revolution, Catholics were not allowed to vote and were subject to various civil discriminations. In 1756 Pennsylvania, for example, "Catholics were disarmed, disallowed from serving in the militia, forced to pay double taxes, and... registered so that their movement could be scrutinized."³² Thus, even in the most welcoming of colonies, Catholics still lacked the basic civil rights afforded their Protestant sisters and brothers.

Protestant Visions of Catholic Nature

These laws demonstrate that Catholics posed a political problem for British-Americans. However, they do not describe the Protestant vision of Catholics which inspired such precautions. One of the most comprehensive presentations of anti-Catholicism is this one, found in *The New-England Primer*, first published in 1737.

Child, behold that Man of Sin, the *Pope*, worthy thy utmost Hatred.
Thou shalt find in his Head, (A) *Heresy*.
In his Shoulders, (B) *The Supporters of Disorder*.
In his Heart, (C) *Malice, Murder, and Treachery*.
In his Arms (D) *Cruelty*.
In his Knees, (E) *False Worship and Idolatry*.
In his Feet, (F) *Swiftness to shed Blood*.
In his Stomach, (G) *Insatiable Covetousness*.
In his Loyns, (H) *The worst of Lusts!*³³

Described here are the qualities typically assigned to Roman Catholics. In particular, we note several characteristics which might foster political fears, including greed and murderous ambition. This perception of Catholic nature was so widespread that conspiracy theories abounded even where there were only few Catholics. "The New England colonial mind pictured the Catholic ages as one long series of plots and persecutions; and held that when, as in England, the Catholic religion ceased to be dominant, there were still constant sub rosa conspiracies to regain the lost power."³⁴ The conspiratorial image of Catholics was compounded by the various political intrigues involving Catholics in England, including the Gunpowder and Popish plots mentioned previously.

Furthermore, the Protestant misperception that Catholics owed the pope both civil and religious loyalty made Catholics the subject of much suspicion. The eighteenth century minister John Cotton claimed that Catholics believed "the Pope is as much above the Emperour, as the Sunne is above the Moone....the emperour is but a borrowed light from the Sun and doth owe homage to the Pope for his Imperial Crowne [sic]."³⁵ The Enlightenment era arguments for reason and individualism became very important in critiques of Catholicism. Curry notes that the "pervasive opinion that 'Popery' was synonymous with tyranny relegated Catholics to a position beyond the realm of acceptability."³⁶

Thus, anti-Catholicism did not originate in a vacuum, suddenly to appear in colonial law. It was rooted in Protestant historical and personal observations which became part of the culture of New England. The heresy perpetuated by the pope and transmitted by his disciples throughout the world posed a threat to Protestant politics, religion and culture. With this in mind, anti-Catholic legislation during the early colonial period can be seen as

a defensive response to a perceived threat that was reinforced by the geo-political circumstances in the New World.

Anti-Catholicism and Early Colonial Catholic Demographics

In the end, early colonial regulations against Catholics were either very successful or highly unnecessary. Records suggest that no Catholics migrated to Massachusetts before about 1650.³⁷ Neither did Catholics make up a significant portion of other colonial populations. As late as 1760, one observer estimated that Catholics numbered only "nine or ten in the whole country" of North Carolina, while the population of "heathens and infidels" totalled almost one thousand people.³⁸

The bulk of American Catholics lived in Maryland and Pennsylvania due to these colonies' more tolerant religious attitudes. However, Catholics were still minorities in these colonies. During the 1750's, Maryland, where Catholics were most numerous, had only about 7,700 Catholics dispersed among over 92,000 Protestants.³⁹ Other estimates locate only ten thousand Catholics in both Maryland and Pennsylvania as late as 1765.⁴⁰ At the height of their population prior to the Revolution, Catholics numbered no more than twenty-five thousand people, "scarcely one percent of the two and a half million colonists."⁴¹

Not only did Catholics lack significant numbers, they also lacked strong organization. In 1776, more than one hundred forty years after Catholics first settled Maryland, there were only twenty-three priests in Maryland and Pennsylvania combined.⁴² At that same time, Philadelphia, the only city in the colonies where Catholics could legally celebrate Mass outside their homes,⁴³ had only two Catholic churches.⁴⁴ The Roman Catholic Church

did not receive a bishop in the former British colonies until 1784, when Maryland native John Carroll was appointed to the office.⁴⁵

Thus, in pragmatic terms British-American Catholics posed no real political or religious threat to Protestant America at the end of the early colonial period. The external threat posed by France and Spain was not mirrored within the British colonial population itself. As we make the transition to the early revolutionary period, these statistics are important because they demonstrate that there was not a large enough or powerful enough Catholic community within the British colonies to justify the significant amount of anti-Catholic rhetoric which arose in this era.

Summary

In this chapter we have looked at anti-Catholicism as a political phenomena. From 1607 to 1763, the French and Spanish in North America presented a threat to Protestant religion and government from the British colonial perspective. This threat, combined with traditional Protestant fears of papal political ambition, led to the exclusion of Roman Catholics from the political process.

While the English colonists saw very tangible enemies in the French and Spanish, they also perceived a more elusive enemy among their Catholic compatriots. There is very little evidence to indicate that British-American Catholics had either the intent or the power to carry out a plot against Protestant America. Despite this fact, Protestant political suspicions dictated a policy of political and civil discrimination that lasted until the Revolution.

After 1763 a new political situation arose in America. Changes in the international situation largely eliminated the French and Spanish menace to the English colonies. Yet anti-Catholicism as an expression of political fear did not die out. Indeed, it continued with a new fervor--and in a new direction--that would carry the British colonies through the Revolutionary War.

Chapter 2

The Development of Anti-Catholic/Anti-Tyranny Rhetoric (1763-1776)

The political circumstances which made anti-Catholicism an obvious concern during the early colonial era shifted significantly during the early revolutionary period from 1763 to 1778. With the 1763 Treaty of Paris, the immediate threat of French and Spanish colonization disappeared. However, Britain's decision in 1763 to give Catholics preference for political offices in Canada resurrected Protestant concerns in the colonies about Catholic political power.⁴⁶ This situation gave rise to rumors that the King and the pope were in alliance, a possibility which horrified all good Protestants.

These rumors are the starting point from which we can look at the new focus taken by anti-Catholicism during the revolutionary period. The development of a pre-revolutionary spirit in America coincided with this transformation of anti-Catholicism. History and geography had ordained that the New World colonists were separate and self-sufficient from Europe. Autonomy in politics, economics, and personal affairs was highly valued by the colonists. However, after 1763, Britain attempted to increase its control of the colonies. The colonies did not receive well Britain's greater involvement in colonial affairs through trade and revenue laws like the Stamp Act in 1765, or through the 1763 imposition of a standing army in the colonies and Royal involvement in colonial governments. Movements aimed at diminishing British intervention sprang up continuously during the thirteen year interval from 1763 to 1776. The colonies sought autonomy in their own affairs.

The demand for autonomy and the "new" focus of anti-Catholicism intersected significantly. The Roman Catholic Church had always been described

as authoritarian and tyrannical, and now the King and Parliament were portrayed similarly as arbitrary tyrants by the colonists. Accusations that the British government had taken up "popery" characterized the King's management style, not his religious affiliation. Anti-Catholicism, formerly an outwardly oriented prejudice, was redirected internally against the British government and used symbolically to represent anti-tyranny.

Why might such a tactic be used in the ideological conflict with Britain? The revolutionary movement was led by "the substantial, propertied, politically dominant elements in each colony" who had personal interests in colonial autonomy.⁴⁷ In many cases they had economic interests at stake. However, the general populace did not share many of these concerns, and without the support of the colonial population, the movement for autonomy and eventually independence could not have been successful. Thus, the leaders needed a rallying point around which they could unite the populace in the protest against British intervention in colonial affairs.⁴⁸ The widespread dislike and fear of Catholics made them an obvious focus for aggression. Anti-Catholic imagery communicated an anti-tyranny message rooted in a common Protestant heritage.

