

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Virginia and Maryland's Connection of  
Crisis:  
Anti-Popery and Indigenous Relations in  
the Seventeenth-Century Chesapeake

By

Michael Medeiros

August 2023

A paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
Master of Arts degree in the  
Master of Arts Program in the Social  
Sciences

Faculty Advisor: Matthew Kruer  
Preceptor: David Cantor-Echols

The Glorious Revolution is viewed by scholars as one of the most important points in English history for the political and social transformations that it brought about in the burgeoning empire. However, it was also one of the most important events in the history of early America. The transition from James II to William and Mary was fraught with decisions about the religious direction of England that would affect both the metropole and its wider empire. This was most important to English subjects when it came to the political, social, and government-based tensions between Protestants and Catholics. Individuals within positions of power were perceived as having been a significant social and political threat to the English Constitution.<sup>1</sup> While these suspicions were a major part of English politics during the latter half of the seventeenth century, they were also a major concern in England's North American colonies.

Many of England's American colonies faced anxieties among protestants with the positions and powers that Catholic individuals possessed not only in the period during and after the Glorious Revolution, but these anxieties were significantly prevalent throughout the seventeenth century as they had been in England. In attempting to analyze this carry over of religious tensions, a great deal of scholarship tends to focus on New England and its specific religious circumstances during the latter half of the seventeenth century in the formation of the Dominion of New England. This usually takes the form of examining Massachusetts, which faced its own internal strife on religion with accusations that governor Edmund Andros was in league with Catholics and was recruiting Indigenous groups to attack and deprive the colonists of their rights as Englishmen.<sup>2</sup> However, this religious conflict with the dimension of relations with

---

<sup>1</sup> William Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 166-168.

<sup>2</sup> Owen Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 98-100.

Indigenous Peoples was not limited to New England, but took on a form all its own in the region of the Chesapeake.

The colonies which encompassed the Chesapeake region, Virginia and Maryland, were those which accompanied not only the same geographic region, but possessed an incredible number of similarities outside of some of their glaring differences in governments. And although they were gripped by many of the same issues as their sister colonies in North America, they were at the same time unique from their peers in both New England and the Greater South. Both colonies faced issues economically, socially, and politically that while at first glance are similar to those of their sister colonies, were in reality ones that were intrinsic to the Chesapeake region itself. For instance, both Virginia and Maryland's unique geographic position lent itself well to the growing of tobacco. And with England's voracious appetite for the commodity, both colonies came to possess monocultural economies focusing on the production of the crop so much so that, "nearly every family in the Chesapeake region grew tobacco."<sup>3</sup> Just as both colonies faced a shared economic situation, both shared political and social difficulties as well. However, the colonies were not without their fundamental differences, as can be seen with Maryland and its governmental structure.

Maryland's unique proprietorship to the Catholic Lords Baltimore and its purpose of being established as a colony with the condition that it would be a kind of haven for Catholic Englishmen provided a key backdrop for how religious tensions and relationships would cross the Atlantic into the American Colonies. This was in addition to Maryland's religious makeup being one which was incredibly diverse. Maryland's religious communities included not just the simple division between Anglicans and Catholics, but also included a large number of

---

<sup>3</sup> Alan Kulikoff, *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1986), 100.

Presbyterians, Independents, and Quakers.<sup>4</sup> This was seen as a positive in some respects by the Lords of Trade and Plantations in London, who viewed this kind of religious representation as having a balancing effect within the colony in terms of religious legislation.<sup>5</sup> However, even with this assumption of a peaceful and balanced coexistence between religious groups, it would not come to be the case. The Calvert appointment of Catholics to offices within the Maryland government corresponded not only with the original intention of the colony, but with Lord Baltimore's beliefs as well. However, as the seventeenth century progressed so too did the protestant population of Maryland increase to become the majority religious group within the colony.<sup>6</sup> The advent of this population shift in the balance of Protestants and Catholics resulted in their opinions manifesting in the political arena simultaneously.

Religious tensions in the political sphere took the form of accusations that the proprietor and the Catholic members of the legislative assembly were enacting policies which were undermining the rights of the Protestant colonists as Englishmen.<sup>7</sup> These Protestant and Catholic tensions would become so severe that protestant anti-popery came to a head when the Glorious Revolution provided the perfect opportunity for those colonists to initiate the Protestant Revolution of 1689. In contrast, this was not the case in the colony of Virginia even with its own tensions between Catholics and protestants. However, that does not mean there is no need for an exploration of how colonies which did not see a full-scale overthrow of their government, like Virginia, possessed Protestant and Catholic anxieties.

---

<sup>4</sup> Minutes of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, 19 July 1677, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/41, Nos. 27-28; CO 5/723, pp. 31-35, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>5</sup> Minutes of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, 19 July 1677, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/41, Nos. 27-28; CO 5/723, pp. 31-35, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>6</sup> Lois Green Carr and David William Jordan, *Maryland's Revolution of Government, 1689-1692* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974), 1-4.

<sup>7</sup> Carr and Jordan, *Maryland's Revolution of Government*, 14-15.

Just as resentments that fueled anti-Catholic rhetoric across the Atlantic were wide ranging in their reach across England, so too were they embedded in many of the English colonies across the Americas. And Virginia was no exception to these circumstances. For instance, during the 1650s there had been Virginians that had sought to invade the colony of Maryland in order to overthrow its Catholic government.<sup>8</sup> As James Rice eloquently indicated, “The periodic panics over a supposed Catholic-Indian conspiracy were nearly as disruptive in Virginia as they were in Maryland and, indeed often originated there rather than in Maryland.”<sup>9</sup> If this was the case, that the religious tensions between Protestants and Catholics and the relationship between colonists and Indigenous Peoples in both Maryland and Virginia were of such an even caliber, then the political violence in Virginia just as in the case of the Protestant Revolution of 1689 in Maryland, should have resulted in an overthrow of its colonial government. Attempting to simply explain why this is not the case has yielded broad interpretations by scholarship, which see the reasoning for this lack of violence in Virginia as either the result of actions taken by individuals or the governments of the two colonies more generally.

Many scholars have seen Maryland’s Colonial Government as having been a principal contributor to the colony’s own political violence between Protestants and Catholics. Importantly, many have placed a good deal of blame specifically on the proprietors, the Lords of Baltimore themselves for fueling such violence. One work that emphasizes this argument is Antoinette Sutto’s book *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists: Maryland and the Politics of Religion in the English Atlantic, 1630-1690*. Rather than comparing the tension filled

---

<sup>8</sup> Gerald P. Fogarty, “Property and Religious Liberty in Colonial Maryland Catholic Thought,” *The Catholic Historical Review* 72, no. 4 (October 1986): 582.

<sup>9</sup> James D. Rice, “Bacon’s Rebellion in Indian Country,” *The Journal of American History* 101, no. 3 (December 2014): 747.

environments of both Maryland and Virginia during the latter half of the seventeenth century, Sutto opts for a focus on Maryland with Virginia being used to describe the existence of anti-Catholic rhetoric in a broader empire focused framework. In doing so, she places responsibility for a great deal of the tension between Protestants and Catholics on the actions of Maryland's various proprietors. Who, in her eyes, only made perceptions of their proprietorship worse, and especially after cases of rebellion within the colony.<sup>10</sup> However, when it comes to the relationship between Virginia and Maryland Sutto notes the differences and similarities in relation to how both colonies dealt with religious and political anxieties more generally. For example, she writes that as it pertained to the possibility of rebellion in the two colonies, "the forms in which discontent was articulated and suppressed highlighted the problems of religion and allegiance that differentiated the two colonies."<sup>11</sup> Although Sutto describes Virginia and Maryland as having key differences in their handling of rebellious as well as religious attitudes, this is the extent of her examination into them. Such an examination is not expanded upon much more in other scholarship, which has in turn simplified why it was Virginia did not collapse into rebellion.

Unlike Sutto, other scholars have presented a more Virginia focused approach when it comes to why the political violence in the colony did not lead to an overthrow of its government during the Glorious Revolution. A key example is David Lovejoy's book, *The Glorious Revolution in America*. Although Lovejoy's book provides a broader look at how the Glorious Revolution occurred across England's various colonies in North America, he does pay a considerable amount of attention to Virginia during and before the Glorious Revolution.

---

<sup>10</sup> For a comprehensive examination of anti-Catholicism in Maryland during the seventeenth-century, see Antoinette Patricia Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists: Maryland and the Politics of Religion in the English Atlantic, 1630-1690* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015), 152-153.

<sup>11</sup> Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 178.

However, when it comes to the eruption of violence within Virginia Lovejoy recognizes its presence, and he provides an answer in line with Rice as to why said violence did not turn into an overthrow of the Virginia's government. For instance, Lovejoy writes that "The difference between Virginia and Maryland in the spring and summer of 1689 was that the proprietary government proclaimed no king at all."<sup>12</sup> This explanation by Lovejoy is also supported by his claims about the actions taken by Nicholas Spencer and the Council of Virginia in preventing an overthrow of the government. He argues that Nicholas Spencer's actions as President of the Virginia Council prevented the colony from falling into utter chaos whilst rumors of a plot among Catholics and Indigenous Peoples to attack the Protestants of both Virginia and Maryland in the spring of 1689.<sup>13</sup> With the two differing perspectives in mind, it is important to examine how it was the governments of both Virginia and Maryland functioned, their social attitudes regarding protestant and catholic relations, and their relationships with Indigenous Peoples in relation to one another.

To accomplish this examination of Virginia and Maryland, the present study will place both colonies in direct conversation with one another through an analysis of a variety of important documents which detail the state of affairs surrounding the tensions between Catholics and Protestants, the actions taken by both colonies to curb insurrectionist turmoil, and how both colonies dealt with their relationships with Indigenous Peoples. These documents include the correspondence of colonial governors as well as other key government figures of the two colonies, the proceedings of both colonial governments, the journals of the English crown's committee on the Lords of Trade and Plantations, and various declarations and manuscripts created by the English colonists of Maryland and Virginia. In utilizing these sources this study

---

<sup>12</sup> David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), 264.

<sup>13</sup> Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 263-265.

will provide an analysis of six distinct ways in which Virginia and Maryland differed, resulting in one colony possessing political violence to the degree of a full-scale government overthrow while the other did not. The first of these differences will be the role which religion played in the governments of both colonies in addition to how it was regulated by each. Second, will be the contrasting steps which Virginia and Maryland took in attempting to stem the tide of potential insurrection within each of the colonies. Third, how the colonial leadership of John Coode in Maryland and Nathaniel Bacon in Virginia differed in their treatment of Catholics shortly following the Protestant Revolution of 1689. Fourth, how the belief of a Catholic oligarchy was distinctly a Maryland based phenomenon. Fifth, the ways in which different magnitudes of religious tensions were linked to anxieties between colonists and Indigenous Peoples. And finally, the divergent ways that the two colonies attempted to create an atmosphere of peace in their respective colonies in regards to unrest and with Indigenous Peoples. Exploring these six key differences will illustrate just how divergent both Virginia and Maryland were in how they handled the similar issues which impaired both colonies, resulting in disparate levels of political violence.

Although the colony of Maryland was unique in its proprietor being a Catholic lord, Virginia utilized a more metropole connected hierarchy for its governmental structure. As a royal colony, Virginia's governors were appointed by the English crown and thus were subject to a great deal more of metropolitan oversight. Having this increased oversight as well as a different structure in the colonial governance altogether resulted in widely dissimilar relationships between religious institutions and between the colonies and Indigenous Peoples. These differing structures however were not the only key dissimilarities that resulted in disparities in the amounts of political violence between Maryland and Virginia. The



governmental structures of the two colonies were joined by those persons who made up said structures, and the decisions they made in regards to attempting to avert the kinds of violence which would result in the complete overthrow of their colonial governments. While it is conceivable that it was simply Virginia's declaration of William and Mary as monarchs that Stanwood, Rice, and Lovejoy take in order to explain why it was that there was not a rebellion in Virginia, there were more actions taken that can explain the discrepancy of results for both Virginia and Maryland regarding the Glorious Revolution.

Although, Antoinette Sutto does explain that the Protestant Revolution of 1689 was the result of differing actions taken by the colonial governments, she does not interpolate more than that. The present study seeks to expand on those previous interpretations and explore more of what resulted in the overthrow of Maryland while that was not the case in Virginia. In exploring these various aspects not covered by some of the key scholarship, this study argues that it was not only the intrinsic difference in the governments of the two colonies that lead to a major difference in the level of tensions between Protestants and Catholics as well as colonists and Indigenous Peoples in Virginia, but that Virginia's colonial government took far more effective action to prevent major political upheaval than Maryland through increased religious oversight and various government initiatives. These initiatives took the form of greater restrictions on religious practices, prosecution of suspected rumor spreaders, and an effective effort to create peace with Virginia's Indigenous neighbors. All of which meant, that the disgruntlement of Maryland's colonists led to such a high amount of political violence and the overthrow of its colonial government as opposed to Virginia in which no revolutionary action occurred.

