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The role religion played in causing the English Revolution of 1688 has been examined. The Catholicism of the heir apparent to the English throne, James, Duke of York, later James II, had a direct impact on the social, political, and religious life of a predominately Protestant, anti-Catholic England in the latter decades of the seventeenth century. James's religion and the prospect of his accession to the throne led to the development of two unsuccessful attempts in the 1670s and 1680s, the Exclusion Crisis and the Rye House Plot, to keep him from ever taking the throne.

Upon becoming king, James II's attempts to reestablish Catholicism as the dominant religion of the country alienated all the important institutions and segments of English society—Parliament, the Anglican Church, the universities, the judiciary, local government, the aristocracy, and the gentry.

James II's actions, which were a consequence of his adherence to the Catholic religion and were directly responsible for his downfall in the Glorious Revolution of 1688, are explored in detail.
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INTRODUCTION

The Glorious Revolution was an event of great political significance in English history. While the abdication of James II was in itself a political act, the events which led to the Revolution and to James II's ultimate flight abroad all had religious origins. The Test Act and the Exclusion Crisis in the 1670s and 1680s resulted from fears concerning James's adherence to the Catholic religion and the prospect of a Catholic king on the English throne. The political struggles of James's reign from 1685 to 1688 were a direct result of James's religious leanings. His attempts to reestablish Catholicism in England led him to launch a personal attack on the institution which since the Restoration had been most loyal to the monarchy--the Church of England. James sought to bring into submission to his will both the Anglican clergy and the universities which the Church supported. James also tampered with the structure of local government in order to secure a Parliament favorable to his aims. To further his objective and to
give his actions the force of law, James altered the make-up of the judiciary as well.¹

Because of the political significance of the Revolution of 1688, its causes are worthy of further study. According to G. M. Trevelyan, personal, political, and religious freedom for the English people was legally established as a result of the Revolution Settlement. Most significantly, this was accomplished without bloodshed, civil war, or a lapse in the flow of England's history. Further study of the causes of the Revolution is equally important for it provides a striking reflection of life in seventeenth-century England. Anti-Catholic feelings and fear of Catholicism were predominant themes in the history of the period. An examination of the Revolution and its religious origins reveals a panorama of English history. The thread of anti-Catholic feeling which so dominated England in the 1670s and 1680s can be traced back to the

time of the Marian persecutions of the mid-sixteenth century. The struggle over James and the throne led to the rise of the Jacobites in the eighteenth century. An investigation of the intensity of the conflict between a pro-Catholic king and his predominantly Protestant, anti-Catholic subjects helps to clarify present-day history as well. Studying the roots of this struggle and its results enables us to better understand the depth of antagonism between Protestants and Catholics in the United Kingdom today.  

---

CHAPTER I

SEEDS OF THE REVOLUTION:
ENGLISH SOCIAL VIEWS AND POLITICAL EVENTS IN THE 1670s

During Charles II's reign Catholics were a small minority of the population. Of approximately 5,500,000 people in England during his reign, it has been estimated that there were somewhere between 50,000 and 260,000 Catholics. Despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of Englishmen were Protestants, anti-Catholic feeling dominated the political activity of the 1660s, 1670s, and 1680s.¹

The fear of Catholicism felt by the majority of the English people had its roots in historical and contemporary experience. Protestants viewed Catholics as subject to the will of the Pope, whose ultimate goal was to use any means (no matter how bloody or brutal) to wipe out Protestantism and reestablish Catholicism in England. According to Protestant propaganda of the day, the functions of the priesthood and the Church were portrayed in a conniving, sinister light. Transubstantiation and confession were represented as ways by which the clergy preserved and extended its influence over the laity. Purgatory, indulgences and masses for the dead were devised as means of increasing the

¹Miller, POPERY/POLITICS, 9, 11, citing THE COMpendium, 85; Kenyon, THE POPISH PLOT, 24-25 and note.
clergy's finances. In order to cloak their schemes and deceptions, the clergy kept the laity misinformed by preserving the Latin liturgy and Bible which the common man could not understand for himself. Celibacy and monasticism were depicted as "unnatural." It was believed that behind the cloak of chastity were hidden endless vices and unrestrained sexual desires. From the Protestant perspective, the only salvation from this evil church and its practices would come through the Protestant Gospel.2

During this period, Louis XIV was the most powerful monarch in Europe and the most outspoken supporter of Catholicism. Throughout Europe, Catholicism was on the increase. In the 1660s James, Duke of York, heir apparent to the English throne, became a Catholic. Once this fact was known, many people feared that James would employ persecution to reconvert England to Catholicism and to set up an absolute government patterned on that of Louis XIV. James's Catholicism and Louis's dominance of Europe led numerous people to recall the persecution by the English Catholic Queen, Mary I, against non-Catholics. Mary had had nearly 300 men and women burned at the stake during her five-year reign. The details of these executions were retold in graphic style in John Foxe's ACTS and MONUMENTS

---

2 Ibid., 67-69.
of the LATTER DAYS. This book, more commonly known as THE BOOK of MARTYRS, was first published in 1563 and became a best-seller. It was reprinted five times during Elizabeth I's reign and again in 1610, 1632, 1641, and 1684. As a result of these reprints, 'Bloody Mary' was probably spoken of with as much frequency as was her half-sister Elizabeth I. That the popular mind linked James with fears of persecution should he become king is evidenced by the fact that, especially during the Exclusion Crisis, he was often described as "Queen Mary in breeches." According to John Miller, Protestant feelings about Catholicism during this time were best stated by Andrew Marvell in AN ACCOUNT of the GROWTH of POPERY and ARBITRARY GOVERNMENT, published in 1677. Marvell wrote: "Popery is such a thing as cannot, but for want of a word to express it, be called a religion; nor is it to be mentioned with that civility which is otherwise decent to be used in speaking of the difference of human opinion about divine matters." 3