In this chapter, I will demonstrate how tyranny and Catholicism were used synonymously during the early revolutionary period. To this end, I look at specific historical events which contributed to the revolutionary movement, as well as original documents written in response to them. The major events that I have selected include the 1763 Treaty of Paris and the establishment of a standing army in that same year, the 1765 Stamp Act, and the 1774 Quebec Act. These historical events have been chosen based on several criteria. First, they all mark critical points in the development of the independence movement. Second, to some extent anti-Catholic propaganda

arose as a response to each event. Third, I have tried to examine events which did not directly affect Catholics, as well as some events which did demonstrate that anti-Catholicism was not only an expression of religious difference. I do not claim to present a comprehensive picture of the Revolution; many critical events which are part of the story of the American Revolution are not included here. However, the events I present provide a representative picture of anti-Catholicism as it was used in the Revolution by American colonial leaders.

The Changing Political Relationship between Britain and her Colonies

Two major events ushered in the revolutionary age in 1763. First, Britain signed the Treaty of Paris with France which officially ended the Seven Years' War. This treaty should have been the cause of great relief for the British colonists because it mandated that Britain would receive Canada from France, and East and West Florida from Spain.⁴⁹ While French and Spanish culture might remain in these areas, the imperial and military threat posed by these nations was effectively eliminated.

Almost immediately, however, controversy arose in the Protestant colonies over Parliament's decision to grant Catholics preference for political office in Canada.⁵⁰ Political life had always been limited to Protestants in the colonies to the south; this new policy contradicted the religious-political tradition which maintained that Catholics could not be trusted to hold office. The Protestant colonists saw Catholic political freedom in an overwhelmingly "papist" Canada as in direct opposition to their own political interests.

The commotion from Protestant Americans fell on deaf ears in England. Britain realized that to avoid unrest among the French-Canadians, it had to make some concessions to Catholic Canada.⁵¹ Allowing Catholics to

participate politically made a lot of sense from Britain's perspective. However, Parliament did not share a border with Canada, and could not understand the immediacy of colonial fears, particularly in New England. Unable to agree with Britain on this issue, the colonists began to realize that Britain's interests did not always coincide with those of the colonies.

Thus developed the idea of an internal "Catholic" enemy--that is, the Crown and Parliament. "The quasi-establishment of Catholicism in Quebec by the English Home Government veered the New England antagonism from Catholic France, removed as a colonial danger by the Treaty of Paris (1763), to Protestant England, now considered as too Catholic in its tendencies."⁵² While the colonists were concerned about Canada, they held the English government, not the Canadians themselves, responsible for the conflict.

The new policy toward Canada became the occasion for rumors about a papal-monarchical alliance. Granting political power to Catholics was so entirely anomalous to the colonists that there seemed no other way to explain such a move. While such an assumption may seem extreme, the colonists

...could not have been astonished at the news that an evil plot against their liberties had been hatched in a corrupt and faintly "Catholic" England. The founders had come to America in the seventeenth century to escape an earlier version of what seemed by the eighteenth century a persistent conspiracy. Christian history afforded many such examples.⁵³

Taken in the wider ideological context of the Revolution, these religious conspiracy fears fit into a larger colonial perspective which historian Bernard Bailyn identified in his study of revolutionary era pamphlets. In his book *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, Bailyn asserts that the Revolutionary leaders believed "that they were faced with a deliberate conspiracy to destroy the balance of the [English] constitution and eliminate their

freedom."⁵⁴ Bailyn further contends that perceptions of conspiracy were pervasive and persuasive enough to motivate the colonists to rebel against Britain. Every new act of Parliament was taken as "evidence of nothing less than a deliberate assault launched surreptitiously by plotters against liberty..."⁵⁵

The conspiracy mentality helped link, in the colonial mind at least, the 1763 establishment of a standing army in the colonies to the granting of political privilege to Canadian Catholics. The British and their American cousins held a historical suspicion of standing armies, envisioning them as "gangs of restless mercenaries, responsible only to the whim of the rulers who paid them, capable of destroying all right, law and liberty that stood in their way."⁵⁶ Rumors flew that the newly empowered Catholic Canada was to be the base of operations for a takeover of Protestant America; the establishment of the army had begun the process of infiltration.

The standing army reinforced colonial perceptions of Britain as an imposing, imperial government at the same time that traditional religious-political conspiracy theories circulated. The Americans did not like the prospect of greater British political and military presence in their communities. Britain intended the army as a protective body, but the colonists saw it as a disruptive force. Even after Catholic conspiracy theories died down, the colonists still viewed the establishment of the army as contrary to their interests.

The Stamp Act

The Stamp Act of 1765 gave rise to more rumors of a "Catholic," or tyrannical, monarchy. This tax encompassed a broad variety of paper goods and affected many people within the colonies. To a greater extent than had occurred previously, its promulgation evoked discussion of colonial autonomy

and, more particularly, Britain's right to tax the colonies. Colonial opposition to the measure was expressed in documents such as the 1765 Virginia Resolves, which argued that

the Taxation of the People by themselves, or by Persons chosen by themselves to represent them...is... the distinguishing characteristick of British Freedom, without which the ancient Constitution cannot exist....[The colonies] have without Interruption enjoyed the inestimable Right of being governed by such Laws, respecting their internal Polity and Taxation, as are derived from their own Consent...the same hath never been forfeited or yielded up...⁵⁷

These words written by Patrick Henry outline the colonial desire to have control over their own affairs. We also see exhibited here concern with constitutional freedoms. Henry explicitly emphasizes that these freedoms are still in force, suggesting that he has reason to fear that they are being threatened or ignored by Britain. His conscientious effort to reinforce constitutional liberties lends credence to the argument that British-Americans suspected Britain of trying to constrain the colonial community.

Attempts to curtail colonial autonomy after the Stamp Act were often represented by colonists in relation to Catholicism, either through conspiracy theories or through more subtle metaphorical language. Samuel Adams, master propagandist of the American Revolution, subtly blended both of these tactics in his 1768 arguments against the Stamp Act. He very shrewdly argued that "much more is to be dreaded from the growth of popery in America than from the Stamp Act, or any acts destructive of civil rights."⁵⁸ Having identified both the Stamp Act and Catholicism as threats, Adams carries his analysis a bit further, cleverly managing to link the two things together by claiming "I could not help fancying that the Stamp Act itself was contrived with a design only to inure the people to the habit of contemplating themselves as the slaves of men; and the transition thence to a subjection to Satan is might

easy."⁵⁹ This comment referred to the Protestant perception of Catholics as subjects of the pope, rather than of God. Protestant perceptions that Catholics owed the pope mindless obedience encouraged slavery images in anti-Catholic literature.

Adams' commentary on the Stamp Act accomplished many things. By first setting Catholicism up as a "dreaded" thing, even more appalling than the Act itself, Adams drew his audience's attention to a "potential danger" they might not have been aware of. Then he managed to connect these two hated things, Catholicism and the Stamp Act, thus calling up fears of a conspiracy. While the Stamp Act might have appeared only annoying at first, it now became the sign of a greater plan to enslave the colonies.