Religion in both Virginia and Maryland was deeply tied to the realm of the political arena and policies enacted on the colonists by government officials. This could take a multitude of forms, and one of the most incendiary of these was that of legal action and the passage of laws having to do with religion. For instance, the Maryland assembly enacted a law in 1649 which forbade the application of various terms to refer to persons of other Christian denominations with certain terms in an offensive manner. If they did so they would be required to pay a fine of ten shillings sterling or the equivalent value in goods, which would be determined by a government official.<sup>14</sup> The existence of this law is indicative not only of the kinds of rhetoric which were being used in an offensive manner to individuals of other Christian denominations, but the law also provides insight into the existence of quite regular religious conflict as well as a clear idea of who exactly was being attacked due to their faith. For instance, the most important of the terms which appear to be restricted from use because of their offensive nature were “Popish Priest,” “Jesuit” and “Jesuited Papist.”<sup>15</sup> For the colonists of Maryland, the passage of this law denotes the kinds of inter-sectarian rhetoric targeting other groups that was not only occurring, but was of such an amount that it was deemed necessary to restrict the language of the colonists and especially that which was being used against those who practiced Catholicism.

The usage of the term “Jesuit” itself has an incredibly important origin for its popular meaning in the colony of Maryland. Owen Stanwood demonstrates as such in his book, *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution*. A major point that Stanwood makes is that Cecil Calvert formulated the Jesuits as being individuals who were,

---

<sup>14</sup> “A Law of Maryland Concerning Religion,” 1689, Early English Books, 1641-1700, 2955:15, New York Public Library, Early English Books Online.

<sup>15</sup> “A Law of Maryland Concerning Religion,” 1689, Early English Books, 1641-1700, 2955:15, New York Public Library, Early English Books Online.

“devious papal agents who would stop at nothing to accomplish their worldly ends.”<sup>16</sup> This language that Stanwood uses to describe how Calvert felt about the Jesuits as a group illustrates just how common inter-group distrust and tension was present between different groups of Catholics. Such distrust was accompanied by Calvert’s attempt at disassociating from the Jesuits altogether, which he saw as a more extreme group of Catholics. Creating this separation would arguably have helped Calvert to stave off the doubts that the Protestant population had of Maryland’s Catholic dominated government by deflecting blame for treacherous action. This is especially true when it came to political opportunism and relations with Indigenous Peoples, as Calvert believed that it was the Jesuits who were creating pacts with them to potentially upset his political control over Maryland.<sup>17</sup> Such a distinction between the Calverts and the Catholics in the government of Maryland and the Jesuits as a group would not last forever.

Some of these same beliefs that Calvert voiced about the Jesuits would be the same ones which John Coode and his followers would bring around during the Protestant Revolution of 1689 to describe the Calvert proprietorship itself.<sup>18</sup> Using terminology to delineate himself as a Catholic from the Jesuits, and the same kinds of language being used against his heir unsettles the argument that Stanwood makes. For him it is “a testament to the power of anti-Catholicism” that such a high-ranking Catholic would use derogatory language against the Jesuits which would also place it outside of the realm of Catholic and Protestant relations.<sup>19</sup> While it may be significant for anti-Catholic rhetoric to be used by one Catholic to launch verbal attacks at others, there is more importance to this than the use of said rhetoric simply amongst Catholics

---

<sup>16</sup> Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed*, 57.

<sup>17</sup> Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed*, 57-58.

<sup>18</sup> Protestant Association, “The Declaration of the Reasons and Motives for the Present Appearing in Arms of their Majesties Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland,” 28 November 1689, Early English Books, 1641-1700, 2076:03, pp. 2-4, Early English Books Online.

<sup>19</sup> Stanwood, *The Empire Reformed*, 57.

themselves. It is vital to note, as Stanwood does, Calvert's usage of anti-Catholic language as a deflection from him having any association with the Jesuits. However, it is also important to recognize that that the same conceptualization of "popery" the Calvert himself uses would not only be used against the Jesuits, but that it would become so pervasive that such terminology and verbal attacks would be launched at all Catholics by some Maryland Protestants. As *A Law of Maryland Concerning Religion* provides, the use of anti-Catholic rhetoric and ideas of "popery" were very much entwined with Protestant and Catholic relations in the colony however unsuccessful it was. The formulation of terminology and the passage of laws were accompanied by other political methodologies to maintain peace between Protestants and Catholics.

Rhetoric like that seen in the previously mentioned law of religion was prevalent in discussions of Catholic colonists within Maryland in tension filled conflict with their Protestant neighbors. From the colony's inception there were a multitude of manners in which conflict between protestants and Catholics as well as the religious nature of the government of Maryland would function. One of the most contested of these expressions of conflict was in the role of property and how Jesuits would acquire it.<sup>20</sup> As the seventeenth century progressed and the Glorious Revolution came to pass these tensions only increased in magnitude. By the middle of the seventeenth century, there had been an overthrow of the Calvert lead government in the colony. Although Lord Baltimore regained control of the colony, the assembly then passed what would become known as the Maryland Toleration Act of 1649.<sup>21</sup> As the seventeenth century progressed however, tensions between the majority Protestant population and the government of Maryland would recur. Lord Nicholas Spencer of Virginia wrote that the declaration of William and Mary as the new monarchs of England was being heavily desired by the Protestant majority

---

<sup>20</sup> Fogarty, "Property and Religious Liberty in Colonial Maryland Catholic Thought," 579-580.

<sup>21</sup> Fogarty, "Property and Religious Liberty in Colonial Maryland Catholic Thought," 581.

who believed the Maryland Colonial Government was withholding the order to declare them monarchs, and that should they declare them without the order, chaos would erupt in the government.<sup>22</sup> This letter from Lord Nicholas Spencer demonstrates the uneasy nature of the colony of Maryland between the majority Protestant population and the Catholic government. Although John Coode's first attempt at overthrowing the Maryland government had already occurred, the anxiety between protestants and Catholics still persisted.

Maryland's colonial government during the 1680s, besides enacting a law on regulating religious terminology, crafted political and legal policies which further fueled the Protestant and Catholic divide within the colony. One of these more unpopular policies was the collection of all of the arms within the colony, which were taken out of the hands of the Protestant citizens and placed in those of the Catholic colonists. This can be seen in a letter by one Colonel Ludwell, who both sums up the current status of relationships between Indigenous peoples in the Chesapeake and the vexation that the protestants of Maryland felt at the collection of their arms.<sup>23</sup> The confiscation of arms from colonists and specifically placing them in the hands of the more elite Catholic citizens was a policy that only made the already palpable tensions within the colony worse, especially as it relates to beliefs that there was a Catholic oligarchy. This is even more so given that this occurred during a time of heightened tensions between Protestants and Catholics in 1682. Disgust over the confiscation of protestant arms was also accompanied by claims that there was also conspiracy to prevent some protestant individuals from being elected to the Maryland colonial assembly, which Colonel Ludwell did not believe was true.<sup>24</sup> It is

---

<sup>22</sup> "Extract from a Letter from Nicholas Spencer, of Virginia," 10 June 1689, *The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739*, vol. 13, p. 66, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>23</sup> Extract of a Letter from Virginia, 22 July 1681, *The National Archives of the UK CO1/47*, No. 35, pp. 91-93, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>24</sup> Extract of a Letter from Virginia, 22 July 1681, *The National Archives of the UK, CO1/47*, No. 35, pp. 91-93, Colonial State Papers Online.

important to note that Ludwell, a Virginian, did not put stake in the claims of a government conspiracy at the highest levels of Maryland's government. This lack of belief in such a conspiracy denotes how Virginians, and more specifically those in Virginia's government, were less susceptible to taking such claims at face value. While this was not believed by Colonel Ludwell, it was in fact taken seriously by the Lords of Trade in London.

This group would later that same year write to the then Lord Baltimore acknowledging that it was most likely that these accusations were not necessarily certain, but that if they were true, Lord Baltimore would need to address them. Because regardless, it was most concerning that Protestants not be in the colonial assembly nor be trusted with matters of colonial defense or the possession of arms.<sup>25</sup> The confiscation of arms from protestants, the potential lack of protestant representation, and the metropolitan interest as well as intervention are key examples of the various forms that the deep religious divide took or appeared, which contributed to fears that Catholics were conspiring against protestants to deprive them of their rights as Englishmen to defense and representation that the colonists held so dear. Such forms of division were those that were inherent to Maryland's colonial government in that Catholics were in places of such high political and social standing in which they were not in Virginia. This kind of inherent conflict because of Catholics in positions of power would also stretch to the appointment of individuals to government offices.

When it came to appointing individuals, Cecil Calvert made an attempt to create a religiously balanced council for himself. Rather than a majority or a council made up entirely of Catholic members, the then Lord of Baltimore appeared to recognize the necessity for there to be at least a representative appearance in the make-up of his 1681 council in regards to religious

---

<sup>25</sup> "Lords of Trade and Plantations to Lord Baltimore. Whitehall," 12 October 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 74, CO 5/723, p. 56, Colonial State Papers Online.

representation, with five members being Catholic and the remaining four being Protestant.<sup>26</sup> This practice of attempting to create even Protestant and Catholic representation in important colonial office was not limited to Lord Baltimore's council however. In addition, a more religiously balanced approach was also taken when it came to the principal offices of the Maryland's government in the same year. For instance, the principal offices of the colony were occupied almost entirely by Protestants as opposed to Catholics.<sup>27</sup> The Lord Baltimore's appointment of primarily protestants to the principal offices of the colony just as with his council not only demonstrates that he was aware of the kinds of religious tensions that could occur should he only appoint Catholics or a large majority of Catholic individuals, but he was actively attempting to prevent such issues.

However, even with the proprietor's persistence of religious equality laws and his endeavor to create an appearance of equality or proportionality of representation, a large amount of civil unrest based on religious affiliation persisted in Maryland. This manifested itself as the Protestant citizens recognized the level of favoritism that Lord Baltimore had for those he appointed to positions within the colonial government, and specifically his family members. This would lead to serious mistrust of both the government and legal system by Maryland Protestants.<sup>28</sup> Although Lord Baltimore attempted to create civil peace between Protestants and Catholics, the fact that such tensions were able to override his preventative measures demonstrates the degree to which such religious tension was so populous in Maryland yet was absent from Virginia. Such a disparity it appears is the result of the inherent nature of the

---

<sup>26</sup> "The Names of the Council of Lord Baltimore in Maryland, from Mr. Rousby," 1681, *The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739*, vol. 11, p. 176, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>27</sup> List of the Principal Officers of Maryland, 27 December 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 119, pp. 175-176, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>28</sup> William Nelson, "The Law of Colonial Maryland: Virginia Without Its Grandeur," *The American Journal of Legal History* 54, no. 2 (April 2014): 183-185.

governments of each colony as Virginia's leadership did not have to worry about a Catholic bias being apparent at the highest levels of governance.

Just as religion was an integral part of politics in Maryland, so too was it a long-standing political focus within Virginia. This concern was evident when royal governor John Harvey was recalled to London based on a series of charges against him. Two of these said charges were in relation to Harvey having been sympathetic to Catholicism and those who practiced the Catholic faith.<sup>29</sup> The Privy Council who conducted this meeting with Harvey's recall highlighted that the governor denied that he was sympathetic to the Catholic religion and specifically to those in Maryland.<sup>30</sup> By recalling a royal governor who faced charges in front of the Privy Council related directly to any sort of appeasement for Catholics it is clear there was not only metropole consideration of religious matters which were occurring in their colonies, but also the desire to prevent any kind of pro-Catholic element from being present in Virginia. The maintenance of a Protestant government in Virginia was not only a concern for the government of the metropole in London, but throughout the seventeenth century would also become the concern of high-ranking religious officials within the Church of England. Just as Catholicism was the focus of protection in Maryland, and Pennsylvania for Quakers, Virginia was frequently seen as the equivalent for Anglicans. For instance, in 1676 during Bacon's Rebellion, the Archbishop of Canterbury recognized that protections in the American colonies were being given to Catholics and Quakers, but not to Anglicans. As such he complained that "Popish Priests" were being "encouraged and supported" while "no care is taken or provision made for the building up Christians in the

---

<sup>29</sup> "Notes by Nicholas of a Meeting of the Privy Council, at Which the King Presided. Whitehall," 11 December 1635, *The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739*, vol. 01, pp. 216, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>30</sup> "Notes by Nicholas of a Meeting of the Privy Council, at Which the King Presided. Whitehall," *The Calendar of State Papers*. pp. 216. Colonial State Papers Online.



Protestant religion.”<sup>31</sup> To counter this, the Archbishop believed that Virginia could be a place in which Anglican protestants could have with a government that should remain inextricably tied to the Church of England and protestants more generally.<sup>32</sup> Calling for Anglicans to be protected in Virginia demonstrates how threatening the Archbishop of Canterbury perceived Catholics to be in regards to the security of Protestants within England’s North American colonies.

The comments made by the Archbishop of Canterbury and governor John Harvey’s recall indicate just how important keeping Virginia Protestant was. The desire to recall a governor across the Atlantic illustrates the importance that these charges represented, and although there were other accusations that were made against Harvey, it is significant to note that his supposed sympathies toward the Catholic faith were repeated unlike the other charges against him. This desire for a maintenance of protestant government and a distrust as well as a dislike of Catholic sympathies being present in Virginia is indicative of a larger trend which impacted the governance in Virginia as opposed to Maryland. While there was only so little that the Privy Council could do because of Maryland’s status as a proprietary colony, when it came to Virginia, they understood the need for creating a wholly protestant colony which could find both social and political balance. This is in conjunction with the Archbishop of Canterbury’s thoughts some forty years later in trying to preserve a potential safe haven for Anglicans and other Protestants. Taking this into account, scholars have offered other explanations as to why it was the same kind of political violence which occurred in Maryland did not in Virginia.