At this time, the majority of the English people disapproved not only of the practices of Catholicism but also of any form of dissent from the Anglican Church. It was strongly held that religious belief and practice were

3 Ibid., 67; J. P. Kenyon, The POPISH PLOT (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972), 3-4; Miller, POPERY/POLITICS, 75, 149; Andrew Marvell, AN ACCOUNT of the GROWTH of POPERY and ARBITRARY GOVERNMENT in ENGLAND (Amsterdam: Gregg International Publishers Limited, 1677), 5.
duties owed the State. This view was given the force of law with the imposition of the Clarendon Code of 1661-1665 and the passage of the various Penal Laws and Test Acts. The purposes of the Penal Laws, passed as early as Elizabeth I's reign, were three-fold. In order to prevent Catholics from gaining any form of political power, statutes were enacted which forbade recusants from holding any governmental position on either the national or local level. Recusants were also prohibited from journeying five miles from home without obtaining the written permission of a nearby judge. Secondly, the Penal Laws imposed fines upon Catholics who refused to attend services of the Established Church. Different methods were used to obtain payment of these fines from each class. The wealthiest men in England might pay £20 a month in order to be allowed to refrain from attending Anglican services. Less wealthy Catholic landowners would obtain the same privileges by agreeing to relinquish up to two-thirds of their total annual rental. With the lower class of farmers and cottagers, fines were collected by state agents who broke into the homes of the individuals and removed goods from the kitchens and barns to which they ascribed ridiculously low values. These agents often behaved in an abusive manner and left destruction in their wake. However, despite the severity of these fines, the sums collected varied from place to place and from year to year. The number of
recusants who actually paid these fines was small. Often due to fear, preferential treatment, or oversight, only one in five recusants was actually named on official government lists. The final aim of the Penal Laws was to halt the spread of Catholic belief and theology through prohibition of the Mass and the priesthood. Officially any priest who performed Mass or any person who helped him carry out this function was to be condemned to die as a traitor. In actuality the existence of these laws served only to alter the way in which Catholics chose to worship. Hundreds of tiny congregations met daily, and, as long as they did not flaunt their actions, they had no need to fear the law. There was also no concentrated effort to drive the priests out of England. However, as long as these laws remained in force, the Government was able to hold sway over the lives and property of Catholics and thus effectively to hinder them in any attempt to spread their beliefs or to gain converts.4

Laws were passed forbidding Protestant dissent as well. Between 1661 and 1665, a series of laws now characterized as the Clarendon Code were passed into law. By the

Corporation Act of 1661, membership in the local governing body which controlled town affairs and the election of representatives to Parliament was restricted to those individuals who were active members of the Church of England. Under the Act of Uniformity of 1662, 2,000 Puritan clergymen were removed from their positions in the Church for refusing to declare "unfeigned consent and assent" to the Prayerbook in its entirety. By the Conventicle Act of 1664, individuals who attended religious meetings other than those held by the Church of England were to be imprisoned for the first or second offense, transported for the third offense, and put to death if they returned. Finally, the Five Mile Act of 1665 required that no clergyman or schoolmaster could come within five miles of a city or incorporated town until he first asserted that he would not "at any time endeavour any alteration of Government either in Church or State." Because Puritan congregations were primarily located in the towns, this act effectively hindered the majority from obtaining private instruction in the Puritan religion. This act also helped to accelerate a marked decrease in the size of the Puritan body and subsequently produced a decline in religious ardor in England by the end of the century. Unlike the Penal Laws against Catholics, the laws against Puritan Dissenters were strictly enforced until 1689.5

5Ibid., 283-84.
In an effort to end the persecution of Catholics and to fulfill promises made to Louis XIV in the secret Treaty of Dover of 1670, Charles II published a Declaration of Indulgence in 1672. By the provisions of this Declaration, all penal laws against Roman Catholics or recusants were to be suspended. The publication of this Declaration produced feelings of consternation on several fronts. Anglican churchmen protested against toleration being extended to Catholics and Puritans. Puritans resented sharing toleration with Catholics whom they viewed as followers of the "anti-Christ." Finally, Englishmen in general and Parliament in particular feared the prospect of a government ruled by a king who made unlimited use of his prerogative to suspend laws. That previous monarchs had asserted the right to suspend penal laws was well-known. However, Parliament felt in the case of Charles II's Declaration that such blanket suspension of penal laws was contrary to the intent of the Constitution. If this suspending power were left unrestricted, it was feared that an absolute monarchy would emerge.\(^\text{6}\)

At this time, the political situation on the international scene helped to fuel fears of absolutism. Charles

II's Declaration of Indulgence had coincided with his declaration of war on the United Provinces. Although local judges refused to enforce the provisions of the Declaration of Indulgence and high court justices questioned its legality, Charles hoped his subjects' long-standing hatred of the Dutch would overcome any trepidation resulting from the existence of the Declaration of Indulgence. However, the fear of the English populace toward England's ally in the Dutch War, Louis XIV of France, served to excite and increase existing apprehensions concerning Catholicism and absolutism. Louis XIV's invasion of the Spanish Netherlands in 1667 had produced immense anxiety among the English people because of the fact that this attack had posed a menace to the channel coast opposite England. The appearance of the pamphlet 'Necessary Queries' in 1668 helped to increase mistrust and fear among the English people concerning Louis XIV's actions. The author of this pamphlet asserted the existence of an international plot to destroy Protestantism. To accomplish this, France was to defeat both the United Provinces and Switzerland. At the same time, the Holy Roman Emperor would conquer the German Protestant States and the kingdoms of Scandanavia. Given the apprehensions which Louis' actions and the supposed existence of this plot provoked, the Anglo-French attack on the United Provinces stirred intense feelings among the people. So strong was this anti-Catholic mood that
Parliament met in February of 1673 with the aim of forcing Charles to withdraw his Declaration of Indulgence.  