Adams' anti-Catholic criticism of the Stamp Act had been preceded a week earlier by another article in which he warned "As you value your precious civil Liberty and everything that you can call dear to you, to be on your guard against Popery."⁶⁰ Adams very clearly had engaged himself in an anti-Catholic campaign--indeed, he admitted this fact in the April 4, 1768, issue of the *Boston Gazette*. That this crusade coincided with anti-Britain and anti-Stamp Act propaganda hardly seems accidental, especially given the political nature of Sam Adams. Analysis of his other writings demonstrates that the distaste he exhibits toward Catholics here might not have been genuine--or at least not quite so powerful. Adams "had chiefly in mind to rouse his fellow countrymen against England; he utilized existing anti-Catholicism to further his purpose....this is amply borne out by the fact that there is no evidence of anti-Catholic antagonism in his writings after 1780."⁶¹

Adams knew how to manipulate the public sentiment. In this instance, his clever melding of political and religious concerns played upon historical colonial religious fears as well as current events. His combination of the

issues makes it less clear that anti-Catholicism can be defined as a religious prejudice. In any case, attempting to associate the Crown with Protestantism's deadliest enemy, Catholicism, allowed for the identification of Britain as an enemy--as a power in opposition to colonial concerns.

Other propaganda surrounding the Stamp Act showed the connection to Catholicism less explicitly, but used imagery similar to that used in anti-Catholic rhetoric. As already stated, slavery image in particular was common in anti-Catholic works, representing the mental and political slavery the pope held over his subjects. For instance, one colonial newspaper depicted the Stamp Act as "first step to rivet the chains of slavery" on Americans.⁶² Such language would continue to surface as the revolutionary movement gained speed. By representing British policy in language similar to that used against Catholics, propagandists communicated an anti-British political message that might otherwise have been unpalatable to colonial sentiments.

The Quebec Act

The passage of the Quebec Act in 1774 affords us the best opportunity to examine anti-Catholicism as a revolutionary tool. This "one deed of England's managed--however difficult the task surely was--to fuse anti-Catholic and anti-English sentiments."⁶³ The Act stated that "...no Person professing the Religion of the Church of Rome, and residing in the said Province, shall be obliged to take the Oath [of Supremacy]."⁶⁴

This granting of political privilege, and, for all intents and purposes, autonomy, to the Catholic government of Quebec, fueled earlier rumors that the King and Parliament were secretly working with the Vatican to spread Catholicism throughout the colonies. Indeed, "well before the text of the Quebec Bill reached the colonies, Calvinists were predicting that the next ship

from England would bring the news that 'we must have imposed on us, the superstitions and damnable heresies of the Church of Rome.'"⁶⁵ The *Boston Evening Post* reported "...the Pope has been solicited to publish a Crusade against the rebellious Bostonians, to excite the Canadians, with the assistance of the British soldiery, to extirpate these bitter enemies to the Romish religion and monarchical power."⁶⁶ Such rumors reflected concerns previously exhibited in 1763 when Britain had first given Canadian Catholics political standing.

Relying on traditional despotic images of Catholics, Protestants in British America saw the Quebec Act as "dangerous in an extreme degree to the Protestant religion and to the civil rights and liberties of all America."⁶⁷ Indeed, Bob Jingle, the "self-styled Poet Laureate of Congress," characterized the Quebec Act as the death knoll of freedom in British America:

If Gallic Papists have a right
To worship their own way
Then farewell to the liberties
Of poor America.⁶⁸

The colonists perceived the purpose of the Act as "to reduce the ancient free Protestant Colonies to the same state of slavery" as the European Catholic states; thus, they could hardly believe "that a British Parliament should ever consent to establish a religion that has deluged [Britain]...in blood, and dispersed impiety, bigotry, persecution, murder and rebellion through...the world."⁶⁹ Considering that many of the British colonies had come into existence through efforts to escape religious hegemony, it is natural that the threat of another religious tyranny, however improbable, should strike a chord with the Americans.

While all of these passages talk specifically about Catholicism, evidence of a more general fear of tyrannical behavior can be found in examining the

particular language employed by the various authors. Thus, we read about creeds "imposed," "Crusade[s] against the rebellious," dangers to "the civil rights and liberties," and the reduction of the "free Protestant colonies to...slavery." All of these passages describe Britain in very imperialistic terms. Britain had taken upon itself the role of the despot by mandating a policy so clearly in opposition to colonial wishes. The connection between religious and political freedom meant that even those people who were not worried about their spiritual liberty might be concerned about the problems presented by a political absolutism. Thus, even if there is no direct link between the pope and the Crown, the two officers certainly share similar modes of political operation.

The colonial responses to the Quebec Act further demonstrate the more general concern with tyranny. The 1774 Suffolk Resolves, written by the Suffolk County, Massachusetts, Committee of Correspondence and submitted to the First Continental Congress, claimed that the Quebec Act threatened the "civil rights and liberties of all Americans; and therefore, as men and Protestant Christians" Americans were "indispensably obliged to take all proper measures for our security."⁷⁰ The threatening aspect of the Act was not limited simply to the fact that Catholicism had legal standing in Canada, however. The perceived danger lay in Britain's assuming the right to establish a religion in opposition to colonial interests. Alexander Hamilton would argue just this point in 1776:

The Romish faith is made the established religion of the land [Canada] and his Majesty is placed as the head of it. The free exercise of the Protestant faith depended upon the pleasure of the Governor and Council...They may as well establish Popery in New York and the other colonies...They had no more right to do it there than here. Your lives, your property, your religion are all at stake.⁷¹

The 1774 Declarations and Resolves of the First Continental Congress, issued in response to the so-called "Intolerable Acts" (among which the Quebec Act is sometimes included), also made explicit colonial resistance to Britain's imposing attitude. The document states clearly that the colonists were "justly alarmed" at the "arbitrary proceedings of parliament" and have united "so that their religion, laws and liberties may not be subverted..."⁷² The document continues, condemning

the act passed...for establishment of the Roman Catholic Religion in the province of Quebec, abolishing the equitable system of English laws, and erecting a tyranny there, to the great danger (from so great a dissimilarity of religion, law and government) of the neighboring British colonies, by the assistance of whose blood and treasure the said country was conquered from France.⁷³

Thus, it was not just that the Quebec Act established Catholicism, but rather the presumptuous nature of Britain in passing such a law, that troubled British Americans. Again, we find tyranny and constitutional freedoms to be of the utmost concern. The colonies felt that Britain disregarded their interests and rights as citizens. Further proof of this hypothesis is found in the attempts by the revolutionary leaders to engage Canada in their struggle against Britain.

The Appeal to Canada

In May, 1775, less than a year after the issuance of the Declarations and Resolves, the Continental Congress also produced "An Appeal to Canada." This letter was meant to convince the Canadian Catholics to join the colonies in the struggle against Britain. Given that so much of the anti-Quebec Act rhetoric had centered on Canada as a dangerous--and Catholic--political actor, this movement to unify with Canada seems significant. American gestures to

Canada suggest that Catholicism as such was never the threat it had been portrayed as in the literature. Had Canadian Catholicism been as dangerous as the rhetoric suggested, the British colonies would not have tried to engage Canadian support.

The "Appeal" begins with an attempt to show that the Canadians and the British Americans share common ground, "as we were both entitled by the bounty of an indulgent Creator to freedom, and being both devoted by the cruel edicts of a despotic administration to common ruin..."⁷⁴ Since both groups were unwilling victims of such a fate, the revolutionary leaders "perceived the fate of the Protestant and Catholic colonies to be strongly linked together..."⁷⁵

Having established an "ecumenical" interest, the Americans then go on to point out that the Canadians should not have to depend upon Britain to assure their freedom of religion, especially since the Parliament and the King have been so arbitrary in the past. Indeed, the Canadian Catholics "cannot be sure that a virtuous prince will always fill the throne...it is impossible to conceive to what variety and to what extremes of wretchedness" the current system might impose upon the Canadians.⁷⁶

Having criticized the fickle nature of the British government, however, the Congress is now hard-pressed to explain its own tendency to simultaneously take contradictory positions. For instance, the Congress must convince the Canadians to ignore past public condemnations of Catholicism in Canada. This task must have seemed tricky at best, especially considering the fact that the colonies had launched a military venture against the Canadians at Fort Ticonderoga earlier in that same year. The Continental Congress wanted

...to repeat that we are your friends, not your enemies...be not imposed upon by those who may endeavor to create animosities. The taking of the fort and military stores at Ticonderoga and Crown Point and the armed vessels on the lake was dictated by the great law of self-preservation....We hope it has given you no uneasiness, and you may rely on our assurances that these colonies will pursue no measures whatever but such as friendship and a regard for our mutual safety and interest may suggest.⁷⁷

Neither the "Appeal," nor a later diplomatic mission sent to Quebec in February 1776 by the Continental Congress, inspired a cooperative effort between the Canadians and the American radicals. Indeed, the united colonies would attempt another invasion of Canada led by the "rabidly anti-Catholic David Wooster" in late 1775 and early 1776.⁷⁸ The opportunist politics of the British colonies did not appeal to Canada.