Although some scholars have argued that it was the Virginia government’s quick recognition of William and Mary as the monarchs of England that staved off insurrection, one

---

<sup>31</sup> Archbishop of Canterbury, “Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop of London. Croydon,” 2 August 1676, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/37, Nos. 38, 38I, CO 5/723, pp. 27-30, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>32</sup> Archbishop of Canterbury, “Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop of London. Croydon,” 2 August 1676, The National Archives of the UK, CO 1/37, Nos. 38, 38I, CO 5/723, pp. 27-30, Colonial State Papers Online.

must also recognize that Virginia had a very different relationship between its colonists and colonial government.<sup>33</sup> The colony's government itself attempted to make certain that said relationship would remain stable in ways that Maryland's colonial administration did not. Most importantly, these structural differences made their way into aspects of religious regulation. For instance, Virginia took a far stricter stance on religion and how colonists practiced religion than was the case in Maryland. When it came to religion in Virginia the parish was the primary institution that regulated conduct. It did so not only in a religious or moral manner but also in a political sense as these structural divisions were the first vestiges of the colony's attempt to assemble a social order involving colonial representation.<sup>34</sup> As the colony developed, the parish as an institution also developed in conjunction. The vestries who were the leadership of the parishes as scholar Brent Tarter put it, "oversaw the religious and moral welfare of the people."<sup>35</sup> These vestries and the parishes themselves were an important foundation for moral, as well as in a manner, political control that maintained quite a lot of oversight over the colony's population. This is especially apparent given the economic situation which Virginians were facing following Bacon's Rebellion. Numbers of the poor steadily increased following the rebellion, and the parish vestries had a great interest in monitoring not only parishioners for their moral conduct, but they also were responsible for taking care of the poor.<sup>36</sup> As a result, they were able to possess a greater amount of oversight and stability in religion which other colonies did not.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Owen Stanwood, "The Protestant Moment: Antippery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire," *Journal of British Studies* 46, no. 3 (July 2007): 497.

<sup>34</sup> Virginia Bernhard, "Poverty and the Social Order in Seventeenth-Century Virginia," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 85, no. 2 (April 1977): 146-147.

<sup>35</sup> Brent Tarter, "Bacon's Rebellion, the Grievances of the People, and the Political Culture of Seventeenth-Century Virginia," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 119, no. 1 (2011): 9.

<sup>36</sup> Bernhard, "Poverty and the Social Order in Seventeenth-Century Virginia," 149-154.

<sup>37</sup> Bernhard, "Poverty and the Social Order in Seventeenth-Century Virginia," 149-154.

Having such oversight was an important tool for the colonial government of Virginia who sought to use it for their own control over the colony's population.

A framework dealing with religious oversight was not limited to the interactions between vestries and the colonists, but it also factored into government control over the ministers of the parishes. One of the main proponents within the Virginia colonial government was the governor Lord Thomas Culpeper, who personally took issue with the relationship that the government had with ministers. An example of this was the governor's disapproval of the ministers being paid by taxes whether or not he approved of them, and that they were being paid in a time when that money was need for defense.<sup>38</sup> While it is clear that there were concerns over ministers taking money away from the defense of the colony, which was paramount considering fears regarding possible attacks by Indigenous Peoples, this would only be the beginning of the colonial governments desire for more control over the colony's ministers.

Over the course of the seventeenth century, ministers were an important position within parishes, but there were a great number of tensions between them and the government of the colony. Lord Culpeper describes in a report the need to control ministers and the kinds of proselytizing they made to the colonists. Specifically, that they were not interpreting religion in the way that would be most beneficial to the colony, especially given its economic and tension riddled situation with Indigenous Peoples.<sup>39</sup> This control over the ministers of the parishes was also so important because it made its way to the governor Lord Howard of Effingham as an order from the Lords of Trade and Plantations in London to get rid of scurrilous ministers.<sup>40</sup> It is

---

<sup>38</sup> Lord Culpeper, "Lord Culpeper to Lords of Trade and Plantations," 12 December 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 105, pp. 6-7, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>39</sup> "Lord Culpeper's Representations Concerning the Church," 27 September 1683, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/52, No. 101, CO 5/1356, pp. 172-174, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>40</sup> Journal of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, 2 October 1683, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 11, p. 511, Colonial State Papers Online.

evident that not only were elements within the parish system of Virginia being used to monitor the conduct of individuals, but members of the government were taking direct action to mold the attitudes of the colonists in terms of religion and in the context of relations with Indigenous Peoples. By forming the religious attitudes of the colonists, Virginia's protestant government was able to maintain better than the mixed and predominately Catholic government of Maryland a sense of religious hegemony that prevented of political violence based on anti-Catholicism from taking root like it would in Maryland. This parish system of religious maintenance was completely absent from Maryland which had its own method in fostering a relationship between religion and government.

Unlike that of Virginia, when it came to Maryland's regulation of religion through government structure there were many significant differences. Firstly, the colony was not split into parishes like that of Virginia because they were unable to make such divisions as a result of the size of the colony.<sup>41</sup> Instead, Maryland strictly relied on using only counties which did not implement the same kinds of political control which unified protestant religion like that of Virginia. While the Virginia government maintained a great deal of oversight over the ministers and religious officials of the parishes, Maryland was lacking in how much oversight it had for the Protestant ministers who were ordained over each of the local governments.<sup>42</sup> This lack of oversight was very much directly contingent upon the colonial Maryland government's desire for religious freedom. Something which is even more apparent when examining the difference in how ministers and churches were funded between Virginia and Maryland. Unlike the Virginia

---

<sup>41</sup> Lord Baltimore, "Answer of Charles Lord Baltimore to the Inquiries Concerning Maryland Presented to Lords of Trade and Plantations on 26th March 1678. London," 26 March 1678, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/42, No. 40, CO 5/723, pp. 35-45, CO 391/2, p. 224, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>42</sup> Journal of the Lords of Trade and Plantations. Whitehall, 17 July 1677, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 10, pp. 117-18, Colonial State Papers Online.

system which saw the parishes, ministers, and churches under direct government oversight as well as receiving their funding publicly from taxes, this was completely absent from Maryland. For instance, Maryland's religious structure was very much placed in the private sphere. As the Lords of Trade noted in 1677, that ministers in Maryland "are maintained by a voluntary contribution of their own persuasion."<sup>43</sup>

The lack of regulation of ministers was even greater as there was no threat that these ministers could lose their places of authority if not following colonial government guidance. In an attempt to foster the freedom of religion may have led to ministers further expounding about the Catholic threat as well as not being in line with government thought. This would have especially played a role during the time of the Glorious Revolution itself as without the kinds of structured government oversight present in Virginia it is clear how it was possible for anti-Catholic sentiment to not only spread, but as there was no regulations on Catholic activity as well, for Protestants to then invoke that those Catholic individuals in office were in fact not holding to their word on religious toleration and were thus leading a Catholic oligarchy. These rumors were not helped as Maryland, unlike Virginia, utilized a more centralized and governor centric system when it came to the rulings of the lower-courts in the colony which was due to the Protestant and Catholic divide that the colony faced.<sup>44</sup> In centralizing the courts to prevent conflict and streamline the process with more governor based-oversight it is easy to see why it would be the colonists were able to spread rumors of the Calverts as being like dictators and running a Catholic oligarchy.

---

<sup>43</sup> Minutes of the Lords of Trade and Plantations, 19 July 1677, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/41, Nos. 27, 28, CO 5/723, pp. 31-35, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>44</sup> Nelson, "The Law of Colonial Maryland," 187-189.

While it is not of serious contention that Maryland's religious tensions and relationship with Indigenous Peoples caused a serious amount of chaos and unrest, Virginia was not immune to such problems. In the period approaching the Glorious Revolution, Virginia was closely tied to Maryland in facing the same fears regarding both a potential Catholic as well as Native American threat. This palpable unrest is seen in a letter written by Virginia politician and former acting governor Nicholas Spencer to then Secretary of War William Blathwayt at near the precipice of such rumors in the spring of 1689. In his letter, Spencer describes the occurrence of a new rumor of a plot involving Catholics and Indigenous Peoples attacking the Protestant Citizens of Virginia and Maryland. According to Spencer, following the occurrence of the Glorious Revolution in England, rumors increasingly began to spread about the Catholic populations of both Maryland and Virginia causing chaos amongst the populations.<sup>45</sup> Such was the case in the early months of 1689 when three Virginians accused of spreading rumors of a plot between Catholics in the colony uniting with Indigenous peoples to attack Protestant Virginians. An order was created by the Council of Colonial Virginia to place those three Virginians, named John Waugh Clerk, Ben Harrison, and John West, in the custody of the Sherriff of Stafford for "spreading abroad a rumor that the Papists and Indians had made a plot to cut the throats of the Protestants."<sup>46</sup> Although Maryland is often labeled as the most prominent case of religious tensions between Protestants and Catholics during the latter half of the seventeenth century, Virginia itself had a great deal of anti-Catholic vitriol amongst its Protestant citizens. This detesting of those who ascribed to the Catholic faith was so strong in Virginia that its colonists were willing to take up arms.

---

<sup>45</sup> "Nicholas Spencer to William Blathwayt. James' City, Virginia," 27 April 1689, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 32, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>46</sup> "April 20. 1689," 1689, in *Executive journals of the Council of colonial Virginia., v.1 1680-1699.*, by Virginia (Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library, 1925), 519

Most do not question the extent to which Maryland faced serious questions of rebellion from its own colonists. However, when it comes to the reasons why Virginia was facing such rebellious tensions as it had during Bacon's Rebellion, a common answer seems to be that it had to do with the temporary absence of the governor of the colony Lord Francis Howard of Effingham from 1688 to 1690, and the steps which the colonial assembly took in that time to clamp down on potential insurrectionists.<sup>47</sup> While this does create a logical conclusion that is quite clean, the Virginia government was taking steps long before the Lord of Effingham's absence could affect the colony. During his first year as governor, the House of Burgesses passed legislation that was intended to curtail any kinds of insurrection acts within the colony. The legislation was crafted specifically with an eye towards the destruction of tobacco plants, specifying that if any person is "lawfully convicted, shall be deemed, declared, and adjudged to be traitors, and shall suffer pains of death."<sup>48</sup> Although the law specifically targeted the destruction of tobacco plants, it is indicative of the steps that Virginia was taking to deal with potentially seditious elements within the colony and shutting them down immediately. The law is also an indicator of the problems that Virginia was facing that Maryland was not. Rather than a law dealing with papist conspiracies with Indigenous Peoples, it targeted the economic troubles that could arise from the loss of tobacco harvests. These steps to prevent insurrection would continue to be taken even after the departure of the Lord of Effingham to London.

Even while Lord Howard of Effingham was being incredibly disliked, the Virginia government was taking steps to prevent the same kind of insurrection which had plagued the colony under the leadership of Nathaniel Bacon. Another important aspect is that it was not only

---

<sup>47</sup> Rice, "Bacon's Rebellion in Indian Country," 747.

<sup>48</sup> "An Act for the Better Preservation of the Peace of Virginia, and Preventing Unlawful and Treasonable Associations," 16 April 1684, The National Archives of the UK CO 5/1380, pp. 146-147, Colonial America, Adam Matthew Digital.

the Lord of Effingham's absence which was significant for the colonial government's conduct during a period of crisis, but it was also the individuals who were members of that same government during his absence that contributed most effectively to the lack of an insurrection. For instance, one of the most important individuals in this case was that of Nathaniel Bacon Sr. or as he was known Bacon the Elder. Bacon the Elder's actions in attempting to prevent the same kind of insurrection as occurred through the activities of his relative. Such as his petitioning for the financial support from the English crown in raising a garrison of sixty men for the "preservation and security of the government."<sup>49</sup> While one cannot truly Bacon the Elder's true attitude towards his rebellious relative, it is most likely that the older Bacon did not wish to see his home colony dragged back into the violent and deadly conflict that had gripped Virginia little more than ten years prior. This was not without an attempt by some of Maryland's most notorious colonists from trying to convince Virginians to join in political violence against Maryland's government.

An important period in which this is evident was following John Coode's overthrow of the Maryland government. During this time in late 1689, several Catholic former government officials fled to the colony of Virginia in order to seek asylum. The fleeing of these "popish fugitives," as Coode labeled them, was something that he could not tolerate.<sup>50</sup> This would be accompanied by an event which illustrates the true division in how Maryland and Virginia handled the treatment of Catholics. The case in question was one in which Nicholas Sewell aboard his yacht *Susanna* denied the boarding of the royal tax collector John Payne because they refused to recognize the reign of William and Mary, which resulted in shots being exchanged and

---

<sup>49</sup> "The Council of Virginia to Lords of Trade and Plantations James City," 4 May 1683, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/51, No.105, CO 5/1356, pp. 175-186, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>50</sup> "Letter from Mr Coode to Mr Bacon President of Virginia," 10 January 1690, The National Archives of the UK CO 5/723, pp. 165-166, Colonial America, Adam Matthew Digital.



