
From the Restoration to the Glorious Revolution: A Protestant Regrouping

Kevan D. Keane
Liberty University, kdkeane@liberty.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/montview>



Part of the [European History Commons](#), [Political History Commons](#), and the [United States History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Keane, Kevan D. () "From the Restoration to the Glorious Revolution: A Protestant Regrouping," *Montview Liberty University Journal of Student Research*: Vol. 9: Iss. 1, Article 2.
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/montview/vol9/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Center for Research and Scholarship at Scholars Crossing. It has been accepted for inclusion in Montview Liberty University Journal of Student Research by an authorized editor of Scholars Crossing. For more information, please contact scholarlycommunications@liberty.edu.

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

From the Restoration to the Glorious Revolution: A Protestant Regrouping

Submitted to Dr. Samuel C. Smith in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

HIUS 820-D01

By

Kevan D. Keane

October 18, 2020

Abstract

Puritans had goals of reforming the Church of England but had difficulty maintaining a consistent vision of that. As Puritans tried to secure their place in the New World, England was going through one of its most significant transitions of power. These events are known as the Restoration, and the political turmoil in its wake resulted in the Glorious Revolution, a time of intense political transition resulting in the overthrow of James II, the last of the Stuart monarchs. However, its effects were not only felt in England. The Restoration as well as the Glorious Revolution carried over into colonial America, and the latter resulted in several upheavals throughout the American colonies, including Coode's Rebellion, as well as Leisler's Rebellion in New York and the Boston Revolt of 1689 in Massachusetts Bay.

Keywords: Puritans, Glorious Revolution, Massachusetts, Maryland, New York

From the Restoration to the Glorious Revolution: A Protestant Regrouping

Puritans had goals of reforming the Church of England but had difficulty maintaining a consistent vision of that. As Puritans tried to secure their place in the New World, England was going through one of its most significant transitions of power. These events are known as the Restoration, and the political turmoil in its wake resulted in the Glorious Revolution, a time of intense political transition resulting in the overthrow of James II, the last of the Stuart monarchs. However, its effects were not only felt in England. The Restoration as well as the Glorious Revolution carried over into colonial America, and the latter resulted in several upheavals throughout the American colonies, including Coode's Rebellion, as well as Leisler's Rebellion in New York and the Boston Revolt of 1689 in Massachusetts Bay.

Further evidence of the transatlantic nature of the Puritan movement is the role the Puritans played in the Glorious Revolution of 1688. The Puritans of England actively sought to purge the Crown of any remaining allegiance to the Pope (as did other Protestants), and consequently, Puritans in America began to purge their own colonies of the same in the wake of the Glorious Revolution. The chain of political upheavals in the colonies in the late seventeenth century were connected to common suspicions on both sides of the Atlantic of threats to the Protestants' freedom and safety in the British Empire, and the Protestants' protective measures to preserve them.

Background: The Puritans, The Restoration and Protestant Liberty

To understand the Glorious Revolution and its aftermath in colonial America, it is first necessary to understand the Puritans and their political philosophy. In addition, it is also essential to understand the kind of monarch James II was. For Puritans to achieve their goals of ecclesiastical purity, royal politics had to be aligned. The Puritans had failed to achieve this

during the Commonwealth of England but were not giving up their ambitions altogether.

However, James's royal policy was a hindrance to that.

Puritans, as devout Protestants, saw themselves as having the best interests of England at heart. They considered themselves exemplary loyal Protestants. Consequently, they saw Catholics as inherently seditious and a threat to the Crown. By the Restoration, this dichotomy was nothing new. Since the Reformation had first taken hold in England, as Antoinette Sutto argues, "who the malicious or factious persons might be depended on one's religious views."¹ Depending on who was in power, this could be Catholics or it could be Puritans. In order to keep England uniform, it was quintessential to maintain a united Church of England. Naturally, this led to questions as to what to do with the colonies, since these were an essential part of the British Empire.² Puritans and Catholics, who both refused to conform to the Church of England, presented a challenge to this vision.

To the Puritans, the Catholics were the problem despite their calls for tolerance of other religious views. Even Andrew Marvell, a "puritan-leaning conformist"³ believed that there was a definite aim on the part of Catholics to take away Protestant freedoms. He argued that Catholics were attempting to "change the lawful government into outright tyranny, and to convert the established Protestant religion into downright popery."⁴ Marvell cited the lack of shared power with the people as proof of the Crown's devious nature.⁵ Marvell's beliefs about Catholicism

¹ Antoinette P. Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2015), 15.

² Ibid.

³ Michael P. Winship, *Hot Protestants: A History of Puritanism in England and America*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2019), 225.

⁴ Andrew Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England*, (Amsterdam, 1677), 1.

matched the attitude toward Catholics of his time. Catholics had been suspected of being inherently seditious since England had broken with the Catholic Church. These fears continued even into the Restoration. Marvell's indictment against Catholics would later fuel the rise of the growing Whig party within Parliament.⁶

This fear of a Catholic conspiracy to deprive Protestants of freedom and religion was notably present in England and her colonies. However, as John Kenyon notes, because the Protestant religion served as a fortification against attacks from without (including from Rome), most Protestants believed the danger had to come "from within," as a conspiracy, which left most Protestants on their guard.⁷ In this way, the Puritans' measures to eliminate the Catholic elements of worship can be seen not only as a step toward true religion, but also protection from losing the freedoms from Catholic tyranny and oppression that they had in a thoroughly Protestant nation.

Catholics would often call for "toleration" despite their refusal to adhere to the religious reforms of the Church of England.⁸ However, Puritans saw in these calls for toleration a subtle move to eventually bring England back into the Catholic Church and eliminate Protestants from England altogether. Puritans in England, New England, and the colonial South all held to this idea of Catholics being suspected of subtly trying to bring in papal tyranny. This tension between

⁵ Marvell, *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England*, 1.

⁶ Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 225.

⁷ John Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, (London, UK: Phoenix Press, 1972), 3.

⁸ Questier, "Catholic Loyalism in Early Stuart England," 1133-1134. England had been a nation where uniformity was greatly stressed. The thought of anyone living there who did not conform to the common religion was unthinkable, and to the minds of many, dangerous. This included Catholics and Puritans, and any other dissenter who did not walk in uniformity with the Church of England. Despite this, Catholics attempted to prove themselves loyal despite their disagreements, and to disprove the many accusations of conspiracy they faced from their fellow Englishmen.

the Protestant establishment in Great Britain and the existence of Catholics in Maryland had existed since the beginnings of the English colonies. However, Maryland's established government was able to endure for awhile despite the shifting politics in the mother country. The situation did not begin to change until the decades following the Restoration of the Stuart monarchy.

James, the Duke of York (later James II when he became King of England and Ireland and James VII of Scotland), by the end of the 1660s, was a committed Catholic, and very outspoken about it. Despite this, he showed no open hostility to the Church of England before his coronation. According to Vincent Buranelli, "he accepted the traditional scheme of a church, a hierarchy, a sacramental system" and for this reason accepted the Church of England as it was when he became king.⁹ However, he opposed Puritanism. He also wanted to make his own reforms to the Church of England to allow it to accommodate his religious belief and practice. This served only to confirm the Puritans' fears of a conspiracy to bring about a Catholic coup d'état.¹⁰ As a result, several questioned his fitness to be King of England.

At the time, Charles II had been reigning as King of England since the Restoration of the Stuart Monarchy. Charles II eventually came to favor a policy of religious toleration toward his subjects inasmuch as it did not disturb the peace. Keay argues that "the events of the exile convinced Charles II that unless he showed himself to be a committed Anglican he could have no hope of reclaiming his kingdom. But at the same time he took the view that there was nothing to be gained by hard-line enforcement of religious conformity."¹¹ Charles's parents and

⁹ Vincent Buranelli, *The King and the Quaker: A Study of William Penn and James II*, (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1962), 69.