While the attitudes and language presented by the Congress in the Appeal to Canada, the Suffolk Resolves and the Declarations and Resolves appear at odds with each other, the messages are not entirely contradictory. The letter to Canada contains the same anti-tyranny message that was the focus of the Suffolk Resolves and other anti-Quebec Act documents. The difference, however, is that the anti-tyranny message is not expressed in terms of anti-Catholicism when posed to Canada. American leaders were concerned with getting across an anti-autocratic ideal and generating support for their cause. To accomplish this, they simply used the language most appropriate to their audiences in each case. However, the public nature of politics meant that the Continental Congress could not make contradictory statements--in this case statements both for and against Catholic Canada--and expect both of them to be acceptable to all the parties involved.

Summary

Discontent with British leadership started emerging in 1763 when the Treaty of Paris and the establishment of a standing army in the New World provoked concerns about Britain's "excessive" involvement in colonial affairs. We begin to see concern with political autonomy developing, as well as a transformation in anti-Catholic sentiment. Anti-Catholicism reflected increasing fears of British tyranny. The 1774 Quebec Act marked a turning point in anti-Catholicism in that anti-Catholic rhetoric was still expressed loudly and publicly by many people, but, the anti-Catholic spirit represented a general concern with despotism rather than with religious affiliation. In the next chapter, I will support this theory further, looking at evidence that that American Catholics began to take on influential political roles at the same time.

Chapter 3

The Changing Political Life of Catholics

As we saw in the last chapter, anti-Catholic sentiment was a common phenomenon during the early revolutionary era. Sometimes, as with the 1774 Quebec Act, anti-Catholic propaganda sprang out of particular situations which involved a change in the political position of Catholics. In these instances we might assume that the propaganda was a response to the perceived threat of Catholic power. If such were the case, we could expect that Protestant revolutionaries would attempt to further limit the political opportunities offered to Catholics. However, during the later revolutionary period after 1776, Catholics received more political privilege than ever before, resulting in the end with complete freedom of religion through the Federal Constitution in 1788 and the Bill of Rights in 1791.

The circumstances surrounding the new political freedom for Catholics do not support the supposition that anti-Catholic rhetoric was purely a response to fears of Catholic political power. Protestant leaders gradually--but freely--gave privilege to Catholics in the military and in legislatures, two of the most influential bodies in colonial society, even though tradition held that Catholics could not be trusted. Also, the alliances made with Spain and France by American revolutionaries amounted to the suspension of the traditional stereotypes of Catholics as insatiable political monsters. Furthermore, *de facto* toleration of Catholics rose during this period even though discriminatory laws against Catholics continued to exist. After the Declaration of Independence, colonial laws finally began to match this *de facto* toleration.

In this chapter, I will provide further proof that anti-Catholicism during the revolutionary era was more than a simple expression of dislike or fear of Catholics. While in the last chapter we used document analysis to explore this hypothesis, we will now look beyond the documents to the actual circumstances of political toleration and opportunity in the colonies to further substantiate this point.

Catholics in the Political System

Just how much did the political involvement of Catholics increase during the era from 1763 to 1791? We can investigate this question from several different angles. In terms of leadership roles, we increasingly find Catholics on Committees of Correspondence and in other colonial political bodies. Among those found in such positions were the Brents of Virginia, Thomas Fitzsimmons in Pennsylvania and Charles Carroll of Maryland.⁷⁹ After 1776, Fitzsimmons and Daniel Carroll made their way into state constitutional conventions and legislatures.⁸⁰ Maryland, allegedly the most politically prohibitive colony for Catholics, sent Catholic Charles Carroll to the second Continental Congress just in time to sign the Declaration of Independence.⁸¹ Thomas Burke, a Roman Catholic from North Carolina, participated in the Continental Congress as well.⁸² When the delegates gathered for the Constitutional Convention in 1787, Catholics were proportionately overrepresented compared to their total population, with two Catholics among thirty-seven non-Catholics.

Catholics also played a role in the military crusade itself once the fighting actually began in 1775. Although Protestant Americans had long feared the possibility of a papist attack, Catholics--and foreign-born ones at that--held critical positions within the colonial military. Colonel John Fitzger

acted as General Washington's aide-de-camp, while Polish-born engineer Thaddeus Kosciuszko served as an artilleryist. Count Casimir Pulaski, another Polish officer, was cavalry commander.⁸³ Stephen Moylan filled the position of Master Muster General for a short while. Perhaps the most well-known Catholic officer in the Revolution, however, was Commodore John Barry, the father of the American navy.⁸⁴ The responsible and active roles assigned to Catholics in the Revolution disprove the hypothesis that revolutionary era Protestant leaders feared Catholic ambition. Had the Catholics really been seen as a significant political threat, the Protestants certainly would not have given them guns and powerful positions within the military.

When we consider that before the American Revolution not one of the British colonies allowed Catholics to hold public office, this list of important positions appears quite impressive. However, we must remember that the people who held leadership roles in the Revolution, regardless of their religion, were elites. Each of them had their own qualifications for office. The Catholic names on the roster of American leaders, like the Protestant names surrounding them, are of established families of some means. For example, it would have been unwise for the American colonial leaders to exclude the powerful--and Catholic--Carroll family, allegedly the richest family in the New World, because of religion.⁸⁵ Their influence in the strategically critical colony of Maryland was significant. I do not mean to suggest that Catholic participation held no meaning; but at the same time, we should be aware that this criterion alone does not reveal how widely Catholics were accepted in society in general at the time.

Spanish and French Cooperation in the War for Independence

The cooperative relationships which the British colonists developed with the French and Spanish provide compelling evidence that anti-Catholicism during the Revolution had little in common with the prejudice which existed before the Revolution. Pre-revolutionary dislike of foreign Catholics was so strong and charged with fear that the thought of an alliance, let alone the actual establishment of one, seemed ludicrous. Nonetheless, in 1778 the United States and France signed two treaties--one of alliance, the other of commerce.⁸⁶ Spain also entered the war on the American side in 1779 with the Convention of Aranjuez.⁸⁷

Even prior to these official alliances, however, both countries provided essential financial and military aid to the colonies. "The aid shipped to the United States through French sources in 1776 and 1777 was critical to the continuing war effort; the American Army at Saratoga received 90 per cent of its arms and ammunition from French merchants."⁸⁸ At one point in 1776 "Spain advanced one million *livres*..to the Hortalez Company for furnishing supplies to the rebellious colonists..."⁸⁹ From the outset, then, the United States accepted Catholic support, and the Catholic superpowers provided it despite the prevalence of anti-Catholic propaganda.