Payne's death.<sup>51</sup> Following this, many of those who had been present aboard Sewell's yacht that were of the Catholic faith fled to Virginia where they sought asylum.<sup>52</sup> The account of what happened aboard this yacht was heavily disputed at the time, with then acting governor of Virginia Nathaniel Bacon writing how the government of Virginia would take no action based on the varying stories. In addition, Bacon noted in his same letter to Governor Lord Howard of Effingham who at the moment was in London, that he and the Council of Virginia "did not think fit to deliver them to Captain Coode or any other until we received his Majesty's Commands."<sup>53</sup> Bacon's reluctance to hand over the prisoners in this yacht affair demonstrates a stark difference in the internal holdings of both the newly formed Maryland government under John Coode and that of Virginia's under Nathaniel Bacon. Coode's use of the terminology of "Jesuit" and the before mentioned "popish fugitives" brings about a demeaning language which presumes a kind of religious motivation for the capture of the mentioned fugitives.

The utilization of this anti-Catholic nomenclature was something that Coode frequently did when describing individuals Coode knew or believed to be Catholic. This is especially so with an individual named Gulick, who is labeled by Coode a Jesuit and is accused of speaking "treasonable words against their Majesties."<sup>54</sup> In making this accusation along with the religious language that he uses, it is clear that Coode was very much wanting to place suspected Catholics under arrest for purely religious motivations as opposed to Bacon's opinion that legal action was only be taken on account of the guilt of the individuals in question. This was however not the only case in which Coode's conduct demonstrated a severe desire to persecute individuals of the

---

<sup>51</sup> Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 171-172.

<sup>52</sup> Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 171-172.

<sup>53</sup> "President Nathaniel Bacon to Governor Lord Effingham, 1689," *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 1 (1901): 29-31.

<sup>54</sup> "Letter from Mr Coode to Mr Bacon President of Virginia," 10 January 1690, The National Archives of the UK CO 5/723, pp. 167-168, Colonial America, Adam Matthew Digital.

Catholic faith. Just as with the incident involving the yacht, Nicholas Sewell and other Catholic associated individuals fled from Maryland during and shortly following the Protestant Revolution of 1689. Before the incident with the yacht in November of 1689 multiple Catholic persons including a Mr. William Joseph and Nicholas Sewell were accused of having stolen arms and powder from the Maryland stores and fleeing to Virginia with two Catholic priests, who Coode requests Governor Bacon to return.<sup>55</sup> While it is understandable from a criminal justice perspective for Coode to ask that both Sewell and Joseph be returned to Maryland for their theft of arms and munitions, it is important to note that the priests are included in said request.

It is logical that Coode saw them as accomplices to the theft of the arms and munitions. However, Coode's description of them as not only "popish" but that he claimed there were rumors Virginia was a safe haven for fleeing Catholics denotes that he seeks to capture, more broadly, fleeing Catholics who he believed were disloyal.<sup>56</sup> The statement by Coode in his request to Nathaniel Bacon not only highlights his extreme desire to capture fleeing Catholics, but also the differences in the treatment of these Catholics between the two colonies. As would be seen with the yacht incident, Bacon as acting governor was keeping to a different standard than what Coode believed was necessary when it came to the treatment of Catholics. However, Coode made clear that he was heavily opposed to Bacon's actions in a letter he wrote only one month later to the acting governor. In attempting to convince Bacon that the capture of Sewall and those who accompanied him was absolutely necessary, Coode wrote to Bacon that he wished "the King's enemies or the toleration of popery or popish priests will have no countenance for

---

<sup>55</sup> John Coode, "John Coode to the President of the Council of Virginia. Maryland," 16 November 1689, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 181, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>56</sup> John Coode, "John Coode to the President of the Council of Virginia. Maryland," 16 November 1689, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 181, Colonial State Papers Online.

your Honours in Virginia that your Gentlemen can look through that pretense which makes your kindness a retribution for the protection yourself and others received in Maryland.”<sup>57</sup> In making his request of Bacon, Coode appealed to a time when Virginians fled upheaval within their own colony and were given shelter by Marylanders in order to convince Bacon to hand them over. Even more important is that in doing so Coode was essentially labeling any sort of harboring of these men as an offense to the whole colony of Maryland. Although this stark difference may be due in part to Coode’s rampant anti-Catholic streak, the fact that Bacon did not immediately turn them over or prosecute them himself is indicative of more general differences in the treatment of Catholics between Virginians and Marylanders.

This contrast is illustrated even more by an instance which was outside of the context of Coode pursuing criminals. Before Coode was successful with his followers in the overthrow of the Maryland government in the Protestant Revolution of 1689, he had attempted almost the same type of overthrow in 1681 and 1682 with former governor of Maryland, Josias Fendall. However, both men were unsuccessful in their attempt and as a result were tried for their crimes against the Maryland Government.<sup>58</sup> What is important to note is that just preceding Coode’s first attempted coup with Fendall he was locked in discussion with a local Catholic in Maryland. This individual was apparently suing a protestant neighbor in a dispute over land in which Coode responded that the Catholic, “need not trouble himself for a piece of Land, for that no Papist in Mary-land should be owner of any land at all in this Province.”<sup>59</sup> Coode’s denial that Catholics had any right to property within Maryland, while extreme, is indicative of not only the kind of

---

<sup>57</sup> “From Mr. Coode to Mr. Bacon. Maryland. 8<sup>th</sup> February 1689/90,” 8 February 1689, 168 Records Illustrating the History of Maryland, *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 8, p. 168, Archives of Maryland Online.

<sup>58</sup> Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, pg. 153-154.

<sup>59</sup> Philip Calvert, “Philip Calvert, Chancellor of Maryland, to Colonel Henry Meese,” 29 December 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 120, pp. 176-177, Colonial State Papers Online.

deep seated Catholic hatred which he himself possessed as an individual, the same kind that was of such a scale in Maryland that was not of an equal measure in Virginia.

Another major element that strikes a difference in the relationships is how the militias of both colonies functioned during the 1680s. Virginia's militia promoted and granted positions to individuals based on their aptitudes and abilities to furnish its ranks.<sup>60</sup> This stands in heavy contrast to the militia of Maryland whose officers fomented great distrust from a portion of them being Catholic. For instance, a Maryland patrol with the purpose of protecting colonists from potential Native American attacks refused to march on because the captain who was leading them was Catholic.<sup>61</sup> This instance of militia members turning their back on their officer is representative of not only the kinds of distrust between Protestant citizens and Catholic leadership in Maryland, but it also exhibits the key disparity in governance between the two colonies. Virginia's efforts to place individuals in positions in the Militia based on merit while perhaps not the main intent, would factor into creating trust with the common citizenry who were members of the militia. On the other hand, in the case of Maryland it only further illustrates the innate problems within its government structure that even had that captain been given said rank based on merit it did not matter because of the perception of a Catholic oligarchy in control. Another major take away from this disobeying of a Maryland militia captain is the kind of example it is of distrust among the colony's Protestant population.

The instance of the militia members disobeying their captain represents not only one of the ways the distrust of the supposed Catholic oligarchy appeared, but also constitutes a more subtle way than is typically discussed. It was not just the grand levels of religious anxiety

---

<sup>60</sup> "Lord Howard of Effingham's Account of the Government of Virginia," 28 May 1689, The National Archives of the UK CO 5/1358, p. 1, Colonial America, Adam Matthew Digital.

<sup>61</sup> Extract of a Letter from Virginia, 22 July 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO1/47, No. 35, pp. 91-93, Colonial State Papers Online.

present in the rhetoric or institutions of the government or the legal system that created Maryland's unique religious tensions, but it is instances of everyday tensions such as in the instance of militia members choosing not to follow a Catholic captain. The fact that Protestant members of the Maryland militia were unwilling to follow a Catholic militia captain is more significant than the more grandiose claims made by protestants against Catholics for their distrust. It contrasts heavily with period written materials such as "A Complaint from Heaven with a Hue and Cry and a Petition out of Virginia and Maryland to King Charles II. and His Parliament." Said document was a multi-page manuscript written in 1676 which accused Catholics in Maryland of being a cultish oligarchy, and blamed the occurrence of violence between colonists and indigenous peoples of said collaboration as part of a massive conspiracy.<sup>62</sup> In addition, the manuscript is one which also does not hesitate in connecting the whole of the Chesapeake to this wider conspiracy.<sup>63</sup> This outlandish document demonstrates that instead of the more extreme action called for in the Complaint from Heaven, Protestants enacted their distrust for Catholics in more subtle and less erratic ways.

However, one must not underestimate or downplay the significance of this refusal to follow a Catholic militia captain as such action is tantamount to an act of mutiny. While a more typical example of distrust between the two groups, it is also one that exemplifies how deep seated the distrust that Protestants had was in that they were willing to commit what was then seen as a heinous crime because of their prejudice. Committing this act of mutiny not only demonstrates tensions and distrust between Protestants and Catholics in Maryland on a more

---

<sup>62</sup> For a comprehensive analysis of the manuscript and its importance for use in the historiography of Early America, see Matthew Kruer, *Time of Anarchy: Indigenous Power and the Crisis of Colonialism in Early America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2021), 124-125

<sup>63</sup> "Complaint from Heaven with a Hue and Cry and a Petition out of Virginia and Maryland to King Charles II. and His Parliament," May 1676, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/36, No. 78, pp. 213-214, Colonial State Papers Online.

daily level, but specifically distrust of Catholic individuals in positions of authority and even more so in matters of colonial defense.

Themes of a Catholic oligarchy tied to colonial defense were not a new phenomenon by the time the Protestant Revolution of 1689 occurred, but came about during John Coode and Josias Fendall's first attempted coup in 1682. Fendall and Coode during 1682 made it clear just how linked not only the Catholic Oligarchy and their supposed rule over the colony was to matters of their own defense generally, but rather tying it to defense from Indigenous Peoples and a larger conspiracy by the Calvert proprietorship.<sup>64</sup> While on the extreme end of the political spectrum when it came to their anti-Catholic rhetoric, Coode and Fendall were inextricably tying the religious tension of Catholics and Protestants in Maryland to issues of relationships with Indigenous Peoples. This was not to say that such heavy anti-Catholic rhetoric was not balanced out by more moderate language. Similarly, to the rhetoric of Coode and Fendall but to not such an extreme extent, a group of Maryland Protestants did complain in a formal Declaration that the Catholic regime was preventing any kind of political or social mobility for Maryland's protestant inhabitants.<sup>65</sup>

Although they discount any notion of worries of conspiracy with Indigenous peoples or fears of attacks by them, they instead put forward much more believable claims about social mobility. However, this is juxtaposed by many of the same talking points used by Coode and Fendall having been voiced even more extremely almost a decade before in "A Complaint from Heaven". This outlandish document not only linked Catholics and the Proprietorship of

---

<sup>64</sup> Noeleen McIlvenna, *Early American Rebels: Pursuing Democracy from Maryland to Carolina, 1640-1700* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2020), 102-103.

<sup>65</sup> "Declaration of the Protestants of Maryland That the Charges against Lord Baltimore of Ill-Favour towards Protestants Are False. Maryland," 13 May 1682, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/48, No. 70, p. 231, Colonial State Papers Online.

Maryland to conspiring with indigenous peoples, but also factored in Virginia explaining that they had allowed said indigenous peoples to commit actions which cost the lives of the colonists of both Maryland and Virginia.<sup>66</sup> The link between Virginia and Maryland was so strong for these conspiratorial authors that they feared that there would be an “overthrow of Virginia by Maryland Piscataway Indians.”<sup>67</sup> Blaming Catholics and most seriously the Proprietary government of Maryland for indigenous attacks was a key theme that continued to persist in the language of the Chesapeake.

The linking of Catholics and the Maryland government to matters of defense, while present with the linkages to attacks by indigenous peoples and a conspiracy linking the two to harm protestant colonists, it all came to a head in with the Protestant Revolution of 1689. In defending his actions, Coode explained that the main reasons for his and others’ deep systemic distrust of Catholic authority in the “Declaration of Reasons and Motives for the present appearing in arms their Majesties’ Protestant subjects of Maryland.” In the Declaration, Coode and his followers describe how the chief offices of the colonial government were Catholics who had violated the rights of the Protestant colonists as Englishmen as well as having conspired with other “papists” to commit “outrages” upon the Protestant population.<sup>68</sup> More explicit discussion of Catholic actions against Protestant colonists directly were also accompanied by conditions of security which related to attacks by Indigenous Peoples. Not only did Coode and his followers claim direct action against Protestants by Catholics as having been supported by the government, but also discussing their involvement with Indigenous nations as a conspiracy against the

---

<sup>66</sup> “Complaint from Heaven,” May 1676, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/36, No. 78, pp. 213-214, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>67</sup> “Complaint from Heaven,” May 1676, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/36, No. 78, pp. 213-214, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>68</sup> Protestant Association, “The Declaration of the Reasons and Motives for the Present Appearing in Arms of their Majesties Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland,” 28 November 1689, Early English Books, 1641-1700, 2076:03, p. 5, Early English Books Online.

Protestant colonists more broadly to essentially rid the colony of them.<sup>69</sup> In the Declaration, Coode and his followers wrote that, “We are every day threatened with loss of life or estate; we have strong suspicion of a design to betray us to the Northern Indians who in 1681 were conducted into the heart of the province by French Jesuits, and there are constant endeavors to set us quarreling amongst ourselves and with Virginia.”<sup>70</sup> It appears that while in the early 1680’s Native American threats were a great concern to Protestants in Maryland in terms of their relationships with the Catholic leadership in the colony, this was needed to be supported with belief in rumors of Catholic government attacks along with an indigenous related conspiracy.