When Parliament met again, it denied Charles II's right to dispense with the laws. However, it did not deny the King's right to dispense with all the laws, but only with those penal laws relating to ecclesiastical affairs. Parliament made it clear to the King that unless he repudiated his claim in this regard, he would not be voted any money for the Dutch War. At first, Charles considered refusing Parliament's request. However, Louis XIV urged Charles to comply with it until such time as the French army would be free to come to his aid in order to quell dissatisfaction in England. Charles II's Chancellor, the Earl of Shaftesbury, feared the approach of a crisis similar to that of 1640. Not wishing to be put into a position such as the one in which Strafford found himself, Shaftesbury refused to back Charles and gave public assent in the House of Lords to the illegality of the Declaration. Lacking the support of his Chancellor and his closest ally, the King was forced to comply with Parliament's wishes. Having no other option, Charles withdrew the Declaration of Indulgence on March 8, 1673. In its place he issued a proclamation requiring rigid enforcement of the penal laws. On 13 March priests were ordered to leave the country

---

7 Kenyon, THE POPISH PLOT, 15-16.
within a month's time, and the Commissary-General was com-
mmanded again to administer the oaths to all grades of the
army.

Close upon this proclamation was the passage of the Test Act by Parliament. By the provisions of this Act, any person presently holding civil or military office or wishing to hold such office must take the sacrament pre-
scribed by the Church of England and certify that he had participated in the Anglican Communion in the recent past, must deny belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation, and must subscribe to the oaths of allegiance and supremacy in open court. No staunch Catholic could in good conscience agree to these provisions. The aim of the Test Act was to remove all Roman Catholics from governmental office, and this it effectivley did. With the Act came the resignation of Lord Clifford, the Lord Treasurer. For his part, the Lord Chancellor, the Earl of Shaftesbury, upon learning that he had unknowingly given his assent to the secret clause in the Treaty of Dover, gave his backing to the Test Act. As a result of this action, Charles dismissed him from office before the year was out. Buckingham, the leading favorite of the period, saw his influence decline as well. Both he and Shaftesbury thereupon entered into active opposition to the Court. With these resignations

---

and dismissals came the end of Charles II's personal rule with the aid of predominantly pro-Catholic advisors known as the Cabal. However, the most politically significant and alarming resignation was that of the Duke of York from the office of Lord High Admiral. Since James had already ceased to partake of the Anglican rites, he had no choice but to resign all his offices in the summer of 1673.  

By this act of resignation, James publicly acknowledged that he, the heir apparent to the throne, was a Catholic, a fact which the English populace had suspected for years. The tenets of Roman Catholicism had made an impression on both James and his brother, Charles, while they were living in exile on the continent during the 1650s. According to Gilbert Burnet, Bishop of Salisbury, James was first urged to embrace the Catholic religion by a nun he met while at a convent in Flanders. Burnet writes that James accepted the Catholic faith although he hid the fact for many years. Speaking of his conversion at a later

time to his daughter Mary, James said that, through a thorough study of the Scriptures under the guidance of Jesuits, he had become convinced of the Pope's infallibility. At some point during the year 1669, James consulted a Jesuit named Father Simons about the possibility of securing a Papal dispensation which would enable him to maintain the semblance of being a Protestant until such time as he could make public conversion to Catholicism. This request Father Simons denied. A similar request to the Pope in writing by James about this matter was denied. In spite of this rejection, James remained convinced of the rightness of the Catholic faith and of his desire to convert to it. This both he and his first wife, Anne Hyde, did in 1669. Upon James's conversion, Charles II removed James's daughters, Mary and Anne, from his charge. He also ordered James never to make his conversion public. Charles was so successful in constructing a network of secrecy about James's conversion that the Pope did not learn definitely of it until 1676. During the period 1669 to 1676, James reluctantly continued to attend Anglican services. Finally, in 1676 he ceased to appear at these services altogether.\footnote{Kenyon, \textit{THE POPISH PLOT}, 16; Ashley, \textit{STUARTS/LOVE}, 200-202, citing \textit{SUPPLEMENT to BURNET'S HISTORY}, 51-52; Kenyon, \textit{THE POPISH PLOT}, 32; Ashley, \textit{STUARTS/LOVE}, 201, citing \textit{PAPERS of DEVOTION of JAMES II}, Appendix I; Kenyon, \textit{THE POPISH PLOT}, 32, citing \textit{ANNALS of the CATHOLIC HIERARCHY in ENGLAND and SCOTLAND} 1585-1876, 122.}
Because James was so firmly attached to the Catholic faith, he could not in good conscience adhere to the provisions of the Test Act of 1673. Yet his resignation from public office confirmed the fact that he was a Catholic and made the people's worst suspicions a reality. Another factor which served to rouse the passions of Englishmen was the proposed marriage of James, Duke of York, to the Catholic Italian Princess, Mary of Modena. Anti-French and anti-Catholic feelings reached even greater intensity in Protestant circles since it was believed that these two groups were the driving forces seeking to secure the match.