How can we explain the American readiness to accept aid from their former French enemies? The answer lies in a complex combination of economic, political and military necessity. After the colonies stopped trading with Britain in 1775, they found themselves without commerce, supplies or weapons.⁹⁰ It soon became apparent that the colonies would have to make new commercial connections if they were to survive. France and Spain welcomed any opportunity to cause instability within the British Empire.⁹¹ Spain had additional territorial objectives in the Americas which they felt

could be better served through United States independence.⁹² Thus, the alliances formed between the three countries were essentially marriages of convenience, serving the political interests of each nation.

Furthermore, American perceptions of the Catholic/Protestant conflict had changed significantly since the end of the Seven Years' War in 1761. Americans no longer found this religious dichotomy as compelling as they had in the past⁹³ and "were not prepared to participate in a religious crusade against Catholicism when other issues seemed more important."⁹⁴ As we have already seen, these "other issues" were related to American political and economic autonomy.

Anti-Catholic propaganda sprang up in the British camp as well as on the American side. The alliances with France and Spain were the cause of much derision among loyalists, who joked that the provisions brought by the French included "tons of holy water and casks of consecrated oil, reliques, beads, crucifixes, rosaries, consecrated wafers and Mass books."⁹⁵ Loyalists pointed to the alliance with France as evidence of the American betrayal of Protestantism. Tory propagandists declared that "Samuel Adams...was taking instructions with an eye toward trying on a Roman collar, presumably with the intention of joining William Penn and King George III on the Jesuitical deathbed."⁹⁶

It was a strange irony that both the British and the Americans found cause to accuse their opponents of "popery." While the loyalist accusations of "popery" were very clearly based in America's political alliances, the "popery" which the colonists accused England of was much more subtle. That the colonists would accuse Britain of popery while they themselves aligned with Catholic nations provides strong evidence that there was a more metaphorical understanding of the word "popery" in use. "Popery"

had come to signify "the conjunction of civil and spiritual power [or] the confluence of church and state."⁹⁷ Indeed, in the colonies it was declared that "the Papacy was never abolished [in England],...but transferred to the sovereign."⁹⁸ The new understanding of "popery" facilitated the translation of political ideals to a greater number of people than simple statements of ideology could have.

Legislation and Constitutions

Another criterion which we can use to gauge the level of Catholic inclusion is the elimination of anti-papist legislation. By the end of the revolutionary period in 1791, each of the colonies had approved the Federal constitution and Bill of Rights which guaranteed freedom of religion to all faiths. These documents formally opened the American political process to Catholics, along with their Protestant brethren.

After 1776, state constitutions began reflecting a growing tolerance as well. These state documents sometimes proved ground-breaking, as was the case with the 1776 Constitution of Virginia. Largely the work of Thomas Jefferson, the article on religious freedom stated "that religion...can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and therefore all men are entitled to the free exercise of religion."⁹⁹ A year later, the New York State Constitution proclaimed

whereas we are required by the benevolent principles of rational liberty, not only to expel civil tyranny, but also to guard against that spiritual oppression and intolerance wherewith the bigotry and ambition of weak and wicked priests and princes have scourged mankind, this convention doth further...ordain, determine and declare that the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever hereafter be allowed, within this State, to all mankind...¹⁰⁰

Both of these documents helped set the stage for federal freedom of religion by putting forth a new, more tolerant attitude toward religious difference.

South Carolina provides another example of an extreme change in the political position of Catholics. The constitution written in 1776 spoke vehemently against Catholicism, naming that religion as partially responsible for South Carolina's call for independence.¹⁰¹ The 1778 revised Constitution of South Carolina moved toward anti-establishment of religion by separating the role of the Church from that of the government. It stated that "whereas the ministers of the Gospel are by their profession dedicated to the service of God and the cure of souls and ought not to be diverted from the great duties of their function," and thus they should not take public office.¹⁰²

The Constitution later went on to call for religious toleration for all who believe "there is one God, and a future state of rewards and punishments, and that God is publicly to be worshipped."¹⁰³ However, the Protestant faith was still the established faith. Thus, civil liberties were not separated from religious belief. Indeed, the government went so far as to establish criteria on which to base the definition of a church.¹⁰⁴ Finally, however, the Constitution of 1790 stated that the "free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination and preference, shall forever hereafter be allowed within this State to all mankind."¹⁰⁵ The evolution process was complete. In a fourteen-year period, South Carolina had made a one hundred-eighty degree turn in its attitude toward religious freedom.

Changes such as these were surely welcome to Catholics; however, this new legislation did not develop in a vacuum. Although exclusionary legislation existed throughout the colonies, evidence suggests that by the revolutionary era these laws were not always taken seriously. Bernard

Bailyn contends that despite regulations forbidding it, Roman Catholics openly held public office in conservative Virginia.¹⁰⁶ Restrictions in the North Carolina state constitution did not prevent Catholic Thomas Burke from representing his home state in the Continental Congress and then becoming governor in 1781--nine years before this would become legal.¹⁰⁷ Some scholars believe that Rhode Island's anti-Catholic law may have been a mistake.¹⁰⁸ Even though Maryland was known for its oppressive legislation against Catholics, "the fact is that most Maryland Catholics paid no substantial penalty for their faith."¹⁰⁹

These incidents do not deny that anti-Catholic laws did severely limit Catholic involvement in politics at times. However, these examples, and others like them, demonstrate that a more tolerant atmosphere was developing in colonial America by the time of the Revolution. To some degree, discrimination against Catholics was already breaking down by 1789. The development of "enlightened" state and federal documents on religion was as much a response to change that had already occurred as it was a mandate for change.

Summary

If we examine the particular situation in which Catholics lived during the revolutionary period, it becomes evident that American political society accepted them more than ever before. During the period from 1763 to 1791, Catholics held influential leadership positions in state legislatures and constitutional conventions, the military, and even within federal bodies such as the Continental Congress. Catholics were allowed to hold these offices--sometimes they were even appointed to them--despite old Protestant fears of Catholic tyranny. The Catholic nations of France and Spain also played criti-

cal roles in the struggle for independence although less than fifteen years before the Declaration of Independence the British colonists had been engaged in a war with these countries in the New World.

Besides change on a the individual office-holding level, the more difficult task of transforming institutions and structures began to happen slowly within the individual colonies, as well as on a larger scale in the federal government. Transformation occurred through the establishment of new constitutions guaranteeing freedom of conscience and civil liberties to all faiths. While some old restrictive legislation against Catholics still remained, it held less sway during this period than it had in the past.

These facts demonstrate that anti-Catholicism during the Revolution was not directed simply at preventing Catholics from gaining political power. Indeed, the bulk of anti-Catholic rhetoric was delivered prior to the improvement in the political position of Catholics, a fact which refutes the argument that anti-Catholicism was a response to an increase in Catholic power. Thus, heightened Catholic involvement did not cause the increase in anti-Catholic rhetoric prior to the Revolution. In the final chapter, we will examine what relationship, if any, we can find between the anti-Catholic sentiment and the increasing acceptance of Catholics in political office.

Chapter 4

Conclusions

Anti-Catholic sentiment as an expression of political concerns existed in both the colonial and revolutionary eras. However, this rhetoric held different meanings in each period. During the early colonial period French and Spanish colonization provoked concern that Catholics might actually engage in a crusade to overtake British America. When the Catholic nations were no longer an immediate political threat after 1763, the term "Catholic" was used more broadly to describe a mode of governing associated with the Roman Catholic Church. American Protestants characterized "Catholic" or "popish" government as arbitrary, unresponsive, and tyrannical.

The new interpretation of "Catholicism" came into use due to colonial conflicts with Britain during the 1760's and 1770's. At that time the British government heightened its involvement in colonial affairs, largely out of economic necessity.¹¹⁰ The colonists did not like the increased monetary demands placed upon them, nor did they appreciate the heavy-handed manner in which Britain enforced new regulations. "Attempts by the mother country in the 1760's to make the colonies more productive within the merchantist system appeared to many to signal a shift toward centralization and a limitation of Protestant individualism."¹¹¹ Colonial freedom in colonial affairs was described as parallel to the Protestant belief in personal freedom in religious matters. Following this analogy, Britain's imperialist attitude toward the colonies was described as similar to the pope's tyrannical control of Catholics.