Questions of relationships with indigenous peoples while inextricably linked to questions of religion in the cases of Maryland and Virginia go back to the earliest days of colonization in North America. From England’s first attempts at colonization in the Chesapeake, relationships with Indigenous Peoples had been central to the lives of colonists living within the region. When it came to interactions with indigenous peoples in the Chesapeake there were many possible outcomes. Sometimes relations could be a quite amicable and peaceful affair in which colonists and Indigenous peoples were quite friendly. Such was the case with one Robert Widders who, while not a colonist of the English North American colonies, was a Quaker missionary that travelled throughout the English colonies in an effort to convert Indigenous peoples.<sup>71</sup> In his travels in 1676 Widders noted how both him and his companion were able to not only convert a multitude of Indigenous Peoples, but that both he and his companion were allowed to lodge with

---

<sup>69</sup> Protestant Association, “The Declaration of the Reasons and Motives for the Present Appearing in Arms of their Majesties Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland,” 28 November 1689, Early English Books, 1641-1700, 2076:03, pp. 6-7, Early English Books Online.

<sup>70</sup> Protestant Association, “The Declaration of the Reasons and Motives for the Present Appearing in Arms of their Majesties Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland,” 28 November 1689, Early English Books, 1641-1700, 2076:03, pp. 6, Early English Books Online.

<sup>71</sup> “The Life & Death, Travels and Sufferings of Robert Widders of Kellet in Lancashire Who Was One of the Lords Worthies Together with Several Testimonies of His Neighbors and Friends Concerning Him,” 1688, Early English Books, 1641-1700, 1486:35, p. 25-26, Harvard University Library, Early English Books Online.



them.<sup>72</sup> Although Widders was not a traditional colonist, his encounters with Indigenous Peoples do provide a look into how English citizens were received by Indigenous communities. However, these peaceful interactions were juxtaposed to more violent encounters which occurred.

Just as colonists could have peaceful relationships with Indigenous communities, so too was violence a pivotal element of their interactions with one another. One such individual who discussed colonial relationships with Indigenous peoples in North America was Sir Jonathan Atkins the Governor of Barbados in 1676. Writing a letter to then Secretary of State for the Northern Department, Sir Joseph Williamson, Atkins attempted to appeal for more aid following attacks by enslaved individuals as well as the island of Barbados having been ravaged by a hurricane. However, he attempted to make a petition through crafting commentary about how the metropole in London did not care for the specific issues of the colonies because they were not having to live in fear of losing their lives constantly, citing the example of violence between colonists and Indigenous peoples.<sup>73</sup> For instance, he points out that violence between Indigenous peoples and colonists was spreading like a “contagion,” and that Indigenous Peoples in Virginia and Maryland had “done great mischief burning some towns and destroying many people and carrying others away.”<sup>74</sup> Although it is possible that Sir Atkins was playing up the violence of encounters between colonists and Indigenous Peoples to more effectively get his point across, it is still vital to note that while all the way in Barbados he is keenly aware of the kinds of violence which occurred in the Chesapeake. And that he believed mentioning said violence would be

---

<sup>72</sup> “The Life & Death, Travels and Sufferings of Robert Widders of Kellet in Lancashire Who Was One of the Lords Worthies Together with Several Testimonies of His Neighbors and Friends Concerning Him,” 1688, Early English Books, 1641-1700, 1486:35, p. 26-27, Harvard University Library, Early English Books Online.

<sup>73</sup> Sir Jonathan Atkins, “Governor Sir Jonathan Atkins to Secretary Sir Joseph Williamson. Barbadoes,” The National Archives of the UK CO 1/36, No. 39, p. 368, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>74</sup> Sir Jonathan Atkins, “Governor Sir Jonathan Atkins to Secretary Sir Joseph Williamson. Barbadoes,” The National Archives of the UK CO 1/36, No. 39, p. 368, Colonial State Papers Online.

persuasive to Sir Williams, denoting just how widely known said violence was in the English Empire. While these violent encounters in the Chesapeake occurred, they did not do so without attempts by the colonial governments and the royal proprietors the Lords of Baltimore to create peace between the colonies and the various Indigenous Nations.

Many of the same Indigenous Nations that Maryland was making peace deals with were the same ones that Virginians were attempting to do the same. This was particularly the case following Bacon's Rebellion and the Maryland-Susquehannock War, with both Marylanders and Virginians attempting to reconcile with Indigenous Nations for the chaos that had been caused. In 1677 just such an attempt at a treaty was made with the then newly Lord Baltimore, Charles Calvert the 3<sup>rd</sup>'s government. That year Maryland's government ventured to form a treaty with local Indigenous Nations in an attempt to create a lasting peace. As a result, it negotiated a deal which included the colony of Virginia in an agreement that would restrict the expansion of the settlement of colonists into territory disputed by Indigenous peoples.<sup>75</sup> Achieving such a deal though faced its own trials and tribulations which brings out the fundamental differences in why Maryland's government failed to maintain its authority while Virginia's did. For instance, when Maryland's government attempted to create a peace deal just one year prior in 1676 it faced issues of anti-Catholic rhetoric that directly tied its relations with indigenous peoples to notions of religion.

This anti-Catholic rhetoric would reach a critical point when one William Davies and several of his followers complained about just how costly the military operations which the Maryland Colonial Government had taken against the Susquehannocks and other indigenous

---

<sup>75</sup> "Journal of the Lords of Trade and Plantations [1 of 2]. Whitehall," 18 October 1677, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 10, p. 168, Colonial State Papers Online.

peoples given it was a time of great economic difficulty in the colony.<sup>76</sup> Davies and his group of follower's protestations against Maryland's government are evident of the innate difficulties which the colony possessed in attempting to be a Catholic proprietorship. Rather than blaming the problems of the economic or relationships with indigenous peoples on simply poor governance, protestant Marylanders were able to jump on preconceived notions that Catholics were a group which sought to harm protestants while only making themselves richer. When Thomas Notley and the Council of Maryland defended their decision to raise the taxes, they specifically mention Davies, his followers, and their attempted rebellion. To this point they provide a direct response to the reasoning for the rebellion of them functioning as a Catholic oligarchy and avoiding paying their new taxes themselves by writing that "we can with truth say, that there is not one of us whether Governor or Councilors nay not the Proprietary himself when in the Province paid not his equal proportion of the Levy even for his own person."<sup>77</sup> Just as with A Complaint from Heaven, Davies and his numerous followers latched onto a desire to rebel in believing that the Catholic governor and council members were acting as a corrupt class of citizens who were thus mistreating the Protestant population.

The perceived threat from Indigenous Peoples which plagued the American colonies throughout the seventeenth century was one that was different depending on location. The Chesapeake was no exception, as it did not possess the same level of anxiety about the potential imminent threat that lay to the North in the case of French Canada. This division of anxieties was all the more apparent between the colonies of Virginia and Maryland. The previously mentioned proven false case of conspiracy between Native Americans and Catholics to attack

---

<sup>76</sup> Kruer, *Time of Anarchy*, 121-122.

<sup>77</sup> "By the Governor & Council of this Province Maryland a Remonstrance of the true State of the Province & of the causes and reasons of the publique Taxes," Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 15, pp. 137-138, Archives of Maryland Online.

was only harmed even more by the presence of a treaty which Lord Howard of Effingham informed the Lords of Trade that the Virginian government had established with the various Native American nations of the northern region of Virginia.<sup>78</sup> Lord Howard of Effingham felt as much in May of 1689, that while he believed the military affairs of the colony of Virginia to be in a disorganized state, there was not a large amount of threat coming from the Indigenous Peoples in the region due to the signing of said treaty.<sup>79</sup> This contrasts heavily with that of Maryland who just as Virginia made treaties with Indigenous Nations, but the colony was less successful in providing a stable atmosphere of peace through said treaties.

One such instance of legal action taken by Virginia to quell violence with Indigenous Peoples was when in 1689 the Virginia colonial government crafted binding articles of peace in order to safeguard the colony from Native American threats.<sup>80</sup> Rather than being subject to the public opinion of the colonial government's actions, Virginia could utilize its legislative power in a way that did not subject itself to questions of a Catholic ruling class. Just as with the case of William Davies in his actions during the 1676 peace deals with Indigenous Peoples, Maryland continued to have troubles as it moved into the 1680's. This can be seen in Noeleen McIlvenna's book, *Early American Rebels: Pursuing Democracy from Maryland to North Carolina, 1640-1700*. When it comes to Calvert's attempts to create peace with the Indigenous nations in the Chesapeake, McIlvenna writes that, "he had to work with them in an attempt to control their incursions into his colony. Fendall and Coode would continually try to exploit that situation to

---

<sup>78</sup> Lord Howard of Effingham, "Lord Howard of Effingham to Lords of Trade and Plantations," 28 May 1689, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 44, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>79</sup> Lord Howard of Effingham, "Lord Howard of Effingham to Lords of Trade and Plantations," 28 May 1689, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 44, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>80</sup> "Lord Howard of Effingham's Account of the Government of Virginia," 28 May 1689, The National Archives of the UK CO 5/1358, p. 1, Colonial America, Adam Matthew Digital.

paint a picture of a Popish Plot in Maryland.”<sup>81</sup> In this way Calvert’s administration over the colony could not win. With any attempt to reconcile and prevent conflict with Indigenous Peoples being turned against him, it was the innate nature of his administration being a Catholic Proprietorship that worked to prevent civil peace. This was only made worse by perceptions in the colony of rights being taken away from Protestants and the Calvert Proprietor’s legally questionable authority within the colony as it related to whether all of the prescribed powers by way of the colony’s charter to him were in fact legal.<sup>82</sup> Such division contrasts heavily with Virginia’s strictly protestant government who was able to achieve peace initiatives with groups like the Maquas.

A major peace deal which helped Virginians to achieve a lasting peace with Indigenous Peoples involved Governor Lord Howard of Effingham’s propositions for the Maquas to make peace with the Ottawas in 1687. In this case the Maquas took the advice of the Lord of Effingham, releasing Ottawa prisoners back to their nation, exchanging prisoners with the French, recognizing that they would no longer accept French Jesuits, and giving the governor three belts of wampum for his propositions.<sup>83</sup> The creation of this peace between the Maquas and the Ottawas can provide a look into the kinds of peace deals and negotiations between Native American nations and colonial governments as well as how it was Lord Howard of Effingham handled relationships with Indigenous Peoples. In addition, there was a keen awareness of the greater international relations context between the English and the French which accompanied the religious context. Lord Howard of Effingham’s recognition and petitioning for the Maquas to no longer be accepting of French Jesuits may speak to the distrust

---

<sup>81</sup> McIlvenna, *Early American Rebels*, 102.

<sup>82</sup> Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 115-117.

<sup>83</sup> “Answer of the Maquas, Oneidas, Onandagas, Cayongas, and Senecas to the Governor’s Propositions,” 6 August 1687, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/ 63, No. 4, p. 4, Colonial State Papers Online.

of the French outright, but it also speaks to a desire to prevent Catholic influence among the Maquas. This is especially because they considered the French mutual enemies with the English.<sup>84</sup> In this way Lord Howard of Effingham, even if not entirely effective, was attempting to remove catholic influence from Indigenous groups which may have contributed to reduced belief in a Catholic conspiracy that was intrinsically tied to joining with Indigenous Peoples in attacks on Protestants.

It is also important to note that the Maquas were also aware of the problem of tensions between themselves and the Virginians. For instance, they made promises to take care of punishing some of their group who had caused disturbances in Virginia and paid four beaver skins in reparations.<sup>85</sup> Doing such brings into focus that tensions were not only present, but that both sides were actively attempting to prevent them. In addition, it reveals that Lord Howard of Effingham was aware that the Maquas were making such efforts in actively trying to prevent these tensions from spilling over into full-scale violent conflict. Having such awareness would even allow the governor and others within the colonial government to recognize that there was not an intention among especially all Native American groups to create conflict between themselves and colonial Virginians, and thus result in them being less likely to accept a Native American conspiracy with Catholics and especially French Jesuits or the potential for an attack more generally. Lord Howard of Effingham's awareness in this matter also stretches in his recognition of what the Maquas desired, allowing him to take advantage of the situation for his own gain.

---

<sup>84</sup> "Answer of the Maquas, Oneidas, Onandagas, Cayongas, and Senecas to the Governor's Propositions," 6 August 1687, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/ 63, No. 4, p. 4, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>85</sup> "Answer of the Maquas, Oneidas, Onandagas, Cayongas, and Senecas to the Governor's Propositions," 6 August 1687, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/ 63, No. 4, p. 5, Colonial State Papers Online.

Recognizing that the Maquas desired to make peace with the Ottawas as well as with Virginians, he was able to craft a peace deal that the Maquas were satisfied with as well as one in which he could monitor the actions of Catholics among Native Americans. For example, in their reply to Effingham's advice, the Maquas responded that "if any of the five nations are inclined for English Jesuits, they will come to acquaint your excellency with it."<sup>86</sup> Recognizing the desire of the Maquas to achieve peace for themselves, Lord Howard of Effingham was able to achieve multiple goals for himself. Using his advice to the Maquas he successfully achieved both a peace deal with them and assistance in being able to observe potential Catholic based threats connected to the five main Native American nations which inhabited the Chesapeake and northernmost regions of England's North American colonies into Canada. The same kind of precautions and legislative measures which Virginia took were not the case in Maryland. This lack of a state of mostly peaceful conditions as well as a colony attempting to maintain peace and make proactive measures for the safety of its colonist was the case in Virginia as opposed to Maryland, whose difficulties such as the case with Coode and Fendall's proposing that they be in league with indigenous peoples creates a stark contrast.