¹⁰ Graham Goodlad, "Before the Glorious Revolution: The Making of Absolute Monarchy?" *Historical Review*, 58 (2007), 15.

predecessors, Charles I and Henrietta Maria, had been Catholic, and a number of religious sects had arisen in England as well as throughout the British Empire by now. Charles and his brother and heir apparent, James the Duke of York, shared sentiments toward religious freedom. By 1667, nonconformists were enjoying a wider audience in England and Charles's court included those more sympathetic towards them.¹² However, while Charles showed no sign of a conspiracy to make a Catholic coup and even seemed to tolerate Puritans and other Protestants despite his Catholic sympathies, most of the English did not share the same sense of security toward James, who was staunchly and unabashedly pro-Catholic in his retinue.¹³

Graham Goodlad disputes the notion that James had any intention of making a Catholic coup, but only wanted to achieve toleration for his fellow Catholics. He paints his actions as a monarch being sincere toward his comrades, but tactless and failing to assuage the Puritans of

¹¹ Anna Keay, *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and Ceremonies of Power*, (London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing Place, 2008), 146.

¹² Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 213.

¹³ This is not to say that the Puritans experienced no trouble whatsoever in Restoration England. Though some of the nonconformist sects were getting along, among them the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists, the Church of England was not going to give up its crackdown on Puritanism without a fight. They secured the passage of an act in 1670 that increased the fines for refusal to attend church, which was only relaxed when Charles shifted his interests to his French relatives, specifically King Louis XIV, and began to make the choice to eventually convert to Catholicism himself (Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 216-217). However, Charles II eventually shifted his attention away from a Protestant Church of England, which changed the priorities and brought about political and ecclesiastical changes that resulted in increased tension as the final decades of the seventeenth century progressed. Winship notes that by 1680, Puritanism was once again under fire (Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 218). In addition, though Puritans were still very active in England, the center of Puritan activity had arguably shifted to Massachusetts. By this time, Increase Mather had become active. Mather was a staunch providentialist who believed that the natural disasters occurring in New England as well as Virginia and Barbados were clear examples of loss of God's favor and the coming of His judgment, and called on his fellow Puritans in Massachusetts for "a sincere Reformation of those evils which have provoked the eyes of God's glory" (Increase Mather, *An Earnest Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New-England to Hearken to the Voice of God in His Late and Present Dispensations As Ever They Desire to Escape Another Judgement, Seven Times Greater Than Any Thing Which as Yet Hath Been*, (London, UK: 1676), 2, 5). For Mather, the mission to purify the Church of England from Catholic traditions was still very real and very present. He was also critical of the lack of discipline in the churches of New England, which he saw as "a form of godliness," but that his fellow Puritans "knew little the power of" (Mather, *Earnest Exhortation*, 11). He criticized New England's inhabitants as coming to grab more and more land, and failing to recognize the need for Reformation of the Church, and that the children dishonored their parents, which hindered the progress of Reformation (11-15).

their fears, which validated them into mistakenly thinking he was merely a Catholic tool.¹⁴ W. A. Speck also disputes the notion that James was seeking to develop an outright tyranny over the people. He claims that James, once he became king, was seeking “toleration as well as power for his Catholic subjects.”¹⁵ However, James only worsened the colonists’ anxieties when, in 1676, he finally broke from the established Church in his refusal to attend Easter Communion.¹⁶ It became clear to many that James was going to steer the nation in a Catholic direction if he were to inherit the throne.

When time began to approach for James II to inherit the throne, more people called into question whether he would be a problem as a known Catholic. As a result, the new Whig party tried to exclude him from becoming king beginning in 1679 in what is now known as the Exclusion Crisis. The English wanted to preserve themselves from losing their established political order and Protestant religion. The Whigs saw themselves as a continuation in the line of succession of revolutionary movements of the past, up to and including the Puritans who revolted from King Charles I during the English Civil War.¹⁷ As the English Civil War had been an attempt to protect England from a Catholic tyranny, so the attempted exclusion of James II from the monarchy was likewise.

¹⁴ Goodlad, “Before the Glorious Revolution,” 15.

¹⁵ W. A. Speck, *James II: Profiles in Power*, (London, UK: Pearson Education, 2002), 36.

¹⁶ Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, 23. These insecurities were further heightened when Titus Oates brought before the authorities information that the Jesuits were secretly plotting to overthrow Charles II and install the Catholic James as King of England (Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, 64-67).

¹⁷ Caroline Robbins, *Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*, (New York: Atheneum, 1968), Online Edition, Location 19. This did not make “Whig” necessarily synonymous with “Puritan” altogether in the sense that not all Whigs were Puritans, but most Puritans were Whigs. They believed that a Catholic could not rule England because he would not put England’s subjects first, but his own religion, which necessarily meant that he would try to bring England back under the dominion of the Roman Catholic Church. James II’s attempted reforms and Parliament-free rule only validated this stance once James inherited the throne (J. R. Jones, *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1683*, [London, UK: Oxford University Press, 1961], 217).

The Whigs, Feared Catholic Conspiracy and the Exclusion Crisis

As noted above, the political shift in England in the 1670s began to revive English Protestants' fears that there was a conspiracy afoot for the Crown to commit a Catholic coup. When it became clear that Charles's heir apparent was going to be James II, Puritans and others united once more in their concern to protect their interests. The result of their concerns was the development of the Whig Party in England. The Whigs' first move was to attempt to block the succession of James II. The Whigs feared that a Catholic monarch would, given the history of queens such as Mary Tudor, necessarily go for absolute power to restore England to Rome. Among the Whigs, John Locke, himself of a Puritan background, eventually argued that man was created in a naturally free state, and that having a king with absolute power betrayed such a notion.¹⁸

Charles II's Changing Religious Policy

By the late 1670s, Charles II's ecclesiastical reforms, which changed direction notably as previously mentioned, had served to further polarize Puritans and Anglicans against each other.¹⁹ Both wanted to outperform the other and would not allow attendance at each other's services without retaliation from church authorities. In addition, the laws still favored the Anglicans, who were determined as noted previously to enforce conformity. Finally, Charles issued the Royal Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, which inconveniently came at a time when it was clear James Duke of York would succeed him. While several Puritan ministers enjoyed the Declaration,

¹⁸ John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, Project Gutenberg, accessed October 10, 2020, <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/7370/7370-h/7370-h.htm>.

¹⁹ Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 219.

others panicked.²⁰ These included not only Puritans, but even concerned Protestants such as Andrew Marvell, as noted above.

Fear of a Catholic takeover prompted Parliament to issue the Test Act of 1673, which ultimately forced Charles's withdrawal of the Declaration and began to target Catholics for removal from political office. It required a solemn denial of transubstantiation in order to pass.²¹ Those who refused to take it were promptly removed from and/or deemed unfit for public office in Great Britain.²² The same restriction also applied to anyone who converted to Catholicism from Protestantism and attempted to teach their children Catholic doctrine.²³ However, the universal enforcement of the Act would soon be put to the test. James, Duke of York, the heir apparent, refused to comply with the Test Act when it was first issued.²⁴ English Protestants were so concerned, that, as Harris notes, Lord Danby arranged the marriage of Mary, daughter of James Duke of York, to William of Orange (consequently also James and Charles's nephew, as he was the son of their sister) in hopes to have a plan in place to prevent the impending Catholic coup.²⁵

Charles II vs. the Parliaments Over Succession

Try as Parliament did, they were unable to stop the presumed Catholic coup completely. Winship notes that eventually, word of a Catholic plot reached the ears of Parliament. Once this

²⁰ Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 222-223.

²¹ Charles II, "An Act for Preventing Dangers Which may Happen From Popish Recusants," in John Raithsby, ed., *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. 5 (1628-1680), (1819), 782-785.