Colonists with significant financial interests in British America led the movement against the King and Parliament. To help motivate popular support of their interests, these elites perpetuated the use of "anti-Catholic" imagery against Britain, realizing the emotional and historical appeal that such language could have on communities which had originated in the face of religious persecution. Familiar religious rhetoric metaphorically communicated a political message that the Protestant community could understand.

The pressure for colonial autonomy mounted throughout the 1760's and early 1770's, accompanied by a corresponding increase in anti-Catholic/anti-tyranny rhetoric. Some of the anti-Catholic sentiment generated at this time was in response to British laws increasing Catholic political rights, as when Canadian Catholics were granted preference in political office in 1763, and in 1774 with the Quebec Act. However, even laws which had no direct connection to Catholicism were described by colonial radicals as "popish." Such was the case with the Stamp Act of 1765. The fact that "popish" language was applied to unpopular laws regardless of their content supports the hypothesis that anti-Catholic propaganda described more than just a fear of Catholic political ambition.

The push for autonomy finally climaxed with colonial independence in 1776. With the revolutionary ball rolling, the need for provocative anti-tyranny propaganda diminished, and, consequently, anti-Catholic rhetoric was less visible. This analysis does not deny that individual prejudice against Catholics still existed. However, anti-Catholicism as a public expression of colonial political concerns lost its revolutionary relevance. Anti-Catholicism would subsequently resurface in xenophobic reactions to heavy immigration in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. For the time being,

however, anti-Catholicism had served its political purpose in the Revolution by 1776.

The ease with which Catholics gained political privilege during the revolutionary era despite anti-Catholic propaganda further suggests that Protestant political fears were not primarily focused on Catholics. Although the Protestant colonial leaders publicly decried "popery" as politically dangerous, they did not actively prevent Catholics from participating in the new government of the United States. In some cases Catholics were even recruited by Protestant leaders, as happened in 1776 when Charles Carroll of Carrollton and his cousin Father John Carroll traveled as envoys to Canada on behalf of the British colonies.

It might be argued that colonial leaders took advantage of the Carrolls' Catholicism in an attempt to gain favor with the Canadians. Regardless, the point stands, however, that religious difference no longer represented the biggest political division in society. Protestant Americans felt that something bigger than religious uniformity was at stake and were therefore willing to work with Catholics. The fact that the United States sought out the Catholic nations of France and Spain as allies lends credence to this point. American political interests extended beyond simple religious matters, and so anti-Catholicism also came to point beyond its literal interpretation to new concerns about self-government.

As the United States began its awkward development, Protestant leaders had the power to create political institutions that excluded Catholics. Indeed, historical precedent would have predicted just such a situation. The original governments and constitutions of the colonies were highly selective structures formed so as to exclude whoever the founders determined to be objectionable. The United States, by contrast, adopted on the federal and state

level what was the most liberal system of religious freedom in the Western world at that time. Had anti-Catholic sentiment been entirely sincere, this could never have happened.

The Relationship Between Anti-Catholicism and Catholic Political Opportunity: One Possibility

The conclusion I derive from the preceding analysis is that anti-Catholicism during the revolutionary era was not simply a defensive reaction to increased Catholic political influence. This conclusion contrasts sharply with what we found in early colonial history, where anti-Catholicism did seem a response to an actual political threat. In fact, I contend that the particular form of anti-Catholicism expressed in the revolutionary era *preceeded* the improvement of Catholic political life. However, can the coexistence of anti-Catholic propaganda with an expansion of Catholic liberties be chalked up to mere coincidence or did these two occurrences have a different kind of relationship?

I think one possible answer to this question lies in the identification of anti-Catholicism as a form of resistance to tyranny. The religious and political sensibilities of Protestant Americans were offended at the beginning of the revolutionary period by the formal legal acceptance of Canadian Catholics as political actors. Britain's action touched two different colonial sore spots. Most obviously, British colonists were upset that the dreaded "papists" would have political status and power that could potentially be dangerous to Protestantism.

A less apparent concern sprang out of Britain's imperial interference with religion in the New World. British Americans, Catholic and Protestant alike, had crossed the Atlantic to escape the suffocating religious atmosphere

in Europe which limited civil and political rights. Governmental interference in Canada caused the British colonists to wonder whether Britain might attempt the same thing in her original colonies. For the most part this fear was not made explicit in 1763. Instead, Protestant Americans attacked Catholic political privilege on the basis of old stereotypes of Catholics as greedy and ambitious political beings. However, by the time the Quebec Act was passed in 1774, American criticism of Britain had matured. Although the British colonists still referred to traditional images of Catholics, they also increasingly identified Britain's crime as the "imposition" of a particular creed within the colonies.

If we look back to the documents issued by the First Continental Congress in response to the Quebec Act in light of this analysis, they no longer seem contradictory. Despite their conflicting perspectives, both the Suffolk Resolves, written from a Protestant perspective, and the Appeal to Canada, written as a diplomatic communique, are concerned with the preservation of colonial autonomy in religious affairs. The same can be said of Alexander Hamilton's blistering attack of Britain in his *Full Vindications of the Measures of Congress*. The attitude these three documents express is aptly summed up in Hamilton's assessment that Parliament "had no more right" to establish Catholicism in Canada than they had to establish it anywhere else in the colonies.

American concerns about British imperialism were not limited to religious matters, however. This fact is demonstrated in the colonial response to the establishment of a standing army in 1763 and the imposition of the Stamp Act in 1765. These actions generated debates about the colonial right to representation and autonomy in their own government. Such political arguments paralleled the religious questions raised at the same time. In both politics and

religion, Britain had crossed the line from benevolent and distant ruler to intrusive and over-demanding despot. Furthermore, all of the conclusions that we have derived thus far about American fears of British interference in religious and political matters fit into the conspiracy ideology described by Bernard Bailyn. Anti-Catholicism represented a particular application of the conspiracy theory.

British Americans soon realized that this "popish" interference posed a greater threat to their freedoms than individual groups within colonial society posed to each other. Thus, it was in each particular group's best interests to ally with the others. With regard to religion, this meant that "[each denomination] wanted freedom for itself....It became clear that the only way to get it for themselves was to grant it to all the others."¹¹² So while revolutionary leaders espoused anti-Catholic/anti-tyranny rhetoric, they were inadvertently creating room for Catholics in the political system. Revolutionary leader Oliver Ellsworth clearly described the "anti-popery" attitude in 1787:

The business of a civil government is to protect the citizen in his rights, to defend the community from hostile powers, and to promote the general welfare. Civil government has no business to meddle with the private opinions of the people. If I demean myself as a good citizen, I am accountable not to man but to God for the religious opinion which I embrace.¹¹³

Thus, the stronger the resistance to "popish" government, the more latitude was granted to Catholics.

The eventual outcome of this (possibly unconscious) realization was the federal disestablishment of religion and the separation of church and state. Colonial toleration had evolved significantly from the seventeenth century belief that religious uniformity was the only way to preserve religious liberty. Now in the late eighteenth century Americans accepted that "the fear that

'popery or some other tyrannical way of worship' would be established was groundless if no religious test were allowed by the Constitution."¹¹⁴

I have suggested a relationship in which anti-Catholic/anti-tyranny rhetoric was a response to a set of political limitations imposed by Britain. The increased political opportunity offered Catholics in revolutionary America resulted from the rejection of those limitations. This relationship does not fully explain Catholic-Protestant dynamics during this period. However, it does provide us with a possible framework within which to consider other aspects of the Revolution, including the interplay of other religious groups and the further development of religious liberty in America.