James's first wife, Anne, had died on March 31, 1671. Soon after, negotiations were begun to find another wife for James. Since it now seemed certain that Queen Catherine of Braganza would never have any children, it fell to James to find a mate who could give him a legitimate male heir, thereby ensuring the future of the Stuart dynasty. James required that the person chosen to be his second wife must be beautiful. The candidate selected was the fourteen-year-old Mary Beatrice d'Este from the tiny

---

Italian principality of Modena. She has been described as "tall with dark curly hair" with an "enchanting" personality. Although James fully favored the match, Mary had no desire to marry James or anyone else. Mary's wish was to follow her former governess in residence at a convent. However, her mother impressed upon the young girl that it was her duty to consent to the marriage. The argument was even more forcefully made to Mary in a letter from the Pope urging that she marry James for the good of the Catholic religion. The Pope was able to convince Mary that she could be the instrument by which England would be brought back to the one true faith—Catholicism. For the sake of her religion, Mary reluctantly agreed to the marriage. A proxy wedding took place on September 20, 1673, and a month later she was met by James at Dover. Although James supposedly loved his bride of fifteen from the moment he saw her, Mary's initial reaction to James was one of dislike, and she cried at the sight of him. The kindness shown to her by Charles II helped her through those first unhappy months. In time she became very fond of her husband whom she described as "...a very good man" and "firm and steady in our holy religion."  

James pushed hard for the marriage and, coming as it did, so soon after the startling results of the Test Act,  

---

12 Ashley, STUARTS/LOVE, 201-206, citing MARY of MODENA, Chap I; THE LIFE OF JAMES II, i:485; STUART PAPERS, ii:369.
it is not surprising that there was great concern within Parliament and the nation about the marriage. Such was the intensity of feeling about the matter that it took precedence over the course of the Dutch War. However, Charles II did not fully appreciate the extent of the opposition to the match. Charles had ordered that Mary and Anne be brought up as Protestants after the Duke and Duchess of York converted to Catholicism. In all likelihood, he meant for any future children born to James to be reared in like manner. 13

Whatever Charles II's intentions may have been, Parliament was not appeased. When it appeared that the opposition party might try to block the marriage, Charles resolved to prorogue Parliament. However, before Charles could accomplish this, the House of Commons prepared, introduced, and passed a resolution against the marriage. Prior to this first prorogation, the House of Commons had also voted to send to Charles II an address expressing opposition to James's proposed marriage. Charles's reply to this address only served to irritate Parliament further. He told the members of the House of Commons that apparently they were not very well-informed since the marriage had already taken place with his backing. Charles told the members that he had not thought they would object to the

13 Abbott, "Long Parliament," 256; Ashley, STUARTS/LOVE, 204.
marriage because they had not voiced disapproval when James had previously been involved in negotiating a marriage treaty with another Catholic princess. The members of the Commons responded by voting a second address against James's marriage. They also agreed to draw up a general test act whereby papists would be prevented from holding either civil or military office, a seat in Parliament, or from residing within five miles of the Court. The Commons also refused to vote additional supplies for the Dutch War until the current assessment was depleted, "and only when the kingdom was effectually secured against Popery and papist counsels" and the Crown had redressed Parliament's complaints. The House of Commons drew up a bill against popery, voted against a standing army, and prepared an address stating that fact. The members were in the midst of an attack on the French alliance and the Government's ministers, especially the Duke of Lauderdale, when the Court took action. Parliament was quickly prorogued on 4 November under circumstances which W. C. Abbott describes as tending toward "violence and conspiracy on the part of the court..." With this action, the shortest and fiercest session of Parliament during Charles II's reign ended. It had lasted only a week, passed no bills, and refused the Court further supply. At this point in time, the Court party had been brought to a standstill. The Crown's attempts to secure legislation had been rejected, and both
the Court's policies and ministers had come under attack. The result of all this was that for a brief time the opposition party was triumphant. According to J. R. Tanner, in this successful outcome achieved by the anti-Court party can be seen the seeds of the Revolution of 1688.14

Despite the short-lived success of the opposition party over the Crown, the fears of the nation concerning its future were not relieved, nor were its anti-Catholic feelings lessened. The recent series of events had served to confirm the anxiety of the people. In June 1673 Sir Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby, had been appointed to the office of Lord Treasurer. Danby's aim was to persuade the nation to support royal policy under the banner of "Church and King." French attacks against the Protestant Dutch produced among Englishmen feelings of antagonism toward France. Charles II's unsuccessful attempts to grant a Declaration of Indulgence had increased apprehension. The Earl of Shaftesbury, leader of the newly formed Whig Party, supported the idea of the King seeking a divorce from his barren wife, Catherine of Braganza. Matters were made even worse by James's marriage to Mary of Modena. Many people were willing to believe any idle rumor about Mary, including the charge that she was the Pope's eldest

daughter. On the day she landed at Dover, effigies of the Pope were burned in London. The feelings of the nation were best summarized by the observation of Sir John Reresby that "...the nation was much troubled at the match, she being a strict papist, and the match carryed [sic] on by the interest of the French King."\footnote{Abbott, "Long Parliament," 259; Ashley, STUARTS/LOVE, 204; Andrew Browning, ed., MEMOIRS of SIR JOHN RERESBY (Glasgow: Jackson, Son & Co., 1936), 93 (hereafter cited as Browning, ed., RERESBY MEMOIRS).}

According to Maurice Ashley, as a result of all these recent events, a violent anti-Catholic movement was developing apace in England. At the root of this anti-Catholic feeling was the fact that James, Duke of York, heir apparent to the English throne, was a known Catholic. Alarm about the possible increase and spread of Catholicism and about what the future held for England under a Catholic monarch were to produce efforts by both the Government and private individuals to make England safe from the threat of Catholicism.\footnote{Ashley, STUARTS/LOVE, 204; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 15.}
CHAPTER II

CRISIS OF THE SUCCESSION:

THE POPISH PLOT, THE EXCLUSION CRISIS, AND THE RYE HOUSE PLOT

According to John Miller, "from 1673 on fear and hatred of Popery came to increasingly dominate politics." Public tension in general and animosity toward the Catholic Duke of York and his foreign wife in particular were directly responsible for the development of three plots during the 1670s and 1680s. Two of these, the Popish Plot of the 1670s and the Rye House Plot of the 1680s, contained elements of attempted assassination against Charles II or James, Duke of York, or both. The Exclusion Crisis of the 1670s and 1680s was an attempt to prevent James, the Catholic heir apparent, from ever taking the throne. John Miller rightly contends that "...without James's conversion there would have been...no Popish Plot and no Exclusion Crisis."¹

The Popish Plot was hatched in the imagination of one Titus Oates. Prior to coming to temporary prominence upon revealing the existence of the plot, Oates had led a life undistinguished and unsavory in nature. According to John Kenyon, prior to 1673, Oates was forced to leave several schools after displaying homosexual tendencies. A short

¹ Miller, POPERY/POLITICS, 59, 154, 93, citing NORTHERN CATHOLICS, 13, 132-34, 213-14.
time later, he became an Anglican clergyman. However, by the end of 1673, he had been removed from a parish in Kent after his parishioners charged him with drunkenness. He next went to Hastings where he made slanderous claims against an important local family. However, the charges were dismissed and Oates himself was accused of perjury. In order to escape, Oates signed on as chaplain aboard a ship but was again dismissed because of homosexual behavior. Later, while serving as a chaplain in the household of the noted Catholic peer, the Duke of Norfolk, Oates was surrounded by Catholic clergy and swayed by their arguments. Although himself an Anglican cleric, Oates was never one to hold strong convictions. He became a Catholic in 1677 and soon joined the Society of Jesus. He studied for a time at two Catholic seminaries on the continent but was dismissed from both on charges of misconduct. Oates used these episodes to later claim that he had earned a Doctor of Divinity degree at Salamanca. However, only Catholic priests could obtain a Doctor of Divinity degree there. Oates was never a Catholic priest nor even briefly at Salamanca. After his dismissals from these seminaries, Oates returned to London in 1678.

---

Oates used his experiences in seminaries at Valladolid and St. Omer in 1677 and 1678 to formulate the basis of his tale, which was subsequently to become known as the 'Popish Plot.' Oates discerned from conversation between the Catholics at the seminaries that Charles II was felt to be an obstacle to the reconversion of England to Catholicism, which he had once promised to carry out according to the provisions of the secret Treaty of Dover with France. Great expectations were placed upon the eventual succession of James, Duke of York, to the throne for the good of the Catholic religion, especially with the anticipated aid of Louis XIV of France. Oates became aware that much correspondence had been exchanged between the Duke of York's secretary, Edward Coleman, and Louis XIV's confessor, Père La Chaise. Oates also learned that a Jesuit 'consult' was held in England on the 24th of April, 1678, at which he claimed to have been present. However, unfortunately for the credibility of Oates's story, he was unaware that the Jesuit congregation, which was in reality a routine business meeting, had been held at the residence of the Duke of York.3

---

According to G. M. Trevelyan, once he was back in London, Oates enlisted the aid of "a miserable fanatic scribbler named Tonge" to set down the facts of the alleged plot in a document containing eighty-one sections. Oates maintained that the Pope claimed dominion over the realms of England and Ireland. Under order of the Pope and the head of the Society of Jesus, the Jesuits were directed to subject both the English Church and Government to the will of the Pope. Aided by France, the Jesuits would arm and finance a rebellion in Scotland and Ireland. Catholics would make a third effort to burn London. Most importantly, plans to assassinate Charles II were made at the English Jesuit consult, which Oates mistakenly asserted to have taken place at the White Horse Tavern in the Strand. The method chosen to bring about Charles II's demise varied as Oates's tale expanded. Oates claimed that the King might either be poisoned by the Queen's physician, shot, stabbed, or murdered by Irish thugs. Both French and Spanish Jesuits and the Benedictines would finance the proposed murder plot. If the Duke of York stood in the way of these plans, he too would be killed. Oates declared that he had acted as a secret courier during the planning stage of the plot. However, one of the intended victims of the plot, Tonge, had supposedly persuaded him to reveal the plot. Oates named ninety-nine individuals involved in the plot, with names of prospective candidates who would hold
office in the government to be established by the Jesuits. The best known of the individuals named were Lord Arundel of Wardour, Lord Powis, Lord Petre, Lord Stafford, Lord Bellayse, Sir William Godolphin, Sir George Wakeman, the Queen's physician, and Edward Coleman. This scheme was to be aided by troops mobilized by Catholic English peers. After the King's murder, 20,000 Catholics would band together in London to slash the throats of 100,000 Protestants. As time went on, other witnesses appeared with supposedly new details about the plot, either because they sought a spot in the limelight, or because they wished to vent feelings of personal animosity by implicating certain individuals in the plot. These additions to the tale were designed to arouse Protestant bias concerning the little understood mysteries of Catholicism.