With the previous case of Virginia making peace with the Maquas it is also important to note more generally how relations and tensions with Indigenous Peoples was something which occurred in an international context. The threat of the French Empire encroaching on the territory of the English colonies in North America and launching an attack on them was very real. This took many different forms and one of the chief ways that it affected the Chesapeake was in the destruction of needed imported supplies which ramped up during the period surrounding the Glorious Revolution and contributed to an already dire economic situation in the

---

<sup>86</sup> "Answer of the Maquas, Oneidas, Onandagas, Cayongas, and Senecas to the Governor's Propositions," 6 August 1687, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/ 63, No. 4, p. 4, Colonial State Papers Online.

region.<sup>87</sup> However, most importantly was the colonists' relationships with Indigenous Peoples based on Jesuit activity in converting said Indigenous Peoples to Catholicism, which was perceived as a major threat by protestant colonists.<sup>88</sup> And although this threat was an important facet for many of the other instances of political violence which occurred in the English North American colonies, it was distinctive in the case of the Chesapeake.

The Maryland government faced difficult decisions about how to regulate colonist actions as they pertained to Indigenous Peoples. And what peace higher ups were able to achieve only fed into the oligarchic and Indigenous relationship conspiracy which spread throughout the region into Virginia as well.<sup>89</sup> This was only worsened with events such as Bacon's Rebellion and the period following in which tensions between colonists and the Virginia government remained so treacherous that there were fears of a second possible insurrection only heightened by fears of attacks by Indigenous Peoples.<sup>90</sup> Taking this into consideration these fears that Virginians would rebel against their colony's government for a second time is indicative of just how persistent anti-government sentiment was in the Chesapeake. This is especially so given the events of 1682 in which both Maryland and Virginia feared rebellion within their respective colonies. However, this was not to say that the colonial governments did not attempt to prevent incidents from occurring between colonists and Indigenous Peoples.

Both Josias Fendall and John Coode were quite familiar with Virginia, especially during 1682 when it came time for them to attempt their coup against the colonial government of Maryland. In 1681 Fendall and Coode saw an opportunity and headed into Virginia to both

---

<sup>87</sup> Petition of Several Traders to Maryland and Virginia to the King, 1689, *The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739*, vol. 13, p. 183, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>88</sup> Kruer, *Time of Anarchy*, 124-125.

<sup>89</sup> Sutto, *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists*, 101-102.

<sup>90</sup> Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 54.



discuss their plans for a coup against Maryland's government as well as a place in which they would be able to place their families during said coup for their protection.<sup>91</sup> This however, was not the only condition in which they saw Virginia as vital to their plan. The two Marylanders traveled to Virginia not only to safely discuss their plot against the Maryland government, but Virginia they saw as a place where they could recruit potential allies much to the fear of the Maryland Government.<sup>92</sup> Members of Maryland's colonial government were not very pleased when it came to the multiple excursions that Fendall and Coode took to Virginia. One such individual was then Lord of Baltimore Charles Calvert, who described his anxieties about the actions of Fendall and Coode in a letter he wrote in July of 1681 to the Earl of Anglesey.

Through this letter it is clear that Calvert believed that not only would Fendall and Coode's rhetoric cause another rebellion on the scale of the one committed by Nathaniel Bacon in 1676, but that Nicholas Spencer was enabling them to do so. He wrote to the Earl of Anglesey that only a few days before Fendall had been apprehended by Maryland's government, Nicholas Spencer "had openly entertained and cherished this rascal in his house; which gives me cause to be confident that he as encouraged Fendall in his designs against Maryland."<sup>93</sup> This letter makes it evident that the proprietor Charles Calvert, Coode, and Fendall believed that Virginia was the perfect place where revolutionary rhetoric could spread. This is especially poignant given Nicholas Spencer's seemingly amicable relationship with Fendall. However, even with Coode and Fendall's multiple excursions into the colony this was not the case. Fendall's brother himself even attempted to gain support from Virginians once Josias had been arrested and this

---

<sup>91</sup> Philip Calvert, "Philip Calvert, Chancellor of Maryland, to Colonel Henry Meese," 29 December 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 120, pp. 176-177, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>92</sup> Philip Calvert, "Philip Calvert, Chancellor of Maryland, to Colonel Henry Meese," 29 December 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 120, pp. 176-177, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>93</sup> "Letter from the Lord Baltimore to the Earl of Anglesey," 19 July 1681, 280 Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 1676-81, *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 5, p. 280-282lin, Archives of Maryland Online.

came to nothing in the end.<sup>94</sup> It appears that even though the perception of espousing anti-Catholic rhetoric in Virginia would be perfect for an eruption of political violence this was not the case. It may have been that the convincing of Coode and Fendall and later Fendall's brother was not enough for Virginians, but this along with the potential threat of attack by Indigenous Peoples did not take hold in Virginia for economic reasons.

While Maryland's relationship with Indigenous Peoples throughout its existence has some similarities to those of other colonies, as the seventeenth century progressed the colony more and more created a quite unique relationship. For instance, during the latter half of the seventeenth century, and especially after Bacon's Rebellion in 1676, the colony possessed tensions to a degree unlike that of its neighbor to the south because of its Catholic and Protestant animosity. During the 1670s and into the 1680s Maryland's relationships with the Seneca and Susquehannock tribes was its most contentious, with fears that the Senecas could be paid to attack the inhabitants of Maryland. This can be seen in a letter to Lord Thomas Culpeper in which the Senecas are described as being an incredibly violent people who can "be hired to do anything."<sup>95</sup> These fears were only made worse in Maryland due to the presence of religious tensions. Lord Culpepper of Virginia himself highlights said tensions as being strictly a problem inside of Maryland with the attempted coup by John Coode and Josias Fendall in 1681.<sup>96</sup> Just as with the Protestant Revolution of 1689 eight years later, Coode and Fendall's appeal to Native American relationship tensions along with playing on the protestant catholic tensions did not

---

<sup>94</sup> McIlvenna, *Early American Rebels*, 102-103.

<sup>95</sup> "Extracts from Letters to Lord Culpeper from Virginia. Virginia," 25 July 1681, The National Archives of the UK, CO 1/47, No. 36, pp. 416-417, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>96</sup> "Extracts from Letters to Lord Culpeper from Virginia. Virginia," 25 July 1681, The National Archives of the UK, CO 1/47, No. 36, pp. 416-417, Colonial State Papers Online.

have the same sorts of appeals in Virginia.<sup>97</sup> This was most likely due to the priorities of the Virginia colonists during this time.

Virginia in 1681 and 1682 during Coode and Fendall's attempted coup was in a poor economic state. With a poor harvest, a sharp increase in population that was coupled with an economic downturn, and fears of the poorer colonists rising up in the colony, Virginians were in a state of serious anxiety and desperation.<sup>98</sup> Rather than the Protestant and Catholic divide encompassing the fears of Virginians their priority was the economic conditions within the colony. While this may speak to how dire the economic conditions within the colony were, it is also indicative that it was not reported protestants were blaming Catholics for said economic downturn and that the conflict was more based on notions of status or class. This was so much to the point that Virginia colonists were more concerned with potentially overthrowing their own government based on its own economic mishandlings.<sup>99</sup> To this point, it is clear following Bacon's Rebellion that while relationships with Indigenous communities were being joined by other pressing concerns for colonists heading into the 1680s in Virginia. However, Virginia's colonial leadership utilized new kinds of social and political control in order to maintain order among its colonists.

One major way in which the Virginia government sought to maintain political control and reduce the kinds of social tensions which Maryland was facing was through certain government-led initiatives. Virginia itself had a history of potential insurrection in 1682 with tensions between colonists and the government heating up. However, this was over rising prices in tobacco and led to numerous Virginians destroying tobacco plants. It was such to the degree that

---

<sup>97</sup> McIlvenna, *Early American Rebels*, 102-103.

<sup>98</sup> Journal of Lords of Trade and Plantations. Council Chamber, 31 October 1681, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 11, pp. 134-135, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>99</sup> McIlvenna, *Early American Rebels*, 105-107.

one Richard Gardner of Virginia stated that the governor's proclamation did "nor prevail to retard their proceedings in the least."<sup>100</sup> To counter this kind of unrest unlike Maryland, Virginia's government in the years following 1682 was concerned with instituting a large number of reforms. This is evident as early as 1680 when then governor of Virginia Lord Thomas Culpeper addressed the House of Burgesses about key issues within the colony. In his speech, Lord Culpeper discussed with the assembly the possibility of opening trade with local Indigenous Peoples as well as how he was willing "to do all things that may be for the public good without considering any private interest" in regards to relations with them.<sup>101</sup> These proclamations regarding relations with Indigenous Peoples was in addition to assurances that he would listen to any and all grievances which the legislative assembly had.<sup>102</sup> Making such a commitment to the assembly was done not just as a political move to smooth over relations between Lord Culpeper's administration and the House of Burgesses. Rather, it is also a key piece in showing how proactive Virginia's government and its officials were in attempting to prevent conflict within the colony. It is also important to note that Lord Culpeper's words were not empty and it was only one year later that he would take a truly active role to create social order within Virginia.

Following his speech to the House of Burgesses, Lord Culpeper in 1681 crafted a plan to address the state of the colony of Virginia. This plan included several reforms related not just to aiding with economic unrest, but many other anxieties present within the colony. One such was with Indigenous Peoples in which Culpeper proposed that, "there be no war or peace made with

---

<sup>100</sup> Clement Hill to Richard Gardner, 18 May 1682, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/48, No. 72, p. 231, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>101</sup> "Speech Made by Lord Culpeper to the General Assembly," 1680, in *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1659/60-1693*. Ed. by H. R. McIlwaine., 1659-93., by Virginia, ed. H.R. McIlwaine (Richmond, VA: The Colonial Press, E. Waddey Co, 1914), 149

<sup>102</sup> "Speech Made by Lord Culpeper to the General Assembly," in *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia*, 149

any Indians but by the knowledge or approbation of the Governor and Council of Virginia.”<sup>103</sup> Rather than the vigilantism of Bacon’s Rebellion, Lord Culpepper sought to maintain colonial government control of interaction with Native Americans to not only foster more peaceful relations, but to make sure those relations were maintained. Lord Culpepper’s plan also reveals how this more regulated plan in tending to relations with Indigenous Peoples was put into action. Rather than there being a kind of panic amongst the Virginian government, Lord Culpepper ordered for, “An exact and speedy inquiry to be made into the disturbances in Maryland.”<sup>104</sup> The measured yet rapid approach to the potential for violence with Indigenous Peoples provides a clear view that in a post-Bacon’s Rebellion Virginia there were not only concerns over potential Indigenous attacks, but that there was a desire to make sure that wild theories about them could not spread like in Maryland.

Culpepper’s plan to stabilize Virginia was not the only action taken by Virginia’s government to prevent conflict between colonists and Indigenous peoples as well as make sure that the colony was itself stable. Once 1688 came around the House of Burgesses was petitioned by the English Crown to provide support to colonial New York in the form of funds which the colonial administrators could use for its defense against Indigenous Peoples.<sup>105</sup> As previously stated, colonial Virginia’s economic situation during the 1680s was quite poor and this is reflected just as much in the House of Burgesses’ decision regarding whether or not to provide aid to New York. In responding to the request, the House of Burgesses replied that because Virginia needed to create peace with the Senecas and other Indigenous groups, that it could not

---

<sup>103</sup> “Lord Culpeper’s Projects for the Relief and Improvement of Virginia,” 18 October 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 76, CO 5/1355, pp. 405-407, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>104</sup> “Lord Culpeper’s Projects for the Relief and Improvement of Virginia,” 18 October 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 76, CO 5/1355, pp. 405-407, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>105</sup> “To his Excellency Francis Lord Howard Baron of Effingham his Majesties Lieutenant and Governor General of Virginia,” 1688, in *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1659/60-1693. Ed. by H. R. McIlwaine., 1659-93.*, by Virginia, ed. H.R. McIlwaine (Richmond, VA: The Colonial Press, E. Waddey Co, n.d.), 298-299

“comply with giving help or assistance by money or other ways to the Province and Government of New York, without reducing this country to an insupportable poverty and want.”<sup>106</sup> Rather than plunging the colony into poverty by providing assistance to New York, the House of Burgesses instead put its efforts behind maintaining peace and stability within the colony of Virginia itself. Their actions in not providing monetary assistance to New York is also indicative of the overall situation and the importance that peace with the local indigenous peoples had. Because Virginia was on the precipice of economic calamity, the House of Burgesses saw fit that the most important aspects which government funds were needing to go to was its economic security in addition to its attempts to create peace with Indigenous Peoples. While these attempts to maintain peace in Virginia were actively taken throughout the 1680s, the situation in Maryland was different especially in regards to the spread of rumors involving attacks by Indigenous peoples.