The relationship of religion and politics in world history comprises a long and sordid tale, rife with misunderstanding, narrow-mindedness and distrust. However, no matter how similar the tale may sound from century to century, each era has its own particular set of circumstances which form and inform our historical understanding of a situation. Unfortunately, it is very easy to take our interpretation of one period and transfer it to any event vaguely resembling the original without critical analysis of how similar the two situations truly are. This presumption can perpetuate inappropriate stereotypes or interpretations which in turn jeopardize our ability to interpret current events.

What I have tried to demonstrate here is that although anti-Catholic rhetoric appeared the same on the surface throughout the colonial period, its thrust during the early colonial era was not the same as that intended during the revolutionary era. Literature during the early period demonstrated a sincere concern with foreign domination. In the later era anti-Catholic rhetoric showed that the colonists feared internal corruption and tyranny. While there

is no doubt that true anti-Catholic sentiment did exist, the point I am making is that we can not make broad generalizations about the "hateful" anti-Catholic nature of the Protestant colonies on the basis of a literal interpretation of their words, nor can we assume that anti-Catholicism after the Revolution meant the same thing that it did prior to the war or even the same thing it does now.

Historical investigation of prejudice provides us with a context in which to understand attitudes--whether religious, political or something else--as constantly evolving, rather than as a constant force that can not be altered or fought against. Only when we understand the history and "changeability" of attitudes will we be able to fight the prejudices which pervade society.

###

Endnotes

Introduction, pages 1-7

¹John Tracy Ellis, *Catholics in Colonial America* (St. Paul: North Central Publishing Company, 1965), p. 319.

Chapter 1, pages 8-19

²*Ibid.*, p. 4.

³Sister Mary Augustina Ray, *American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1936), p. 16.

⁴Joseph Casino, "Anti-Popery in Colonial Pennsylvania," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (1981), p. 279.

⁵Thomas Bokenkotter, *A Concise History of the Catholic Church*, (New York: Image Books, 1979), p. 247.

⁶Casino, p. 279.

⁷*Ibid.*, p. 280.

⁸Sidney E. Mead, "From Coercion to Persuasion: Another Look at the Rise of Religious Liberty and the Emergence of Denominationalism," *Church History* 57 (1988), p. 69.

⁹Michael Kammen, "Unstable Pluralism and the Quest for Legitimacy," in *Conflicts and Consensus in Early American History*, 5th ed., Allen F. Davis and Harold D. Woodman, eds. (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co., 1980), p. 7.

¹⁰"Government of New Haven Colony," in Francis N. Thorpe, ed., *The Federal and State Constitutions*, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1909) p. 526.

¹¹"Commission of John Cutt," in Thorpe, p. 2448.

¹²"Charter of New England," in Thorpe, p. 1839.

¹³"Massachusetts Anti-Priest Law" in Arthur J. Riley, *Catholicism in New England to 1788*, (Washington: Catholic University of America, 1936), p. 326.

¹⁴*Ibid.*

¹⁵Louis B. Wright, *Religion and Empire*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1943), p. 155-156, quoted in Ellis, p. 316.

¹⁶William Warren Sweet, *Religion in Colonial America*, (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1942), p. 12, quoted in Ellis, p. 320.

¹⁷Ellis, p. 316.

¹⁸"Charter of Connecticut," in Thorpe, p. 534.

¹⁹"Second Charter of Virginia," in Thorpe, p. 3802.

²⁰"Act Against Jesuits and Popish Priests," in John Tracy Ellis, ed., *Documents of American Catholic History*, vol.i, 1493-1865, (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc. 1987), p. 118-119.

²¹Riley, p. 306.

²²Charles H. Metzger, *Catholics in the American Revolution*, (Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1962), p. 21.

²³William Smith, *A Brief State*, quoted in Casino, p. 301.

²⁴"Act Against Catholics and Priests in Virginia," in *Documents*, p. 110-111.

²⁵Thomas J. Curry, *The First Freedoms: Church and State in America to the Passage of the First Amendment*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 80.

²⁶Riley, p. 317-318

²⁷James Hennessey, *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981), p. 42; Ellis, p. 344, 345.

²⁸Ellis, p. 345.

²⁹John Webb Pratt, *Religion, Politics and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967), p. 37.

³⁰Theodore Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949), p. 142.

³¹Casino, p. 289.

³²Casino, p. 303-4.

³³Quoted in Riley, p. 50. Emphasis in original.

³⁴Riley, p. 315.

³⁵Quoted in Riley, p. 57.

³⁶Curry, p. 80.

³⁷Ellis, p. 321.

³⁸James Reed, "An Account of Religious Conditions in North Carolina," June 26, 1760, in Merrill Jensen, ed., *Tracts of the American Revolution 1763-1776*, (Bobbs-Merrill Co, Inc: Indianapolis), p.548.

³⁹Ellis, p. 358.

⁴⁰Thomas McAvoy, *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), p. 29.

⁴¹Hennesey, p. 55.

⁴²Hennesey, p. 55.

⁴³Sanford H. Cobb, *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, (New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1968), p. 450.

⁴⁴Robert Leckie, *American and Catholic*, (New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1970), p. 39.

⁴⁵Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience*, (Garden City, NY: Image Books), p. 105.

Chapter 2, pages 20-33

⁴⁶Carl Bridenbaugh, *Mitre and Sceptre*, (New York: Oxford University Press), p. 333; Theodore Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism*, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1949), p. 115.

⁴⁷Philip Davidson, *Propaganda and the American Revolution*, (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941), p. 36.

⁴⁸Underlying my argument about anti-Catholic rhetoric is a more general argument about the nature of the American Revolution. In his book *Propaganda and the American Revolution* Philip Davidson asserts that the Revolution was not a popular movement, but instead a carefully engineered attempt by colonial elites to retain their own power in response to Britain's greater involvement in colonial affairs. To do this, these elites tried to gain the support of the populace using various forms of propaganda, including, as I argue here, religious propaganda.

⁴⁹William C. Stinchcombe, *The American Revolution and the French Alliance*, (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1969), p. 3.

⁵⁰Bridenbaugh, p. 333.

⁵¹Robert Middlekauf, *The Glorious Cause*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 52.

⁵²Riley, p. 74.

⁵³Middlekauf, p. 134.

⁵⁴Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 1967), p. 144.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, p. 95.

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p. 62.

⁵⁷Middlekauf, p. 80.

⁵⁸*Boston Gazette*, April 11, 1768.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, April 4, 1768.

⁶¹Riley, p. 309.

⁶²*New London Gazette*, Sept. 20, 1765, quoted in Middlekauf, p. 126.

⁶³Edwin Scott Gaustad, *A Religious History of America*, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966), p. 117.

⁶⁴"The Quebec Act Grants Religious Freedom to the Catholics in Canada," 1774, in *Documents*, p. 131.

⁶⁵Quoted in Alan Heimert, *Religion and the American Mind*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 388.

⁶⁶*Boston Evening Post*, September 19, 1774.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*

⁶⁸Quoted in Maynard, p. 130.

⁶⁹"Suffolk Resolves," 1774, in *Documents*, p. 134.

⁷⁰*Ibid.*

⁷¹Alexander Hamilton, *Full Vindication of the Measures of Congress*, October 1776.

⁷²"Declarations and Resolves of the First Continental Congress," in Harold C. Syrett, ed., *American Historical Documents*, (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1960), p. 74-5.

⁷³*Ibid.*, p. 77.

⁷⁴"An Appeal to Canada," in *The Annals of America*, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., (Chicago, William Benton, Publishers, 1968), p. 327.

⁷⁵*Ibid.*

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, p. 328.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*

⁷⁸Hennesey, p. 57.