John Miller has stated that "Oates's story was neither very original, nor on its own, very convincing." Certainly Charles II did not believe Oates's tale. However, by leaving the Capital to attend the races at Newmarket, he failed to confront the issue directly, or to reveal Oates as the liar he was. Although the King failed to take Oates's revelations seriously, the public reacted to them

---

4 Ibid., 318-319, citing STATE TRIALS, vi:1433-1472; Pollock, THE POPISH PLOT, 11-12; Earle, JAMES II, 118; Miller, POPERY/POLITICS, 156, 157, citing STATE TRIALS, vi:1452-1453, 1455, 1457, 1463; CSPD 1678, 519; and THE PAPISTS BLOODY OATH of SECRECY; Kenyon, THE POPISH PLOT, 110; Miller, POPERY/POLITICS, 157.
with unexpected vigor. In Bishop Parker's estimation, "There were two enchanting terms which at the first pronunciation could...change men into beasts, namely, Popery and the French Interest." Intense public antagonism toward both of these factions prefaced the unveiling of the Popish Plot. The terror which the plot produced had been preceded by the plague and the great fire. Both of these events had "unsettled men's reason...and charged the political air with thunder." A scheme to murder a Protestant ruler in order to replace him with a Catholic successor did not seem unlikely to a generation whose grandparents had seen Elizabeth I's life threatened by murderers in an attempt to place the Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots, on the throne. The idea of widespread slaughter was not in the least ridiculous to men who held memories of the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre. 5

Two other events gave credence to the plot. These were the discovery of some letters written by Edward Coleman, the Duke of York's secretary, and the death of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey. The circumstances which surrounded these two men made it impossible for the Government to dismiss Oates's claims. In letters written by Coleman during the period 1674-1676 to Louis XIV's confessor, to

5 Ibid.; Aylmer, STRUGGLE/CONSTITUTION, 196; Tanner, CONFLICTS, 239, citing Parker, HISTORY of his OWN TIME, 379; ENGLAND UNDER THE STUARTS, 361.
the internuncio at Brussels, and to Cardinal Howard, Coleman discussed the possibility of bribing members of Parliament or of ending Charles II's financial dependence on Parliament. It was evident that part of the correspondence had been written upon orders from James. Speaking of James in one letter, Coleman wrote that his master was "converted to such a degree of zeal and piety as not to regard anything in the world in comparison with God's Almighty glory, the salvation of his soul and the conversion of our kingdom which has a long time been oppressed and miserably harassed with heresy and schism." According to Coleman, these letters had been written at James's command. To those who read them, they seemed to substantiate Oates's story. The existence of Coleman's letters served to strengthen fears of Catholicism and absolute government which had been so prevalent in the public mind since James's conversion, and this apprehension was increased by the existence of the standing army which Charles II had raised for use in France's war against Holland.6

A second event which confirmed the truth of Oates's Popish Plot in the public mind was the death of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey. Godfrey was the London magistrate to whom

Oates had made some of his most startling depositions and given a written copy of his allegations. Shortly after Oates appeared before Godfrey to make these statements, the latter disappeared. In a few days' time, he was found dead just outside London. The mystery surrounding his death has never been solved. Although several possible explanations have been offered to account for his death, the explanation which was widely believed at the time was that Godfrey had been murdered by the supposed Catholic plotters named by Oates. Although the true circumstances of Godfrey's death will probably never be known, the effect of his demise was profound. A feeling of panic immediately engulfed London and, with lesser intensity, the entire country. No real objective examination of Oates's claims was possible. According to G. E. Aylmer, "From then on a feverish atmosphere developed which lasted for the next two or three years." 7

The fervor which the events surrounding the Popish Plot produced provided fuel for the aims of the anti-Catholic Whig Party. Since 1674, this Party, led by the Earl of Shaftesbury, had openly espoused a policy to bar a Catholic successor from the English throne. Oates's claims concerning the Popish Plot and the revelations concerning

---

7 Pollock, THE POPISH PLOT, 84; Aylmer, STRUGGLE/CONSTITUTION, 197.
the content of Coleman's correspondence heightened feelings against the prospect of a Popish successor to such a degree that individuals who had previously withheld their opinions about succession out of regard for the monarchy now openly called for James's exclusion from the throne.8

When first informed of the existence of any assassination plot against him, Charles II allowed that possibly Tonge's assertions might contain an element of truth. Yet Charles was openly doubtful of Oates's tale, although the substance of Oates's plot placed the Court and the King in a difficult situation. Both the religious and political propensities of the Court came under attack. Therefore, Charles was forced to take strong action in order to counteract the idea that the Court might have had any involvement in the plot or any ties to Popery. The Council investigated Oates's charges vigorously. Charles II also knew that it was politically vital for those named by Oates and others as a part of the conspiracy to be found guilty of treason and executed. This was true in spite of the fact that Charles, his advisors, and judges knew the witnesses were a disreputable group. Some of these witnesses' evidence was so weak that they had to be guided

---

through their testimony by the judges to ensure that the credibility of the "king's evidence" would survive. The King had to see that punishment of Catholics according to existing laws was carried out in order to protect his brother's right to succeed to the throne. In November 1678, Charles had several proclamations and Council orders published requiring that laws concerning Papists be strictly administered. During this period, the Second Test Act, of 1678, was passed which prevented Catholics from sitting in either House of Parliament. The Court was able to have James excluded from the provisions of this Act. Although other anti-Catholic bills were recommended, the Second Test Act of 1678 was the only one to become law.9

In spite of the alarm which the events surrounding Oates's plot produced throughout the country, the laws against Papists were not fully executed. However, anti-Catholic laws were sanctioned with fuller intensity than previously. This was especially true of the laws concerning the priesthood. Between 1660 and 1678, no priest had been put to death. However, between 1678 and 1681, eighteen priests—among them an Irish Archbishop—were executed; in addition other priests died while in prison. The Catholic mission was thrown into a state of

---

disarray. Catholic property was confiscated. The Catholic laity was less affected by the anti-Catholic agitation that resulted from the plot. The members of the laity most influenced by Oates's plot were those individuals named by Oates and others as conspirators in the plot. During the course of the plot, many members of the Catholic aristocracy chose to go abroad. For those who stayed at home, the atmosphere produced by the allegations must have caused them to suffer great mental strain.\(^\text{10}\)