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ Speck, *James II*, 24-25.

²⁵ Tim Harris, *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660-1685*, (London, UK: Allen Lane, 2005), 75-76.

occurred, Charles met with three Whig-dominated Parliaments between 1679 and 1681. At this time, Titus Oates had begun spreading a conspiracy theory that the Catholic Church was actively planning to assassinate Charles II and execute Protestants all over England as part of their alleged takeover.²⁶ The goals of these Parliaments were to stop this “Popish Plot,” as it came to be called before anyone knew of its falsehood, prevent the succession of James II, and to relax the laws against Puritans (Presbyterian or Congregationalist).²⁷ The Whigs wanted to ensure Protestants (not simply Puritans, but certainly including them), would be tolerated, and to do this the Test Act would need to be reversed.

The irony is that the Puritans got behind Parliament and the Whigs. Up until now, the Puritans had been pushing for their own supremacy in English religion and politics. However, once again, they seemed willing to cave to some form of religious toleration if it meant they could avoid persecution.²⁸ In North Carolina (founded during the reign of Charles II), the new governor Samuel Stephens, in 1677 was given orders not to harass the nonconformists of the colony.²⁹ Harris notes the meeting of the minds that occurred toward the end of Charles II’s reign. Charles II himself sympathized with the idea of religious tolerance, and the Puritans took comfort in the Anglican-dominated Parliament against the growing threat of a Catholic coup. Simultaneously, in the 1670s, Anglicans began to divert their attention away from persecuting dissidents in exchange for promoting a front against the Roman Catholic Church.³⁰

²⁶ Tim Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*, (London, UK: Longman, 1993), 78.

²⁷ Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 225-226.

²⁸ Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 226.

²⁹ William Saunders, ed., *The Colonial Records of North Carolina* (Raleigh, NC: Josephus Daniels, 1886), I.45.

³⁰ Harris, *Restoration*, 77-78.

Colonial Revolts in the 1670s in Response to Political Instability

Tension was already in place in the colonies. In 1676, Nathaniel Bacon and John Ingram led a revolt against Sir William Berkeley, known today as Bacon's Rebellion. By this time, Puritans had shifted much of their activity from Virginia to Maryland, as noted in a prior chapter. However, at a time when questions arose as to the legitimacy of absolute monarchy, Bacon's Rebellion represented the first wave of transatlantic tension concerning absolute authority, with more problems in England to follow.

Though Bacon's Rebellion had more to do with a contest against absolute rule, Levy notes that one of the leading figures in it was William Drummond, who thirteen years earlier Berkeley had appointed to the position of colonial governor of Albemarle, part of what would eventually become North Carolina. Drummond may possibly have been a Presbyterian.³¹ The revolt did not overthrow the colonial government, and it was eventually put down. Bacon, Ingram, and the others cited as their grievances that Berkeley raised taxes too high without their consent, appointed only his favorites to political office, and favored Native Americans, whom they had been engaged in constant warfare with over the last several decades, as had other colonists.³²

In North Carolina also, several colonists engaged in the Culpeper Revolt due to their dissatisfaction with royal enforcement of the Navigation Acts, which restricted their ability to trade.³³ Again, this revolt was not explicitly Puritan in form. However, Levy notes that Puritans

³¹ Drummond was later executed for his role in the rebellion (Babette Levy, "Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, vol. 70, no. 1 (1960), 247).

³² Nathaniel Bacon, et. al., "Declaration of Nathaniel Bacon in the Name of the People of Virginia, July 30, 1676," *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, 4th ser., 1871, vol. 9: 184–87.

³³ Levy, "Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," 250.

in both North Carolina and the Massachusetts Bay Colony supported the cause and fought against the Crown on it.³⁴ Massachusetts was much more openly opposed to the Navigation Acts and openly refused to submit to them, which concerned the Crown, as an uprising could clearly break out.³⁵

One Last Attempt to Stop Succession

Whether the Crown liked it or not, the events of the last several decades had positively reinforced the idea that the people had some say in the way they were governed, and the Crown was not above the law. In addition, several Puritans, particularly in Massachusetts, had questioned the legitimacy of the Restoration since it had occurred. Puritans had overthrown Charles I and established the Commonwealth, and now the rights to which they had grown accustomed could be removed upon a resumption of royal authority. As a result, the colony almost did not accept the Restoration when it occurred.³⁶ In England, resistance to apparent tyranny was beginning to take the shape of preventing royal heirs who they felt too power hungry to accept the principle of rule of law. However, the monarchy of England proved equally unwilling to surrender its authority over the colonies.³⁷

The Whigs continued to fight against the succession of James II. Harris notes that by now, they were reaching people in England far and wide, of all backgrounds to create a united front against Catholic tyranny.³⁸ However, they were not the only ones fighting for the proper

³⁴ Levy, "Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," 250.

³⁵ Viola F. Barnes, *The Dominion of New England: A Study in British Colonial Policy*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1960), 15-19.

³⁶ Barnes, *The Dominion of New England*, 6.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 25.

³⁸ Harris, *Restoration*, 142-143.

direction of royal succession in England. While they staunchly opposed the succession of James II, there was another party who fully supported it. The Tories believed the Whigs' ideas were ridiculous and that James II was of good character and perfectly fit to be king.³⁹ They defended him against what they saw as false accusations coming from the Whigs. Eventually, Charles II dissolved the second Parliament, which shot down Whigs' and Puritans' goals of stopping James's succession and prevented them from signing into law what would have secured their toleration and began to crack down on suspected rebels.⁴⁰ Finally, the Whigs changed tune. Now, they believed that not only was there a Catholic conspiracy to install James as king, but that Charles, a Catholic sympathizer, was aiding and abetting it.

It is important to note here that the Puritans' attitudes and political direction were both shifting, while their overall outlook remained roughly the same. The Puritans had been previously exclusively trying to get their reforms passed, but their attempts at reform with the Commonwealth of England had ultimately not been successful. However, once again, the Puritans had the attention of most English Protestants to keep Parliament strong and prevent an absolute monarch, who was himself a known Catholic, usurping political power. However, this is not to say that even the opponents of the Exclusion Crisis were necessarily in favor of absolute monarchy. Harris notes that both Whigs and Tories were champions of Parliament and wanted to

³⁹ Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 228-229.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*; It is also important to note that not all Whigs got behind the Exclusion Crisis. In fact, there were a variety of opinions on how to limit the constitutional powers of the king and give Parliament a more active role in politics in England. However, the solutions proposed never made it to fruition (Harris, *Restoration*, 148-149). Harris also notes that the irony of the Exclusion Crisis was that it would not have actually favored Monmouth in any way, but actually would have been on the side of William and Mary (Harris, *Restoration*, 161). However, it was blocked regardless.

act in the best interests of keeping the English system alive.⁴¹ It was their level of trust in the shape the system would take were York to become king where they differed.

For the Whigs, it was inexcusable that a Catholic monarch should inherit the throne, as the character of such a one had already been proven. Elkanah Settle, in 1681, argued that Protestant kings were good for the kingdom, because they strengthened England against her adversaries and discouraged Catholic activity. However, a Catholic king, “when the Fraternity of their Religion shall encourage the Pope to make his working emissaries ten times more numerous...’til they are become our most threatening and formidable enemies. And if ever the Protestant religion wanted a defender, ‘tis then.”⁴² Settle further argued that a Catholic king would be “the greatest Barbarian in all creation; a Barbarian that shall cherish and maintain the Dissenters from Truth, and punish and condemn the pillars of Christianity and proselytes from Heaven.”⁴³ To Settle, a Catholic king would “break an Oath for his own faith.”⁴⁴ This necessarily meant that a Catholic king not only could not be trusted, but would be the instrument of destruction the Pope could use to tyrannize England. The concerns of the Whigs, again, were not simply for Puritans but for Protestants in general. However, their arguments echoed earlier remarks of the Puritans.