To this point of rumors of indigenous attacks, they could not occur in Virginia to the degree of those in their neighboring colony of Maryland. Lord Culpepper made this even more evident in a manuscript discussing the status of both Virginia and its neighboring colonies. He described the colony as having been at peace with the Indigenous nations, and that while there were fears in Virginia that they may be subject to Indigenous attacks, it is not to the same level that it was present in Maryland. This is especially important considering that he viewed the colony as on the verge of collapse, writing that Maryland had Virginia’s “disease, poverty, but in very great danger of falling in pieces.”<sup>107</sup> As to why Maryland was on the verge of collapse, Culpepper gives a series of reasons. Chief among them he explains is the absolute collapse of

---

<sup>106</sup> "To his Excellency Francis Lord Howard Baron of Effingham," in *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia*, 299

<sup>107</sup> Lord Culpeper, "Lord Culpeper to Lords of Trade and Plantations," 12 December 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 105, p 7, Colonial State Papers Online.

the tobacco market in addition to the fact that the “politick maxims” of Lord Baltimore were having a detrimental effect on the relationships that colonists within Maryland had with one another.<sup>108</sup> By crafting this description of the state of Maryland as well as Virginia, Culpeper illustrates that while both colonies suffered from many of the same problems, the situation in Maryland was far more dire than it was in Virginia. However, Coode and Fendall’s attempted coup was not the only precipice which increased the fears related to Native Americans in Maryland.

A case which provides an important view into the how Virginia was able to stave off the protestant and Catholic divide linked to perceived threats from Indigenous Peoples is a believed Catholic run plot for Indigenous nations to attack the protestant colonists in both Maryland and Virginia. This plot is the same one referenced earlier in which John Waugh Clerk, Ben Harrison, and John West had been taken into custody for trying to spread. Nicholas Spencer reported to William Blathwayt that many colonists in the north of the colony as well as in Maryland had taken up arms for fear that the Catholic government of Maryland was conspiring with the Senecas to attack them.<sup>109</sup> However, the belief by individuals as it relates to the validity of the rumored plot was starkly different in both colonies. For instance, Spencer labeled it immediately as having been a baseless rumor, but that it nonetheless took hold of many colonists, most of which were in Maryland.<sup>110</sup> It was mainly a Maryland problem such to the point that it was something the Maryland Council to the Governor had to create solutions to prevent any kind of actual political violence. This was only further confirmed by said Council, who recorded that

---

<sup>108</sup> Lord Culpeper, “Lord Culpeper to Lords of Trade and Plantations,” 12 December 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 105, p 7, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>109</sup> “Nicholas Spencer to William Blathwayt. James’ City, Virginia,” 27 April 1689, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 32, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>110</sup> “Nicholas Spencer to William Blathwayt. James’ City, Virginia,” 27 April 1689, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 32, Colonial State Papers Online.

Nicholas Spencer of Virginia had asked for the Maryland Colonial Government to try and resolve the fear surrounding the plot themselves, because it had caused serious unrest in Virginia about fears of Indigenous attacks.<sup>111</sup> Spencer's denial of the plot's validity in addition to his request that the Maryland government resolve the issue of the plot as it related to colonists confirms that said false plot had more purchase amongst colonists in Maryland than those in Virginia. This was even though Spencer had feared that said plot would potentially spread and feared its outcome for the Virginia government as well should it not be put down.

Just as the supposed plot was taking on a dangerous life in Maryland, Spencer was afraid that the same could potentially happen in Virginia. According to the Council, not only did Spencer ask that the Maryland Government help to resolve the supposed plot, but even Virginia's Council requested that Virginians not be allowed to cross the border into Maryland because it could cause fears to be reignited.<sup>112</sup> It is clear as well that tensions between protestants and Catholics both in Virginia and Maryland with this false plot were intrinsically tied to fears of Indigenous Peoples being in league with Catholics and more importantly the government of Maryland. This is only further supported by Colonel Jowles's actions in attempting to prevent violence amongst Protestant Marylanders. The militia colonel had been dispatched by the Maryland government to both investigate the claims of Indigenous Peoples preparing to attack as well as the unrest of the local Protestant population.<sup>113</sup> While the fact that such unrest occurred is not necessarily of major note, it is the action taken by Jowles as well as Maryland's government at large that is of most importance.

---

<sup>111</sup> Minutes of Council of Maryland, 24 March 1689, *The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739*, vol. 13, pp. 18-19, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>112</sup> Minutes of Council of Maryland, 24 March 1689, *The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739*, vol. 13, pp. 18-19, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>113</sup> "To the honorable William Joseph Esquire Isaac Allerton president of the Province of Maryland These," March 1689, *Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 1687/8-89, Maryland State Archives*, vol. 8, pp. 83-84, Archives of Maryland Online.



Jowles and Maryland's government took a far different approach to its suppression of those who prepared for violence, because it had to also handle the Protestant population's perception of the government. For example, it was reported that when Colonel Jowles arrived at the gathering of those who had prepared for an attack by Indigenous Peoples, there "were gathered about a hundred men in arms exercising to which he gave such satisfaction that they all parted satisfied."<sup>114</sup> Jowles and his men did little stop the current unrest and even less to prevent further unrest from occurring other than to convince those who had taken up arms that it was, at least for the moment, not necessary to do so. This action is curious given the Council of Maryland's fears regarding conflict igniting between themselves and Indigenous Peoples. Such anxiety can be found in their proceedings where they claimed that the greatest fear would be that an Englishman intentionally start a conflict between the colony and Indigenous Nations to take advantage of the fears that were present.<sup>115</sup> Given the fears of the Council that an Englishman in Maryland may try to take advantage of anxieties between colonists and Indigenous Peoples it is strange that Colonel Jowles would not have been ordered to take into custody any of the riotous colonists, at least at first glance.

In fact, this lack of forcefully ridding the colony of these disorderly colonists was most likely a part of the Council of Maryland's recognition to create greater public peace in 1689 to prevent violence and further revolt by attempting to be more open with them. This is evident in the Council's proceedings where they announced that for the peace of and security of the colony, they would publish Colonel Jowles's investigation.<sup>116</sup> Publishing said investigation

---

<sup>114</sup> "To the honorable William Joseph Esquire Isaac Allerton president of the Province of Maryland These," March 1689, Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 1687/8-89, *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 8, pp. 83-84, Archives of Maryland Online.

<sup>115</sup> Colonel Darnell To Major Ninian Beal, 25 March 1689, Proceedings of the Council of Maryland 1687/8-89, *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 8, pp. 75-76, Archives of Maryland Online.

<sup>116</sup> "Declaration or Remonstrance Received from the Early of Shrewsbury," 31 December 1689, Proceedings of the Council of Maryland 1687/8-89, *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 8, pp. 86-87, Archives of Maryland Online.

demonstrates how high the tensions were in Maryland about upsetting the Protestant populous over the perception that they would be hiding information. It is also indicative of how knowledgeable the colony's government was of perceptions that they were in fact a Catholic oligarchy. However, taking this approach differs significantly from that of the hasty and more effective action taken by Virginia's colonial government to end both the ongoing chaos within the northern portion of its colony and to prevent those who were spreading the rumors of Catholics and Indigenous Peoples planning to attack Protestants from continuing to be a threat to colonial security.

The main prevention of both current and future unrest for the Virginia government was to arrest the principal individuals involved in spreading the dangerous rumors about the Catholic and Indigenous plot. However, Virginia's government and particularly the Governor's Council were not only concerned with arresting those who were the main spreaders of the rumors like Clerk, Harrison, and West. In addition, the council crafted orders for the arrest of not only regular citizens but also members within its own government. This was particularly the case with one justice of the peace named Captain George Mason.<sup>117</sup> As a result of his actions spreading the rumors, the council saw fit "that he be removed from being a Justice of the Peace, and discharged from his command in the militia, and that he give good security to the sheriff of Stafford County for his future good behavior."<sup>118</sup> The Virginia council's actions in arresting not only the believed ringleaders who were spreading the conspiracy within the colony demonstrates a greater desire to stop serious unrest from not only occurring but from reoccurring further down the line. Taking this action and even arresting one of its own Justices of the Peace contrasts

---

<sup>117</sup> "Coll Rich: Lee added.," 1689, in *Executive journals of the Council of colonial Virginia., v.1 1680-1699.*, by Virginia (Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library, 1925), 104-105

<sup>118</sup> "Coll Rich: Lee added.," 1689, in *Executive journals of the Council of colonial Virginia., v.1 1680-1699.*, 104-106

heavily with Colonel Jowles's simpler approach of simply convincing those in arms to stand down and return to their homes. The idea to prevent further unrest is only bolstered by the council's request that more powder and ball be accrued by the colony in case any "intense discord should be, or Indian incursion which we are often subject to" occur in the future.<sup>119</sup> Such proactive measures would create an incredible discrepancy between the continuation of unrest in the two colonies as Maryland demonstrated in the weeks following the ending of the conspiracy rumors.

Although it is Maryland that is typically seen as having been paranoid when it came to Catholic plots associated with Indigenous Peoples, Virginia was no exception as their various actions to quell violence amongst their colonists indicate. However, even with the elimination of said plot there was not an instant elimination of tensions. For instance, patrols were still enacted by the Maryland colonial government for the keeping of the peace and in case any conflict between colonists and Native Americans further ignited.<sup>120</sup> Such patrols apparently did not work or were only temporary, despite reports that they had quieted down the populous.<sup>121</sup> As only a few months later in 1689 John Coode would launch his successful plot against the Baltimore Proprietorship in the Protestant Revolution of 1689. This false plot which occurred before Coode was successful in his coup attempt is indicative of the kinds of tensions in both Virginia and Maryland in the belief that a Catholic conspiracy with Indigenous Peoples threatened the lives of colonists. In addition, it is also indicative of the divide between the two, that while it

---

<sup>119</sup> "Coll Rich: Lee added.," 1689, in *Executive journals of the Council of colonial Virginia., v.1 1680-1699.*, 106

<sup>120</sup> Minute of Council of Maryland, 2 April 1689, *The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739*, vol. 13, p. 20, Colonial State Papers Online.

<sup>121</sup> Minute of Council of Maryland, 2 April 1689, *The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739*, vol. 13, p. 20, Colonial State Papers Online.

was catching on among colonists in both colonies, Maryland's colonists were having the greater effect on its spread and potency than those in Virginia.

While it is important to recognize Maryland's anti-Catholic sentiments which were pervasive throughout the seventeenth century, it is just as important to recognize Virginia's place in this landscape. Typical scholarship has tended to focus on the anti-Catholic beliefs of the colonies which participated in planned revolts against their colonial governments. Instead, the problem of distrust and disgust with Catholics was pervasive especially in the most populous and wealthy of the English colonies in North America. The lack of insurrection is often passed over in favor of colonies which had one and explaining why. It is not just important to examine those colonies whose anti-Catholic rhetoric led to violent political action, but to also examine those which still possessed this rhetoric and what prevented it from spilling over into a full-blown overthrow. It was both the innate structural systems of both governments as well as the actions taken by said governments which resulted in the overthrow of Maryland and not Virginia. These differing systems demonstrate differences in not just colonial governance but how those differences affected the lives of everyday people especially as it has to do with religion.

Religion was one of the most important aspects of the lives of both English citizens in the metropole and the colonists in the Americas as it affected not just social but political and legal aspects of their lives. Utilizing the colony of Virginia as a comparative with Maryland illustrates more clearly how different colonial governmental systems contended with issues of religion in the daily lives of English colonists. This comparative perspective can also be used for other colonies in relation to the Glorious Revolution both inside as well as outside of continental North America. For instance, examining the political situation and religious climate of colonies like

Pennsylvania and Massachusetts can inform on the kinds of religious differences between a proprietary colony which did not become embroiled in political violence while the other being in the Dominion of New England did. Another major aspect of the Glorious Revolution which can be quite useful for scholars in utilizing the comparative in this case would be that of relationships with Indigenous Peoples.

Just as each colony was different in how it dealt with religion in its government, so too were English colonies vastly different in how they approached their relationships with Indigenous Peoples. While each colony had their own unique situation as it relates to Indigenous nations which inhabited the same geographic area, there are still major similarities, especially across colonies such as Virginia and Maryland which shared a great deal both geographically and politically in their dealings with indigenous groups. Just as Virginians and Marylanders faced similar conditions with Indigenous Peoples so too did the northern most English colonies in the Americas. Analyzing these colonies in conversation with one another will not only allow for the anti-Catholic connection to become more apparent, but also how different interactions between different Indigenous Peoples and those colonies led to less or more political violence. However, taking all of these aspects together can help provide a more complete picture of the lives of colonists in the Americas during the period of the Glorious Revolution and beyond. It allows for an examination of the interconnected nature of political, legal, social, religious, and Native American relationship aspects that all affected one another. It is just as important to also recognize that these colonies were not present in a vacuum. They had duties to the metropole in London as well as to their own citizens and their governments had a distinct awareness of each other. The government officials of the English colonies in the Americas in this awareness communicated with each other about many of the important issues raised about religion, Native

American relationships, and colonial governments in general. There was collaboration and disagreement, with government officials forming their own opinions and using political maneuvering to their advantage. Thinking about this context in light of the situations of colonies regarding those three aspects is necessary to creating a more complete understanding of how colonial politics functioned and the results as they affected the lives of the colonists themselves. Examining the religious and Native American relationship implications of Virginia and Maryland together a new route is opened for a more wide-reaching examination of the English colonies in the Americas during the Glorious Revolution and the seventeenth century more broadly.