According to John Pollock, after Oates's initial revelations, he "was hailed as the saviour of the nation...." His evidence in fact threw the House of Commons into a highly agitated state. Among the general populace and even among the well-educated there was a ready acceptance of a Catholic plot against Protestantism which had been continuing for several generations and was as strong as ever. Roger North made plain the situation with his statement that, "It was not safe for anyone to show scepticism. For upon the least occasion of that sort, What, replied they, don't you believe in the Plot? (As if the Plot were turned into a creed.)" However, as time progressed, the true nature of Oates's lies became apparent. A major flaw occurred in Oates's testimony when he accused John Lambert, one of Cromwell's surviving generals, of playing a role in

\(^{10}\)Ibid., 168-69, citing MEMOIRS of MISSIONARY PRIESTS 1577-1684, 519-82 and Kenyon, THE POPISH PLOT, Chap. 7.
the plot. The union of ex-Cromwellians with Jesuits in a plot was readily believable to Englishmen of that day. The fact that it was soon confirmed that Lambert was still in prison, as he had been since 1660, and that his mind had snapped under the strain greatly weakened Oates's claims. If Oates's information about one man was so far off the mark, could his claims about the other conspirators possibly be correct?  

Oates weakened his position and the plausibility of his tale even more by claiming that Charles II's wife, Catherine of Braganza, was involved in the plot to assassinate her husband. According to Oates, a contribution the Queen had made to the Society of Jesus was in fact a payment to Wakeman, her physician, to murder the King. While visiting Somerset House, supposedly the site of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey's murder, Oates alleged to have overheard the Queen say "...that she would not take these affronts any longer that had been done unto her, but would revenge the violation of her bed." The exact intent of this statement has never clarified.  

The response that Oates's allegations produced in the Council and Parliament was one of hostility. Oates was put through the most intense cross-examination he had faced to

---

11 Pollock, THE POPISH PLOT, 80; Kenyon, THE POPISH PLOT, 83, 97, 83, citing NORTH PAPERS.

12 Ibid., 109-11.
date concerning the entire scope of his evidence. In view of Oates's allegations against the Queen, his earlier testimony was placed in a dubious light.\[^{13}\]

The Council made a concerted effort to establish the precise date on which Oates had supposedly heard the Queen threaten the King's life. When he failed to name a date, the Council quickly and forcefully recalled the unhesitatingly accurate image Oates had projected concerning times and dates in the past. The Council raised the question of the need for Wakeman to poison the King if, as Oates had already claimed, other conspirators were prepared to do away with Charles II. Still more importantly, Oates was asked why he had not apprised the Council upon his first appearance before it of the information he had concerning Wakeman's role in the plot. The Council also confronted Oates with the question of why he had withheld information so essential for ensuring the King's safety for almost two months. To all these questions Oates gave weak, vague responses. However, Oates's testimony was done the greatest harm when the Council, in a surprise move, took Oates to Somerset House and asked him to indicate the rooms where the events involving the Queen supposedly took place. Although able to identify the porter's lodge and guard room and while given ample time and freedom to explore the

\[^{13}\]Ibid., 111, 114, citing LORDS JOURNAL, xiii:388-92.
building, Oates was not able to locate the rooms he had named.  

The King's reaction to Oates's allegations concerning his wife was one of intense anger. He gave the Queen his complete support. She had equally strong backing in Parliament, which refused to act against her when Oates appeared to accuse her of playing a leading role in the conspiracy against her husband.

In spite of the apparent weaknesses which had been revealed throughout Oates's testimony, the discovery of Coleman's letters and of the body of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey were strong enough evidence of the existence of an actual Popish Plot in the popular mind to proceed with charges of treason against those Oates had named, however faulty his evidence was later proven to be. As the Popish Plot trials progressed, Lord Chief Justice Scroggs all but guided the prosecution, owing to his belief (and that of the other three King's Bench Justices) in the existence of the plot as a result of Godfrey's death. Although Scroggs expressed the view of the majority of the Court when he described Godfrey's death as a "'monstrous evidence'" of the truth of the Popish Plot, the evidence of Oates's lies


15Ibid., 111-12, 114, citing LORDS JOURNAL, xiii:388-92; HOUSE of LORDS PAPERS 1678-88, 66.
continued to be revealed as the trials proceeded. The plot trials began on November 21, 1678, and Coleman was convicted on the 27th. After Oates's initial speculations about what Coleman's correspondence with La Chaise might contain, he had later appeared to implicate Coleman in the plot to assassinate the King. According to Oates, Coleman had been apprised of the decisions made at the famous Jesuit consult of April 24, and Oates had been present when Coleman agreed to the assassination plan by saying that "he thought it was well contrived." Oates was unable to give a satisfactory answer to the Chief Justice's inquiries as to why he had not given the Council this information upon his first appearance even though the Council had been on the verge of letting Coleman go. Most damaging of all was the question of why Oates had failed to reveal the role to be played in the plot by this dangerous individual from September 30 to October 23, 1678. Although Oates clearly committed perjury when he made his allegations against Coleman, Coleman's actions alone were sufficient proof of his guilt. His correspondence revealed that he hoped to help bring about the reestablishment of Catholicism as the official religion of the country. He had also sought the dissolution of Parliament. Either of these acts could be and were considered treasonable in this age. The Earl of Strafford had been beheaded in 1641 for interfering with the King's relationship with his Parliamentary advisors.
In spite of the fact of Coleman's guilt, Coleman's trial unquestionably damaged Titus Oates's credibility.