Conversely, the Tories begged to differ and did not believe there was anything to fear of York’s Catholic faith. John Nalson, for example, acknowledged that the Whigs’ arguments about the Catholics were not entirely wrong, but their propagation thereof served an end that benefited

⁴¹ Harris, *Politics Under the Later Stuarts*, 98-99.

⁴² Elkanah Settle, *The Character of a Popish Successour, and What England may Expect From Such a One*, (Oxford, UK: 1681), 3.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 11.

them. He claimed “All honest men believe the Popish Plot, and have a Detestation, both against the Principles and Practices of Popery; and it would be more vigorously prosecuted, if more Commonwealth Protestants did not endeavour so visibly to make a hand of it, to play their own game.”⁴⁵ He saw the Whigs’ arguments as a tool to advance their agenda. In addition, he believed the arguments the Whigs made about the course of events in English history at that point to advance the Popish Plot as their main conspiratorial cry were logically inconsistent.⁴⁶ He wanted to restore morale and order to England. However, neither side’s appeal to reason for its own position was enough to silence the controversy.

In 1683, the Whigs and others decided to take matters into their own hands. They plotted the murder of Charles II and James, Duke of York in what is now known as the Rye House Plot, in which James, Duke of Monmouth, illegitimate son of Charles II, and the earl of Argyll, were also implicated and exiled for their role.⁴⁷ The plot failed. However, Charles spent much of the final years of his reign attempting to flush out the conspirators violently, though it was never discovered exactly who was involved.⁴⁸ None of these attempted preventions succeeded in keeping James from the throne, and he was eventually crowned James II of England in 1685. However, his reign would not prove to be without its contention.

The suspicions that James was not to be trusted eventually led to the attempted revolt of Monmouth and Argyll, who appealed to the frustrated opponents of James to try and seize the

⁴⁵ John Nalson, *The True Protestants Appeal to the City and the Countrey*, (London, UK: 1681), 1-2.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 6-7.

⁴⁷ Tim Harris, *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*, (London, UK: Penguin Books, 2007), 73-75.

⁴⁸ Ronald Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland*, (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1989), 423-428.

monarchy for himself. By now, James II had gathered a lot of support from the Anglican establishment, who did not believe him to be a threat to Protestants' security at all.⁴⁹ He quickly put down this revolt. However, "in press and pulpit, the rebellion's defeat was the occasion of the final flowering of divine right royalism in its pre-Revolution form."⁵⁰ Monmouth became a byword in the media and in the Church, and the antithesis to Monmouth's attempted coup clearly became submission to James II as the divinely appointed monarch. Though it may have helped in the actual succession of James II in 1685, it certainly did nothing to quell the fears of Protestants who rejected the notion of divine right of kings.

The Exclusion Crisis of 1679 could also be thought of as a succession crisis in the sense that it involved a conflict over who would succeed Charles II on the throne of England. As noted above, the tension involved the open Catholicism of James II and his attempted reforms that pushed for England to be more of an absolute monarchy again and have the Catholic Church replace its Protestant religion. While people in England directly felt the tension, it also played out in colonial politics as well throughout the seventeenth century. To any concerned Englishman who believed in the rule of law, any action the king took that was against English law was not to be held valid (i.e., rule of law), most residents of British Colonial America, particularly Puritans, also took this position concerning the actions of the colonial governments.

The Dominion of New England and Colonial Anger

Already the colonial government of Maryland had been under much criticism throughout the seventeenth century because it allowed Catholics to live and freely practice their religion

⁴⁹ Winship, *Hot Protestants*, 230.

⁵⁰ Tim Harris and Stephen Taylor, *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-91 in Their British, Atlantic, and European Contexts*, (Suffolk, UK: Boydell and Brewer, 2013), 35.

within its borders.⁵¹ The tension born out of these criticisms frequently put the initial colonial governors of Maryland into conflicts with the colonies. However, for the colonists in Maryland, the issue was not simply Puritans vs. Catholics. Colonists in Maryland were, as a whole, against both Puritans and Catholics, and both kinds of tension were present in the middle and eventually the latter decades of the seventeenth century.⁵² However, fears of Catholic conspiracy were a point that Puritans and Anglicans found common ground on that would only increase with time as English politics declined in stability in the 1680s. James II had succeeded the throne despite multiple attempts to prevent it. The outlook for the continuation of Puritanism and the fulfillment of its mission did not look pleasant.

When James II first took the throne, one of his actions that the colonists most despised was the creation of the Dominion of New England. This new agreement served to unite, for administrative purposes, all colonies in New England and the Mid-Atlantic, except for Delaware and Pennsylvania. James did this not only to consolidate the colonies but to reassert royal authority in the face of resistance from the colonies, particularly Massachusetts.⁵³ This union was unpopular with the colonists from the beginning, as it restricted their ability to manage their own affairs and removed the provisions of the colonial charters.⁵⁴ In addition, it also revoked all existing colonial charters, which further angered many colonists. The colonists also did not like Edward Randolph, whom James II appointed to collect taxes and related revenue from the

⁵¹ Antoinette Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2015), 71-72. The exception to this, however, was during the 1650s, when the Puritans had more direct influence over the colony and excluded others as a result (Levy, "Puritanism in the Southern and Island Colonies," 243.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 131.

⁵³ Barnes, *The Dominion of New England*, 25.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

colonists. Randolph's observation was that "though he be the man loaded with their displeasure yet they are plainly against any man whosoever to be sent from this kingdom deterring your Honrs. with the charge of Advance money as if it were a hard thing to be repaired from stopping the abuse of such a law."⁵⁵

The Dominion of New England only decreased in popularity when James appointed Sir Edmund Andros as Governor in Chief, which he did to try to keep the peace in the colonies and reduce the risk of rebellion.⁵⁶ James tried to unite the entire empire to his design. In addition, James eventually dissolved Parliament to eliminate the religious tests to hold office required under the Test Act so his Catholic subjects could have more power.⁵⁷ James's determination to bring in religious toleration was an undermining of the Church of England to many concerned Protestants. James sought to promote the Catholic cause, and this raised the anxieties of many Protestants in England. Once again, the Puritans (and now the Whigs also), who to some may have been promoting preposterous ideas, now had the attention of the rest of the English Protestants, who believed their fears right.

At a time when the colonists already did not understand why the existing colonial arrangements were not good enough to stand, James's policies only served to reinforce the notion that he was a tyrant seeking to bring England and her colonies under a Catholic absolute monarchy. Dunn argues that the Dominion of New England was James's break with the entire old order of English government, and that "as the King broke with Parliament in England, so he

⁵⁵ Alfred T.S. Goodrick and Robert N. Toppan, eds., *Edward Randolph, Including his Letters and Official Papers*, (Boston, MA: Prince Society, 1809), 79.

⁵⁶ James II, "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England," (April 7, 1688), (New Haven, CT: Avalon), accessed October 11, 2020, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/mass06.asp.

⁵⁷ Speck, *James II*, 55.

abolished representative institutions in New England.”⁵⁸ Laurie Hochstetler further argues that the Dominion of New England was James’s attempt to enforce order by taking away the “sense of self-government” among the colonists of Massachusetts Bay and populating the colony with royal authorities.⁵⁹ James’s attempts at reform only stirred the colonists (particularly the Puritans of Massachusetts and Maryland and other staunch Protestants elsewhere such as New York) as well as the other English people that it was time for a change in the regime.

The Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony especially did not like Edmund Andros, the appointed colonial governor under the Dominion of New England. Increase Mather believed that the interests of the American colonies were at risk of ruin so long as Andros was in charge.⁶⁰ Mather despised the idea of the revocation of the Charters of Massachusetts and called Andros’s commission “illegal” and challenged its right to exist on the grounds it had no aid from “Parliament, Assembly, or Consent of the People.”⁶¹ This was similar to the complaints against James’s father, Charles I, who acted without the consent of Parliament, and trampled on the rights of his subjects as a result. Mather and his fellow Puritans of Massachusetts had had enough and were now resorting to other measures to protect their own rights as English citizens and interests as a colony.

⁵⁸ Richard S. Dunn, *Puritans and Yankees: The Winthrop Dynasty of New England*, (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1962), 229.

⁵⁹ Laurie Hochstetler, “Making Ministerial Marriage: The Social and Religious Legacy of the Dominion of New England,” *The New England Quarterly*, 86, 3 (2013), 493.

⁶⁰ Increase Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New-England, by Reason of an Arbitrary Government Erected There. Under Sir Edmond Andross. To which is Added, Some Account of the Humble Application of the Pious and Noble Prelate, Henry Lord Bishop of London, With the Reverend Clergy of the City, and Some of the Dissenting Ministers in it, to the Illustrious Prince William Henry, Prince of Orange on Fryday [sic], September 21. 1688. : Also the Address of the Nonconformist Ministers (in and About the City of London) to His Higness [sic] the Prince of Orange*, (Boston, MA: Richard Pierce, 1688), 1.

⁶¹ Mather, *Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 2.

The Glorious Revolution and the Colonies

James's reforms were not welcome in England or her colonies in the Atlantic World. His open embrace of Catholicism and tendency toward an absolute monarchy upset Puritans and Anglicans alike and gave them the fuel they needed to bring about a change in the monarchy. For English Protestants, a change in the regime meant a return to established political order and Protestant religion as it had been before the reign of James II. This brought about a concerted effort among the Puritans and others to recruit William III of Orange, son-in-law of James and king of the Dutch, and his wife, Mary II (James's daughter) to invade England and take it over. They sought William's assistance to help them "defend themselves" from the politically precarious position they were in, in which James had the upper hand.⁶² They were determined to purge England of an overtly Catholic monarch, particularly once James II had produced a male heir that he made clear would be raised Catholic.

William and Mary, as their answer to the invitation, deposed James and took the English throne. In accepting his help, the Whigs believed they were taking the best step to preserving the old order.⁶³ Most of those behind this "Glorious Revolution," as it eventually came to be known, wanted a return to England as it had been prior to the reforms of James II. His reforms brought about change beyond what most English Protestants were willing to accept.⁶⁴ In this revolution, they had established a very clear precedent that a Catholic was disqualified from the monarchy (and could not be trusted to preserve the England to which Protestants held dearly).

⁶² Henry Sydney, et. al., *Invitation to William III* (1688), (London, UK: National Archives of England), accessed October 11, 2020, <https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/significant-events/glorious-revolution-1688/>.

⁶³ Robbins, *Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*, Location 16.

⁶⁴ J. R. Jones, *The Revolution of 1688 in England*, (New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company, 1972), 328.

When the English Bill of Rights was developed as a settlement agreement for the transfer of power, it listed the grievances the English had with James II primarily as ruling without the consent of Parliament (including executive decisions he made), taking monarchical matters into his own hands, and tyrannizing the people to get his way, and would allow William to rule only if he would do so in the style of a constitutional monarch.⁶⁵ Many believed James had been subtly waging a “counter-revolution,” and his welcoming a Catholic heir into his family shortly after he began to reign was only agitating Protestant anxieties further.⁶⁶ This was not a risk most English Protestants felt they could take, and so they invited William and Mary, whose Protestantism they could believe.

A common misconception about the Glorious Revolution is that James II merely stepped down without a fight, gave the throne to William and Mary, and then the Revolution was over. However, the Glorious Revolution was a much more complex event. James was far from ready to surrender the throne without a fight, and as a Catholic, he was well-received in Ireland, which was one of the three kingdoms England controlled at this time. From Ireland, James launched the unsuccessful campaign to regain the throne, known as the Williamite War, with his son-in-law.⁶⁷ With conflict raging in the mother country, the colonies too began to act on the tension they were feeling. In 1689, William passed the Toleration Act successfully, which “guaranteed freedom of worship to all non-Catholic Christians.”⁶⁸ However, this was not enough to quell Protestant fears

⁶⁵ English Bill of Rights (1689), (New Haven, CT: Avalon), accessed October 11, 2020, https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/england.asp.

⁶⁶ Curran, *Papist Devils*, 128.

⁶⁷ John Childs, *The Williamite Wars in Ireland, 1688-1691*, (New York, NY: Bloomsbury Academic, 2007), 12-14.

⁶⁸ Steven C. A. Pincus, *England's Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689: A Brief History with Documents*, (Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2006), 29.

in the colonies. James had already upended their institutions and establishments while flaunting his Catholicism, and colonial Protestants had had enough. It was time for change, and many in the colonies did not feel that the new monarch was quickly enough answering their concerns.

Some colonies had already engaged in revolt against their established colonial governments in the decade preceding these events. Now, tension was at a new peak. Curran argues concerning the colonial reaction that “like a match striking wood so dry that combustion seemed almost instant, the rumors of a regime change fed the paranoia about a transatlantic Catholic conspiracy threatening local rights and liberties.”⁶⁹ To colonial Protestants, if those in the mother country could not trust the monarch to protect their freedoms, neither could they trust his established government. New revolts broke out in different parts of colonial British America as a direct result of the Glorious Revolution. These were the Leisler Rebellion in New York, Coode’s Rebellion in Maryland, and the Boston Revolt of 1689. These revolts had as their aim an overthrow of the Catholic order that James II had been trying to create.

Encouraged by the outcome of the Glorious Revolution, several angry colonists in Boston rose up and took advantage of colonial dislike of the Dominion of New England. Puritans felt the Dominion of New England threatened them due to allowing “liberty of conscience.”⁷⁰ For the Puritans, it had been quintessential to have a colony in which their church was in charge to conduct their holy experiment. For dissidents and/or Catholics to be able to openly live in the colony while questioning the established Puritan order for which their ancestors had left the

⁶⁹ Curran, *Papist Devils*, 129.

⁷⁰ David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, (Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1972), 191. To devout Puritans, as noted above, “liberty of conscience” implied allowing toleration for Catholics, which would necessarily bring on tyranny. In addition, to the Puritans and other concerned Protestants, tolerating dissenters such as Quakers would necessarily bring on disorder, which the Puritans of Massachusetts were unwilling to put up with.

mother country went against all for which they had founded the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Puritans in Boston had had enough of seeing their charter taken away from them, and finally broke into Andros's house, arrested and jailed him to put an end to the Dominion of New England at its seat of power.⁷¹ Colonists also arrested several other people in positions of power with the Dominion.⁷² They overpowered the Dominion in forces and sought to restore the old order of things in Massachusetts at all costs. They reclaimed the place from which Andros had ruled and officially reclaimed Massachusetts for themselves.⁷³

The Dominion of New England was over. All that needed to happen now was to ensure that it would never rise again. To this effect, in 1691, Increase Mather petitioned William for a new charter to replace the one James II had revoked. In his petition, Mather's loyalty to William is plainly visible. He considered the Glorious Revolution "happy" and when Parliament did not want to deal with New England's political problems, he appealed to William, who considered the matter and agreed to look into it, and in so doing Mather gave William very high praise.⁷⁴

In 1689, another group followed the previous examples in Boston and in England. In the wake of his coronation, William suspended Catholics from holding public office. Protestants of

⁷¹ Curran, *Papist Devils*, 129.

⁷² Stephen S. Webb, *Lord Churchill's Coup: The Anglo-American Empire and the Glorious Revolution Reconsidered*, (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1998), 33.