## Bibliography

Primary Sources:

- A Law of Maryland Concerning Religion. Early English Books, 1641-1700, 2955:15, New York Public Library, Early English Books Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/books/law-maryland-concerning-religion/docview/2248521475/se-2>.
- An Act for the Better Preservation of the Peace of Virginia, and Preventing Unlawful and Treasonable Associations. The National Archives of the UK CO 5/1380, pp. 146-147, Colonial America. Adam Matthew Digital.  
[http://www.colonialamerica.amdigital.co.uk.proxy.uchicago.edu/Documents/Details/CO\\_5\\_1380\\_381](http://www.colonialamerica.amdigital.co.uk.proxy.uchicago.edu/Documents/Details/CO_5_1380_381)
- Answer of the Maquas, Oneidas, Onandagas, Cayongas, and Senecas to the Governor's Propositions. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/ 63, No. 4. Colonial State Papers Online. <http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/answer-maquas-oneidas-onandagas-cayongas-senecas/docview/1845180933/se-2>.
- "April 20. 1689." 1689. In *Executive journals of the Council of colonial Virginia., v.1 1680-1699.*, by Virginia. Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library, 1925.
- Archbishop of Canterbury, Archbishop of Canterbury to Bishop of London. Croydon. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/37, Nos. 38, 38I, CO 5/723, pp. 27-30. Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/archbishop-canterbury-bishop-london-croydon/docview/1845171208/se-2>.
- Atkins, Jonathan. Governor Sir Jonathan Atkins to Secretary Sir Joseph Williamson. Barbadoes. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/36, No. 39, p. 368. Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/governor-sir-jonathan-atkins-secretary-joseph/docview/1845169434/se-2>.
- By the Governor & Council of this Province Maryland a Remonstrance of the true State of the Province & of the causes and reasons of the publique Taxes. Proceedings of the Council of Maryland. *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 15, pp. 137-138. Archives of Maryland Online.  
<https://msa.maryland.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc2900/sc2908/000001/000015/html/am15--137.html>.
- Calvert, Philip. Philip Calvert, Chancellor of Maryland, to Colonel Henry Meese. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 120, pp. 176-177. Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/philip-calvert-chancellor-maryland-colonel-henry/docview/1845176997/se-2>.

Clement Hill to Richard Gardner. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/48, No. 72, p. 231. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/clement-hill-richard-gardner/docview/1845179237/se-2>.

Coode, John. John Coode to the President of the Council of Virginia. Maryland. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 181. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/john-coode-president-council-virginia-maryland/docview/1845181030/se-2>.

"Coll Rich: Lee added." 1689. In *Executive journals of the Council of colonial Virginia., v.1 1680-1699.*, by Virginia, 104-06. Richmond, VA: Virginia State Library, 1925.

Colonel Darnell To Major Ninian Beal, 25 March 1689. Proceedings of the Council of Maryland 1687/8-89. *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 8, pp. 75-76. Archives of Maryland Online. <https://msa.maryland.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc2900/sc2908/000001/000008/html/am8--75.html>

Complaint from Heaven with a Hue and Cry and a Petition out of Virginia and Maryland to King Charles II. and His Parliament. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/36, No. 78. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/complaint-heaven-with-hue-cry-petition-out/docview/1845170240/se-2>.

Declaration of the Protestants of Maryland That the Charges against Lord Baltimore of Ill-Favour towards Protestants Are False. Maryland. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/48, No. 70, p. 231. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/declaration-protestants-maryland-that-charges/docview/1845176623/se-2>.

"Declaration or Remonstrance Received from the Early of Shrewsbury," 31 December 1689, Proceedings of the Council of Maryland 1687/8-89, *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 8, pp. 86-87, Archives of Maryland Online.

<https://msa.maryland.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc2900/sc2908/000001/000008/html/am8--86.html>.

Extract from a Letter from Nicholas Spencer, of Virginia. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739. vol. 13, p. 66. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/extract-letter-nicholas-spencer-virginia/docview/1845180183/se-2>.



Extracts from Letters to Lord Culpeper from Virginia. Virginia. The National Archives of the UK, CO 1/47, No. 36, pp. 416-417. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/extracts-letters-lord-culpeper-virginia/docview/1845174598/se-2>.

Extract of a Letter from Virginia. The National Archives of the UK CO1/47, No. 35, pp. 91-93, Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/extract-letter-virginia/docview/1845177248/se-2>.

From Mr. Coode to Mr. Bacon. Maryland. 8<sup>th</sup> February 1689/90. 168 Records Illustrating the History of Maryland. *Maryland State Archives*. vol. 8. p. 168. Archives of Maryland Online.

<https://msa.maryland.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc2900/sc2908/000001/000008/html/am8--168.html>.

Journal of the Lords of Trade and Plantations. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 11, p. 511. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/journal-lords-trade-plantations/docview/1845179376/se-2>.

Journal of Lords of Trade and Plantations. Council Chamber. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 11, pp. 134-135. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/journal-lords-trade-plantations-council-chamber/docview/1845173143/se-2>.

Journal of the Lords of Trade and Plantations. Whitehall. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 10. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/journal-lords-trade-plantations-whitehall/docview/1845169960/se-2>.

Journal of the Lords of Trade and Plantations [1 of 2]. Whitehall. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 10, p. 168. Colonial State Papers Online.

<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/journal-lords-trade-plantations-1-2-whitehall/docview/1845170034/se-2>.

Letter from the Lord Baltimore to the Earl of Anglesey. 280 Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 1676-81. *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 5, p. 281. Archives of Maryland Online.

<https://msa.maryland.gov/megafile/msa/speccol/sc2900/sc2908/000001/000005/html/am5--281.html>

Letter from Mr Coode to Mr Bacon President of Virginia. The National Archives of the UK CO 5/723, pp. 165-166, Colonial America. Adam Matthew Digital.  
[http://www.colonialamerica.amdigital.co.uk.proxy.uchicago.edu/Documents/Details/CO\\_5\\_723\\_062](http://www.colonialamerica.amdigital.co.uk.proxy.uchicago.edu/Documents/Details/CO_5_723_062)

List of the Principal Officers of Maryland. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 119, pp. 175-176, Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/list-principal-officers-maryland/docview/1845173000/se-2>.

Lord Baltimore. Answer of Charles Lord Baltimore to the Inquiries Concerning Maryland Presented to Lords of Trade and Plantations on 26th March 1678. London. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/42, No. 40, CO 5/723, pp. 35-45, CO 391/2, p. 224, Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/answer-charles-lord-baltimore-inquiries/docview/1845170497/se-2>.

Lord Culpeper. Lord Culpeper to Lords of Trade and Plantations. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 105, pp. 153-157, Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/lord-culpeper-lords-trade-plantations/docview/1845172344/se-2>.

“Lord Culpeper’s Projects for the Relief and Improvement of Virginia,” 18 October 1681, The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 76, CO 5/1355, pp. 405-407, Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/lord-culpepers-projects-relief-improvement/docview/1845176781/se-2>.

Lord Culpeper’s Representations Concerning the Church. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/52, No. 101, CO 5/1356, pp. 172-174, Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/lord-culpepers-representations-concerning-church/docview/1845175857/se-2>.

Lord Howard of Effingham’s Account of the Government of Virginia. The National Archives of the UK CO 5/1358, p. 1. Colonial America. Adam Matthew Digital.  
[http://www.colonialamerica.amdigital.co.uk.proxy.uchicago.edu/Documents/Details/CO\\_5\\_1358\\_001](http://www.colonialamerica.amdigital.co.uk.proxy.uchicago.edu/Documents/Details/CO_5_1358_001)

Lord Howard of Effingham. Lord Howard of Effingham to Lords of Trade and Plantations. 28 May 1689, The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 44. Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/lord-howard-effingham-lords-trade-plantations/docview/1845178071/se-2>.

- Lords of Trade and Plantations to Lord Baltimore. Whitehall. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/47, No. 74, CO 5/723, p. 56, Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/lords-trade-plantations-lord-baltimore-whitehall/docview/1845171933/se-2>.
- Minute of Council of Maryland, 2 April 1689. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 20, Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/minute-council-maryland/docview/1845176120/se-2>.
- Minutes of the Lords of Trade and Plantations. The National Archives of the UK CO 1/41, Nos. 27-28; CO 5/723, pp. 31-35, Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/minutes-lords-trade-plantations/docview/1845171837/se-2>.
- Minutes of Council of Maryland, 24 March 1689, The Calendar of State Papers. Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, pp. 18-19. Colonial State Papers Online. <http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/minutes-council-maryland/docview/1845177738/se-2>.
- Nicholas Spencer to William Blathwayt. James' City, Virginia. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13. Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/nicholas-spencer-william-blathwayt-james-city/docview/1845177537/se-2>.
- Notes by Nicholas of a Meeting of the Privy Council, at Which the King Presided. Whitehall. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739. vol. 01. Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/notes-nicholas-meeting-privy-council-at-which/docview/1845164899/se-2>.
- Petition of Several Traders to Maryland and Virginia to the King. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 13, p. 183. Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/petition-several-traders-maryland-virginia-king/docview/1845182732/se-2>.
- “President Nathaniel Bacon to Governor Lord Effingham, 1689.” *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 9, no. 1 (1901): 29–31. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4242401>.

Protestant Association. "The Declaration of the Reasons and Motives for the Present Appearing in Arms of their Majesties Protestant Subjects in the Province of Maryland." Early English Books, 1641-1700, 2076:03, Early English Books Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/books/declaration-reasons-motives-present-appearing/docview/2264221649/se-2>.

The Council of Virginia to Lords of Trade and Plantations James City. The National Archives of the UK pg. 4-5 CO 1/51, No.105, CO 5/1356, pp. 175-186, Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/council-virginia-lords-trade-plantations-james/docview/1845179310/se-2>.

The Life & Death, Travels and Sufferings of Robert VVidders of Kellet in Lancashire Who Was One of the Lords Worthies Together with Several Testimonies of His Neighbors and Friends Concerning Him. Early English Books, 1641-1700, 1486:35. Harvard University Library. Early English Books Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/books/life-death-travels-sufferings-robert-vvidders/docview/2240904986/se-2>.

The Names of the Council of Lord Baltimore in Maryland, from Mr. Rousby. The Calendar of State Papers, Colonial: North America and the West Indies 1574-1739, vol. 11. Colonial State Papers Online.  
<http://proxy.uchicago.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/government-official-publications/names-council-lord-baltimore-maryland-mr-rousby/docview/1845179122/se-2>.

"To his Excellency Francis Lord Howard Baron of Effingham his Majesties Lieutenant and Governor General of Virginia." 1688. In *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1659/60-1693*. Ed. by H. R. McIlwaine., 1659-93., by Virginia, 298-99. Edited by H.R. McIlwaine. Richmond, VA: The Colonial Press, E. Waddey Co, n.d.

To the honorable William Joseph Esquire Isaac Allerton president of the Province of Maryland These. Proceedings of the Council of Maryland, 1687/8-89. *Maryland State Archives*, vol. 8, pp. 83-84. Archives of Maryland Online.

"Speech Made by Lord Culpeper to the General Assembly." 1680. In *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1659/60-1693*. Ed. by H. R. McIlwaine., 1659-93., by Virginia, 147-49. Edited by H.R. McIlwaine. Richmond, VA: The Colonial Press, E. Waddey Co, 1914.

Secondary Sources:

- Bernhard, Virginia. "Poverty and the Social Order in Seventeenth-Century Virginia." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 85, no. 2 (1977): 141–55. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4248117>.
- Carr, Lois Green and David William Jordan. *Maryland's Revolution of Government, 1689-1692*. Ithaca [N.Y.]: Cornell University Press, 1974.
- Fogarty, Gerald P. "Property and Religious Liberty in Colonial Maryland Catholic Thought." *The Catholic Historical Review* 72, no. 4 (1986): 573–600. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25022406>.
- Kruer, Matthew. *Time of Anarchy: Indigenous Power and the Crisis of Colonialism in Early America*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2021. EBSCOhost.
- Kulikoff, Allan. *Tobacco and Slaves: The Development of Southern Cultures in the Chesapeake, 1680-1800*. Published for the Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture, Williamsburg, Virginia. Chapel Hill: Omohundro Institute and UNC Press, 1986. EBSCOhost.
- Lovejoy, David S. *The Glorious Revolution in America*. Middletown, Conn.: Scranton, Pa.: Wesleyan University Press; Distributed by Harper & Row, 1987. EBSCOhost.
- McIlvenna, Noeleen. *Early American Rebels: Pursuing Democracy from Maryland to Carolina, 1640-1700*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2020. EBSCOhost.
- Nelson, William E. "The Law of Colonial Maryland: Virginia Without Its Grandeur." *The American Journal of Legal History* 54, no. 2 (2014): 168–99. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24465923>.
- Rice, James D. "Bacon's Rebellion in Indian Country." *The Journal of American History* 101, no. 3 (2014): 726–50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44286295>.
- Speck, William Arthur. *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Stanwood, Owen. *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Stanwood, Owen. "The Protestant Moment: Antipopyery, the Revolution of 1688–1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire." *Journal of British Studies* 46, no. 3 (2007): 481–508. <https://doi.org/10.1086/515441>.

- Sutto, Antoinette Patricia. *Loyal Protestants and Dangerous Papists: Maryland and the Politics of Religion in the English Atlantic, 1630 -1690*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2015. EBSCOhost.
- Tarter, Brent. "Bacon's Rebellion, the Grievances of the People, and the Political Culture of Seventeenth-Century Virginia." *The Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* 119, no. 1 (2011): 2–41. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41059478>.