Chapter 3, pages 34-42

⁷⁹Hennesey, p. 59; J.M. O'Neill, *Religion and Education Under the Constitution*, (New York: Harper and Bros., 1949)p. 20; Leckie, p. 44.

⁸⁰Hennesey, p. 59.

⁸¹Leckie, p. 44.

⁸²Theodore Maynard, *The Story of American Catholicism*, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1949), p. 155.

⁸³Hennesey, p. 59.

⁸⁴McAvoy, p. 39-41.

⁸⁵Hennesey, p. 42.

⁸⁶Paul A. Varg, *Foreign Policies of the Founding Fathers*, (Michigan State University Press, 1963), p. 23-24.

⁸⁷Stinchcombe, p. 62.

⁸⁸Stinchcombe, p. 9.

⁸⁹Varg, p. 30.

⁹⁰Stinchcombe, p. 7.

⁹¹Stinchcombe, p. 4.

⁹²Lawrence S. Kaplan, *Colonies Into Nation: American Diplomacy 1763-1801*, (New York: Macmillan Company, 1972), p. 121.

⁹³Heimert, p. 85.

⁹⁴Stinchcombe, p. 5.

⁹⁵Quoted in Leckie, p. 54.

⁹⁶Ibid.

⁹⁷Gaustad, p. 112.

⁹⁸Quoted in Casino, p. 280.

⁹⁹"Constitution of Virginia," 1776, in Thorpe, p. 3814.

¹⁰⁰"Constitution of New York," 1777, in Thorpe, p. 2636-7.

¹⁰¹"Constitution of South Carolina," 1776, in Thorpe, p. 3241-42.

¹⁰²"Constitution of South Carolina," 1778, in Thorpe, p. 3253.

¹⁰³ Ibid., p. 3255.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., p. 3256.

¹⁰⁵"Constitution of South Carolina," 1790, in Thorpe, p. 3264.

¹⁰⁶Bernard Bailyn, ed., *Pamphlets of the American Revolution*, vol. I, 1760-1765, (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1965), p. 151.

¹⁰⁷Maynard, p. 155.

¹⁰⁸Curry, p. 90.

¹⁰⁹Hennesey, p. 42.

¹¹⁰Middlekauf, p. 52.

Chapter 4, pages 43-50

¹¹¹Casino, p. 305.

¹¹²Mead, p. 87.

¹¹³Oliver Ellsworth, "On a Religious Test for Holding Public Office," December 17, 1777, in *Annals.*, p. 171.

¹¹⁴O'Neill, p. 25.

Bibliography

Primary Sources in Collections:

American Historical Documents. Harold C. Syrett, ed. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1960.

- "Declaration and Resolves of the First Continental Congress," October 14, 1774.

The Annals of America. Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. Chicago: William Benton Publishers, 1968.

- "An Appeal to Canada," Second Continental Congress, May 29, 1775.

- Ellsworth, Oliver. "On a Religious Test for Holding Public Office," December 17, 1787.

Bailyn, Bernard. *Pamphlets of the American Revolution, 1750-1783*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1965.

Evans, Charles. *American Bibliography*. vols. 3-6. (Microcard). Chicago: Blakely Press, 1903-1909.

- *Boston Evening Post*, September 19, 1774.

- *Boston Gazette*, April 4, 1768.

- *Boston Gazette*, April 11, 1768.

- Hamilton, Alexander. *Full Vindications of the Measures of Congress*, October 1776.

Documents of American Catholic History, vol. I, 1493-1865. John Tracy Ellis, ed. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987.

- "Act Against Catholics and Priests in Virginia," 1642.

- "Act Against Jesuits and Popish Priests in Massachusetts," June, 1700.

- "The Quebec Act," June 22, 1774.

- "The Suffolk Resolves," 1774.

The Federal and State Constitutions. Francis Newton Thorpe, ed. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1909.

- "Second Charter of Virginia," 1609.

- "Government of New Haven Colony," 1643.

- "Charter of Connecticut," 1662.

- "Commission of John Cutt," 1680.

- "Charter of Massachusetts Bay in New England," 1692.
- "Constitution of South Carolina," 1776.
- "Constitution of Virginia," 1776.
- "Constitution of New York," 1777.
- "Constitution of South Carolina," 1778.
- "United States Constitution," 1787.
- "Constitution of South Carolina," 1790.
- "United States Bill of Rights," 1791.

The Pulpit of the American Revolution. John Wingate Thornton, ed.
Boston: Gould and Lincoln, 1860.

Tracts of the American Revolution 1763-1776. Merrill Jensen, ed.
Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co, Inc.

- James Reed, "An Account of Religious Conditions in North Carolina," June 26, 1760.

also:

- "Massachusetts Anti-Priest Law," 1647, in Riley, cited below.

Secondary Sources:

Bailyn, Bernard. *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution.*
Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 1967.

Bokenkotter, Thomas. *A Concise History of the Catholic Church.* New York:
Image Books, 1979.

Bridenbaugh, Carl. *Mitre and Sceptre.* New York: Oxford University Press,
1962.

Casino, Joseph. "Anti-Popery in Colonial Pennsylvania." *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (1981), p. 279-309.

Cobb, Sanford. *The Rise of Religious Liberty in America.* New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc., 1968.

Curry, Thomas J. *The First Freedoms: Church and State in America to the Passage of the First Amendment.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Davidson, Philip. *Propaganda and the American Revolution.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

- Dolan, Jay P. *The American Catholic Experience*. Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1985.
- Ellis, John Tracy. *Catholics in Colonial America*. St. Paul: North Central Publishing Company, 1965.
- Gaustad, Edwin Scott. *A Religious History of America*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966.
- Heimert, Alan. *Religion and the American Mind*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966.
- Hennesey, James J. *American Catholics: A History of the Roman Catholic Community in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Kammen, Michael. "Unstable Pluralism and the Quest for Legitimacy." in *Conflicts and Consensus in Early American History*, 5th ed., Allen F. Davis and Harold D. Woodman, eds. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath and Co., 1980.
- Kaplan, Lawrence S. *Colonies Into Nation: American Diplomacy 1763-1801*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1972.
- Leckie, Robert. *American and Catholic*. New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1970.
- Maynard, Theodore. *The Story of American Catholicism*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.
- McAvoy, Thomas T. *A History of the Catholic Church in the United States*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.
- Mead, Sidney E. "From Coercion to Persuasion: Another Look at the Rise of Religious Liberty and the Emergence of Denominationalism." *Church History*: v. 57 (reproduced from v25:317-337), p. 68-88.
- Metzger, Charles. *Catholics and the American Revolution*. Chicago: Loyola University Press, 1962.
- Middlekauf, Robert. *The Glorious Cause*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- O'Neill, J.M. *Religion and Education Under the Constitution*. New York : Harper and Bros., 1949.

- Pratt, John Webb. *Religion, Politics and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1967.
- Ray, Sister Mary Augustina. *American Opinion of Roman Catholicism in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.
- Riley, Arthur J. *Catholicism in New England to 1788*. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1936.
- Stinchcombe, William C. *The American Revolution and the French Alliance*. Syracuse, New York, 1969.
- Varg, Paul A. *Foreign Policies of the Founding Fathers*. Michigan State University Press, 1963.

Bibliographies:

- Ammerman, David. *Books About Early America: 2001 Titles*. Williamsburg, Virginia: Institute of Early American History and Culture, 1989.
- Blanco, Richard L. *The War of the American Revolution: A Selected Annotated Bibliography of Published Sources*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1984.
- Gephart, Ronald M. *Periodical Literature on the American Revolution: Historical Research and Changing Interpretations*. Washington, Library of Congress, 1971.
- Shy, John W. *The American Revolution*. Northbrook, Illinois: AHM Publishing Corporation, 1973.
- The American Revolution*. United States. Superintendent of Documents. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.