⁷³ Samuel Prince, *Letter Describing the Boston Uprising* (1689), accessed October 12, 2020, <http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/bdorseyl/41docs/42-pri.html>. See also W.H. Whitmore, ed., *The Andros Tracts: Being a Collection of Pamphlets and Official Papers Issued Between the Overthrow of the Andros Government and the Establishment of the Second Charter of Massachusetts, With Memoirs by Sir Edmund Andros*, (Boston, MA: T.R. Mavin and Son, 1868), 1-10.

⁷⁴ Increase Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New-England, Their Negotiation at the Court of England With Some Remarks on the New Charter Granted to the Colony of Massachusetts Shewing That all Things Duely Considered, Greater Privileges Than What are Therein Contained, Could not at This Time Rationally be Expected by the People There* (London, UK: 1691), 5, 7-8.

New York followed the example of William's England and suspended Catholics from office.⁷⁵ Shortly thereafter, a man named Jacob Leisler, taking encouragement from William III's political victory, led a troop in and seized control of New York City as its self-appointed lieutenant governor for two years. During this time, he committed any who would not submit to him to prison. It was only in 1691 that the British tried and executed Leisler and his allies for treason.⁷⁶

Leisler had attempted to purge New York of any remnant of the Dominion of New England, including Sir Edmund Andros and anyone else James II had appointed, and largely succeeded despite his rule lasting only for a brief period.⁷⁷ Lovejoy argues that Leisler took courage from the Boston Revolt to lead his own rebellion in New York.⁷⁸ However, Leisler's establishment of himself did not last particularly long, as he was eventually executed for his actions once it was clear that William and Mary were in charge of England and her colonies.

The Dominion of New England was over indeed, as was any remnant thereof. Massachusetts and New York, and any other place in New England or the Mid-Atlantic associated therewith, were now separate colonies again. However, tension between Protestants and Catholics in the colonial South was now also at a peak. As a result, a revolution broke out in Maryland. This revolution had much longer-lasting effects.

While Massachusetts violently overthrew the Dominion of New England to restore the original "city on a hill," New York was somewhat aiding the process in the Leisler Revolt (since

⁷⁵ A Gentleman of the City of New York, *Leisler's Rebellion*, Western Standard, 2020, accessed October 11, 2020, <https://www.originalsources.com/Document.aspx?DocID=4V388SLAARKE8BQ>.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ This was in large part because Jacob Leisler, to the English Crown, was a largely obscure figure from Germany whom most had not heard of prior to his leading the revolt (Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 256-257). William certainly wanted to put down any semblance of disorder in the colonies but had more pressing matters to take care of in England prior to dealing with this.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 257.

the Dominion of New England included it). The political turmoil in England had proven to be of no help to the religious tensions between Protestants and Catholics, which had been present in Maryland since the colony's founding. In 1689, just like the other two revolts, those tensions came to a head and the Protestants revolted against the established colonial government.

As mentioned earlier, different religious groups had existed in Maryland since its founding, including Puritans, Quakers, Anglicans, and Catholics. However, these groups did not typically get along, and often experienced conflict over political agendas. By 1676, Anglicans, in particular, were upset about the lack of Anglican ministers in Maryland, such that one fell in danger of falling into "Popery, Quakerism, or Phanaticisme [*sic*]." ⁷⁹ Yeo lamented that most of the Anglican clergy sent were not as authentic as they presented themselves, and that the Church of England was in decline as a result, against the growing threats of the Catholics, Quakers, and others. ⁸⁰ Despite this, Lord Baltimore still was able to claim the colony was very tolerant of diverse religions who could practice freely, including "Praesbiterians, Independents, Anabaptists and Quakers, those of the Church of England and those of the Romish being the fewest..." ⁸¹ The situation in Maryland was such that even as early as 1676, the Protestants of Maryland petitioned Charles II for the establishment of Protestant schools and further protections of the Protestant churches there. ⁸² Catholics were still a minority in Maryland twelve years before the Glorious Revolution broke out. However, due to James II's attempts to counteract established laws

⁷⁹ John Yeo, "A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury," in Michael G. Hall, et. al., eds., *The Glorious Revolution in America: Documents on the Colonial Crisis of 1689*, (Durham, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2012), 152.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

⁸¹ Lord Baltimore, "Paper Setting Forth the Present State of Religion in America" (1676) in Hall, et. al., eds., *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 153.

⁸² William H. Browne, ed., *Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland*, vol. 5, 149.

Protestants had refuge in, the number of Catholics did not matter. What mattered was that they were in Maryland, and their presence signaled a danger to the other colonists.

It is important to note here that initially, when James II took the throne, some of his subjects on both sides of the Atlantic gave him the benefit of the doubt. These included the Tories, who had fought for him to succeed Charles II against the Whigs in Parliament, and also some in Maryland. Several colonists in Maryland initially rejoiced at his welcoming an heir at first, expressing their best wishes and the highest blessing of the Lord upon him.⁸³ They gave him their congratulations, and seemed to enjoy the prospect of him continuing the Stuarts' reign with a legitimate heir. However, this was not universal, as tension between the Crown and the Puritans of Maryland was escalating due to it becoming clearer that James had every intention of bringing Catholicism back to Great Britain. Soon, all Protestants would unite in their concern against James, just as they had decades earlier against his father, Charles.

In this respect, when the Glorious Revolution broke out and the tension from it traveled across the Atlantic, differences that Maryland's resident Protestant sects (Anglicans and Puritans [the independents mentioned above]) had with each other did not take priority. What mattered to both sides of the divide was eliminating the Catholic threat in the name of protecting the Protestant cause and freedoms. It was out of these tensions that the Protestant Revolution of 1689, otherwise known as Coode's Rebellion, developed. The Protestants believed they could no longer tolerate a Catholic presence in a country promising them freedom if there really was a subtle Catholic conspiracy to reclaim England for the Catholic Church. They saw Catholics as obvious enemies of the Crown, and unsuccessfully tried getting Virginia's help in getting rid of

⁸³ Inhabitants of Maryland, "Letter of Congratulations to the King," (Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Archives, 1688).

them.⁸⁴ Like the other colonial revolutions that sprung up in 1689, the one building in Maryland had as its goal to install proper Protestant protections in the local government that would keep a seditious Catholic from bringing in any foreign agenda. Soon, Maryland's Puritans took matters into their own hands.

In 1682, Josias Fendel and John Coode were arrested for attempting to incite a rebellion in Maryland. The results of this rebellion would have been to indirectly expel Catholics from the colony (which would have occurred via the deprivation of the right to own property).⁸⁵ Eventually, Protestants in Maryland initiated a rebellion that deposed the old regime, tolerant of Catholics, and installed one that they felt was more guaranteed to protect Protestants. They felt justified in doing so because they believed the Catholics were trying to sway their loyalty away from the Crown.⁸⁶ Eventually, they published a set of reasons to William and Mary why they rebelled. All the reasons they listed, however, were the very things that Protestants had not favored about Maryland all along.

The Protestants of Maryland had had enough of the various threats to their freedom in the mother country to not take some kind of action, and finally became encouraged at the results of the Glorious Revolution, like others before them. They acted in 1689 in response to the "Plots, Contrivances, Insinuations, Remonstrances, and Subscriptions, carried on, suggested, extorted, and obtained by the Lord Baltimore, his Deputies, Representatives, and Officers here."⁸⁷ They

⁸⁴ Curran, *Papist Devils*, 134.

⁸⁵ Philip Calvert, *A Letter from the Chancellour of Maryland to Colonel Henry Meese*, (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan), accessed October 12, 2020, <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A32345.0001.001/1:1?rgn=div1;view=fulltext>.

⁸⁶ General Assembly of Maryland, *Correspondence with the Secretary of State, 1688-1696: Addresses from Maryland to Their Majesties King William and Queen Mary*, (Marlborough, UK: Adam Matthew Digital, 2015).

felt that Lord Baltimore had used the Dominion of New England to his advantage and was bringing about subtly all the Protestants feared. Coode and the others accused Catholics of disloyalty and attempting to recruit to a like cause, and of the charter's failure to meet the requirements for a church that it called for, in that only what was "erected and converted to the use of Popish Idolatry and Superstition" (i.e., Catholic churches) had clergy provided to them.⁸⁸ Protestants did not feel they were getting what the charter rightfully gave them while Catholics were. Maryland had been founded as a colony with the Church of England meant to be expanded and promoted within the borders thereof. However, the Church of England was not the exclusive religion of the colony. Catholic Churches, though noted a decade earlier to be among the fewest, were still growing at an uncomfortable rate for Coode and his fellow revolutionaries.

Additionally, the revolutionaries felt the rights under the charter were under attack. They still clung to the original charter's provisions, like other colonists in other locations, even despite its dissolution with the Dominion of New England. Lord Baltimore, they claimed, was only acting in his own interests, which put their "liberty and property at stake."⁸⁹ That is, Lord Baltimore was only acting when convenient for him and what he was attempting to push, and not at all concerned about the colonists' rights to liberty and property.

In addition, they held a grievance with the lack of enforcement of a law that allowed "orphan children to be disposed of to persons of the same religion with that of their deceased parents," which would benefit the cause of Protestantism in that it would allow Protestant infants

⁸⁷ Protestant Association of Maryland, *The Declaration and Reason for the Motives for the Present Appearing in arms of Their Majesties' Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland*, (London, UK: William Nuthead, 1689), 1-2.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 3.

to be kept with Protestant families.⁹⁰ However, the law was not being properly enforced, because despite this law, “several children of *Protestants* have been committed to the tutelage of *Papists*, and brought up in the *Romish Superstition*.”⁹¹ The revolutionaries cited this along with another case of a woman leaving her husband for a Catholic suitor, and converting thereto, and nothing being done to stop it.⁹² For the revolutionaries, it was clear where Lord Baltimore’s true loyalties lay, and he was not going to hear the concerns of those under his charge, but simply commit to punish all perceived opposition to him.⁹³ Further proof of this was in Lord Baltimore’s refusal to uphold a provision of the charter that required the consent of the freedmen in the passing of laws, and his refusal to address the violence committed against Protestants by Catholics in recent days.⁹⁴

To be sure, the revolutionaries wanted to “defend the Protestant religion” and to achieve deliverance from “tyranny and popery.”⁹⁵ To devout Protestants, these two were one and the same. They wanted to purge Maryland of any Catholic tyranny, and in so doing created a situation in which conservative Protestants had control of Maryland and successfully eliminated any vestige of freedom of religion that was there when the colony was founded. The tone of the revolutionaries gives evidence that in light of the regime change in England, Catholics were empowered by Lord Baltimore’s inaction to violence against Protestants and were causing

⁹⁰ Protestant Association of Maryland, *Declaration of the Reasons*, 4.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² *Ibid.*

⁹³ *Ibid.*

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 5-6.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 7.

problems in an outrageous fashion within the colony. The political and religious climate in Maryland was eroding by 1689, and Coode's Rebellion, for the Protestants, seemed to provide a feasible answer. Later on in 1689, the Protestant Association reiterated their claims of liberty and property being violated, and petitioned William to have a stricter regime. They asked specifically for a "Protestant government."⁹⁶ They felt that under this model their "Rights and Libertyes may be secured."⁹⁷ Protestants in Maryland were pleased with the results of William's reign and pledged their utmost loyalty to him were he to give them what they wanted.⁹⁸ All William had to do was ensure the rights of Protestants will be protected.

Further evidence that the colonists of Maryland were leaning increasingly in a Catholic direction came from an avowal of Protestantism to the Crown. In Somerset County, Maryland, Protestant subjects wrote the crown. In their letter, they urged the crown to defend the Protestant religion against the "French and other Papists that Oppose and trouble us."⁹⁹ By the time the transition of power took place, it was clear that earlier Protestant predictions had proven true. Catholics in other major powers of Europe, such as France, were taking encouragement from the presence of a Catholic monarch to do harm to the cause of Protestantism. To concerned Protestants, William's reforms were their only defense, and he was succeeding, which gave them fuel to act on their own initiative in the colonies. As far as staunch Protestants were concerned, Maryland was turning Protestant, and all who did not go along were considered a threat.

⁹⁶ Protestant Association of Maryland, *The Address of the Representatives of Their Majestyes Protestant Subjects, in the Province of Mary-land Assembled, to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty*, (London, UK: William Nuthead, 1689), 2.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ Inhabitants of Somerset County, MD, "An Avowal of the Protestant Religion to the King," (Annapolis, MD: Maryland State Archives, 1689).

Protestants had built their case that to be Catholic was to be inherently disloyal and had James II's reforms to secure this notion. Though they had initially arrested Fendal and Coode for their earlier attempted revolt, they now sided with these men in getting their desired reforms to protect what mattered to them.¹⁰⁰ Colonial Maryland would never again be the same. The revolutionaries overthrew the old regime and replaced it with one to secure their rights as Protestants and keep away the dangers of Catholicism. However, they still needed to prevent their efforts being put down.

The list of grievances had served its purpose, which was to ensure to William and Mary that there was no disloyalty in the motives of Coode and his comrades.¹⁰¹ In the end, Coode and his fellow revolutionaries were not prosecuted for their actions. However, as Sutto notes, the Crown brought Maryland promptly under its jurisdiction as a royal colony, with no evidence that they did or did not believe Coode's allegations.¹⁰² Protestants had gone on a steady campaign of Catholic removal, and the Crown did not reverse this. It even went as far as to ban Catholics from holding public office in Maryland.¹⁰³ When Coode's Rebellion was over, Catholics would never again be in a position in colonial Maryland to usurp any kind of power to themselves at the expense of Protestants.

Conclusion

¹⁰⁰ Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 159. Sutto attributes the reason for Coode's Rebellion as having to do with Lord Baltimore failing to verbally acknowledge the legitimate coronation of William and Mary and deposing of James II, which would have solidified any Protestant notion that Catholics were not loyal to the Crown, and that this was as true in Maryland as it was in England (164).

¹⁰¹ Nuthead, *Declaration of the Reasons*; Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 169.

¹⁰² Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 174.

¹⁰³ Moran, "Anti-Catholicism in Early American Politics," 222.

Puritans sought to purify England of traditional Catholicism and absolute monarchy. In England, their reforms were rejected and the English authorities vigorously opposed them. This prompted the Puritans to start emigrating to different colonies in America, including Massachusetts, Virginia, and Maryland, among others. In Massachusetts, the Puritans were able to conduct a “holy experiment” with a “city on a hill.” In the colonial South, they often contended with the established authorities. This was especially true in Maryland, a colony with established freedom of religion and a proprietary government that the Catholic Calverts were in charge of.

The Glorious Revolution crossed the Atlantic Ocean into several of the American colonies in a decisive effort to purge the remnants of the Roman Catholic Church and absolute monarchical tyranny out of their boundaries. James, as an outspoken Catholic, wanted to promote toleration for himself and his fellow Catholics. However, he did so in blatant disregard of his subjects’ concerns and even dissolved Parliament. While his motives are a subject of debate among historians, it is generally agreed that the effect of James’s reforms was to convince the people he did not have their best interests at heart, but instead sought to overturn the established constitutional monarchy and Protestant Church of England and replace it with an unchecked Catholic, absolute monarchy. This signaled to concerned Protestants in England that his reign was a danger to their rights and freedoms, and it needed to be overturned.

James’s opponents solicited the help of his son-in-law, William III, to overthrow him and make England Protestant again. The tension continued for two years during the Williamite War in Ireland. While William purged England of any remnants of Catholicism and James II’s reforms, colonists sought to do likewise. The Leisler Rebellion and the Boston Revolt of 1689 eliminated the Dominion of New England and purged Catholics from political office in New

England and the Mid-Atlantic. Simultaneously, Protestants in Maryland believed Catholics were attempting to sway their loyalty to the Crown and sought protection from an alleged Catholic conspiratorial coup. In the end, the colonists succeeded, as their English counterparts had, in making the colonies more solidly Protestant (or at least protective of Protestantism to their desired level) less than a century before the American Revolution.

Biblical Worldview Connections

As a Christian historian, the author's aim is to present history as close to the primary sources as possible. To be able to engage the scholarship is critically important because it helps to understand where the other major scholars are coming from. Simultaneously, true history begins with an examination of the primary sources, not to shape an agenda, but to allow the facts to speak for themselves. In addition, belief that God wants His people free to choose Him in this life has sparked the author's interest in a study of the development of freedom of religion and the various Christian movements that helped bring about the United States of America that made this possible. The author is firmly devoted to presenting the truth and letting the facts speak for themselves, as God would have people be completely honest, and have a singular agenda about their research.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- A Gentleman from the City of New York. *Leisler's Rebellion*. Western Standard: 2020.
Accessed October 11, 2020.
<https://www.originalsources.com/Document.aspx?DocID=4V388SLAARKE8BQ>.
- Andrews, Charles M., ed. *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690*. Barnes and Noble, Inc.: New York, 1915.
- Browne, W.H., ed. *Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly of Maryland*. (64 vols.) Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1883.
- Calvert, Philip. *A Letter from the Chancellour of Maryland to Colonel Henry Meese*. University of Michigan: Ann Arbor. Accessed October 12, 2020.
<https://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A32345.0001.001/1:1?rgn=div1;view=fulltext>.
- General Assembly of Maryland. *Correspondence with the Secretary of State, 1688-1696: Addresses from Maryland to Their Majesties, King William and Queen Mary*. Adam Matthew Digital: Marlborough, 2015.
- James II. "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England." April 7, 1688. Avalon: New Haven. Accessed October 11, 2020.
https://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/mass06.asp.
- Marvell, Andrew. *An Account of the Growth of Popery and Arbitrary Government in England*. Amsterdam. 1677.
- Marvell, Andrew. *Prose Works* (2 vols.). Yale University Press: New Haven, 2003.
- Mather, Increase. *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New-England, Their Negotiation at the Court of England With Some Remarks on the New Charter Granted to the Colony of Massachusetts Shewing That all Things Duely Considered, Greater Privileges Than What are Therein Contained, Could not at This Time Rationally be Expected by the People There*. London: 1691.
- Mather, Increase. *A Call From Heaven to the Present and Succeeding Generations or a Discourse Wherein is Shewed, I. That the Children of Godly Parents are Under Special Encouragement to Seek the Lord. : The Exceeding Danger of Apostasie, Especially as to Those That are the Children and Posterity of Such as Have Been Eminent for God in Their Generation. III: That People Ought to Remember God Their Creator*. John Foster: Boston, 1685.
- Mather, Increase. *A Narrative of the Miseries of New-England, by Reason of an Arbitrary Government Erected There. Under Sir Edmond Andross. To which is Added, Some Account of the Humble Application of the Pious and Noble Prelate, Henry Lord Bishop of*

- London, With the Reverend Clergy of the City, and Some of the Dissenting Ministers in it, to the Illustrious Prince William Henry, Prince of Orange on Fryday [sic], September 21. 1688. : Also the Address of the Noncomformist Ministers (in and About the City of London) to His Highness [sic] the Prince of Orange.* Richard Pierce: Boston, 1688.
- Mather, Increase. *An Earnest Exhortation to the Inhabitants of New-England to Hearken to the Voice of God in His Late and Present Dispensations As Ever They Desire to Escape Another Judgement, Seven Times Greater Then Any Thing Which as Yet Hath Been.* John Foster: London, 1676.
- Nalson, John. *The True Protestants Appeal to City and Countrey.* London: 1681.
- Prince, Samuel. *Letter Describing the Boston Uprising* (1689). Accessed October 12, 2020. <http://www.swarthmore.edu/SocSci/bdorsey1/41docs/42-pri.html>.
- Protestant Association of Maryland. *The Address of the Representatives of Their Majestyes Protestant Subjects, in the Province of Mary-land Assembled, to the Kings Most Excellent Majesty.* London: William Nuthead, 1689.
- Protestant Association of Maryland. *The Declaration and Reason for Motives for the Present Appearing in arms of Their Majesties' Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland.* London: William Nuthead, 1689.
- Saunders, William, ed. *The Colonial Records of North Carolina.* 10 vols. Josephus Daniels: Raleigh, 1886.
- Sydney, Henry, et. al. *Invitation to William III.* National Archives of England: London. Accessed October 11, 2020. <https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/education/resources/significant-events/glorious-revolution-1688/>.
- Whitmore, W.H., ed. *The Andros Tracts.* Boston: 1868-1874.

Secondary Sources

- Barnes, Viola F. *The Dominion of New England: A Study in British Colonial Policy.* Yale University Press: New Haven, 1960.
- Buranelli, Vincent. *The King and the Quaker: A Study of William Penn and James II.* University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, 1962.
- Childs, John. *The Williamite Wars in Ireland, 1688-1691.* Bloomsbury Academic: New York, 2007.
- Curran, Robert E. *Papist Devils: Catholics in British America, 1574-1783.* Catholic University of America Press: Washington, 2014.

- Goodlad, Graham. "Before the Glorious Revolution: The Making of Absolute Monarchy?" *Historical Review*, 58 (2007). 10-15.
- Hall, Clayton C., ed. *Narratives of Early Maryland, 1633-1684*. Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1910.
- Hall, David D. *Puritans: A Transatlantic History*. Princeton University Press: Princeton, 2019.
- Harris, Tim. *Politics Under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*. Longman: London, 1993.
- Harris, Tim. *Rebellion: Britain's First Stuart Kings, 1567-1642*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2014.
- Harris, Tim. *Restoration: Charles II and his Kingdoms, 1660-1685*. Allen Lane: London, 2005.
- Harris, Tim. *Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*. Penguin Books: London, 2007.
- Harris, Tim and Stephen Taylor. *The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688-91 in Their British, Atlantic, and European Contexts*. Boydell and Brewer: Suffolk, 2013.
- Jones, J. R. *The First Whigs: The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1683*. Oxford University Press: London, 1961.
- Jones, J. R. *The Revolution of 1688 in England*. W. W. Norton and Company: New York, 1972.
- Keay, Anna. *The Magnificent Monarch: Charles II and Ceremonies of Power*. Bloomsbury Publishing Place: London, 2008.
- Pincus, Steven C. A. *England's Glorious Revolution, 1688-1689: A Brief History With Documents*. Bedford/St. Martin's: Boston, 2006.
- Robbins, Caroline. *Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman*. Atheneum: New York, 1968.
- Rose, Jacqueline. *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of Royal Supremacy, 1660-1688*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, 2011.
- Speck, W. A. *James II: Profiles in Power*. Pearson Education: London, 2002.
- Sutto, Antoinette. "Lord Baltimore, the Society of Jesus, and Caroline Absolutism in Maryland, 1630-1645." *Journal of British Studies*. Vol. 48. No. 3 (2009): 631-652.
- Sutto, Antoinette. *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*. University of Virginia Press:

Charlottesville, 2015.

Winship, Michael P. *Hot Protestants: A History of Puritanism in England and America*. Yale University Press: New Haven, 2018.

Archives

Maryland State Archives: Annapolis, 2021.

- a. Inhabitants of Maryland. *Letter of Congratulations to the King*. 1688.
- b. Inhabitants of Somerset County, MD. *Avowal of the Protestant Religion to the King*. 1689.