The thread of Oates's tale finally unraveled during the course of Wakeman's trial. According to Oates, he had seen a letter from Wakeman to a Jesuit which dealt with the assassination plot against the King and a Jesuit ledger in which $5,000 of a promised $20,000 had been paid to Wakeman. Wakeman wanted to know why Oates had failed to give stronger testimony against him on September 30th if Oates knew, as he alleged, that Wakeman planned to assassinate the King. To this question Oates could give no reply. Wakeman pointed out that the same query had been raised during the course of Coleman's trial. However, now the matter was one of even greater weight. If Oates's allegations were true, as he claimed, he had allowed an individual who had pledged himself to kill the King and had ample opportunity to commit the act to retain his freedom. In J. P. Kenyon's estimation, this act "was almost constructive treason in itself." Wakeman produced witnesses who refuted Oates's testimony concerning the letter. Finally, Wakeman called a Clerk of the Council, Sir Philip Lloyd, who had been present when Wakeman appeared before

the Council on September 30th. According to Lloyd's testimony, when the Council questioned Wakeman, his denials were so vehement and the testimony against him so weak that the Council summoned Oates again to give further information. Oates had replied, "No, God forbid that I should say anything against Sir George Wakeman, for I know nothing more against him." When asked at Wakeman's trial to explain his earlier behavior, Oates was unable to give an adequate explanation. According to A. F. Havighurst, "Wakeman's acquittal of charges of high treason, [in] July 1679, marks a turning point in events associated with the Popish Plot." It was the first setback suffered by the Earl of Shaftesbury's anti-Court party, which had been trying to exploit the plot for its own ends, and it was the first real victory for the King's party.17

After Sir George Wakeman's acquittal in July 1679, there began a gradual decline in fear of the Catholics as an imminent danger to English Protestantism. Between the time of Wakeman's acquittal and the conviction and execution of Viscount Stafford for treason in December 1680, there were no convictions in the Capital for involvement in the Popish Plot. Several priests were tried and convicted simply for being priests. However, after June 1679, no executions resulted from these convictions. In addition, the fact that many of the individuals condemned to death in

1678 and 1679 still maintained complete ignorance concerning the existence of any Popish Plot in their final speeches before execution helped to erode belief in the plot. According to John Miller, by the end of 1680, the number of individuals convinced of the certainty of Oates's Popish Plot was definitely decreasing. The last Popish Plot trial took place in May 1681.

According to J. R. Tanner, "the most important result of the Plot, so far as Parliament was concerned, was that out of it the Exclusion Bill was born." In the three successive Parliaments which sat during the years 1679-1681, several attempts were made to pass legislation which would exclude the Duke of York from the succession to the English throne. During the 1670's, with the existence of intense anti-Catholic sentiments which were pervasive in the country, the problem of the succession was bound to be a dominant issue of the period. Although Charles II had had a number of illegitimate children, he had no offspring by his legal wife. Because the King lacked a legitimate heir, and because his brother was an admitted Catholic whose young second wife would possibly produce a male heir whose rights would supplant the claims of his older Protess-

---

18 Miller, POPERY/POLITICS, 176; Kenyon, THE POPISH PLOT, 204.
tant daughters, Mary and Anne, the Exclusion Crisis was under full steam by the late 1670s.

Even before the events surrounding the Popish Plot occurred, the fear that the religion of a predominantly Protestant nation would be overthrown by a Catholic conspiracy was intensified by the pro-Catholic atmosphere of the Court. Although by 1678 it was well-known that the Duke of York was a Catholic, Charles II's religious beliefs were also in question. Both James and Popish recusants had been prevented from holding office by the Test Act of 1673, but these individuals openly frequented the Court. According to J. R. Jones, "With its papist mistresses, pimps, artists, musicians, servants, and even physicians, the Court became abhorrent to all staunch Protestants, a constant irritant as well as a potential danger." The reality of a Court filled with Catholics and Catholic supporters supplied the Earl of Shaftesbury with his major argument, the menace of Popery, in the fight for Exclusion.

John Pollock has asserted that the Whigs initially scoffed at Oates's claims and viewed them as an artifice for maintaining a standing army. However the episode of

19 Tanner, CONFLICTS, 240, citing SELECT STATUTES, CASES, AND DOCUMENTS 1660-1832, 86-92; Hill, CENTURY/REVOLUTION, 196; Aylmer, STRUGGLE/CONSTITUTION, 191, 193-94; Miller, POPERY/POLITICS, 93.

the Popish Plot provided Shaftesbury and the Whigs with a strong weapon to aid in furthering the Exclusion cause. The fact that public feeling against Catholics during this period and particularly against James remained at a frenzied pitch helped advance the Exclusion aims of the Whigs. In T. B. Macaulay's opinion, no other political issue had ever been so openly debated as was the question of Exclusion. Opinions were expressed through the pulpits, the press, the theatre, and even in poetry. Thousands of Londoners burned the Pope in effigy, and military matériel was situated around Whitehall.21

In Shaftesbury's view, in order to further the cause of Exclusion, Oates's 'Popish Plot' had to be treated as genuine whether his allegations were true or not. In the course of the Commons' examination of Coleman, the latter admitted that the Duke of York was aware of and endorsed the subject matter of his correspondence. At that point, Shaftesbury and the Whigs began a concerted attack on the Duke of York and called for his removal "from the King's presence and councils." As a result of this effort, the Test Act of 1678 was passed. In a matter of months, Shaftesbury and the Whigs openly called for James's exclu-

sion from the succession to the throne. According to G. M. Trevelyan, once having proposed that James be barred from the King's inner circle, it was necessary "to exclude from the throne the revengeful man whom they thus insulted... [for] the safety not only of the Whigs but of all England was involved." 22

In John Pollock's opinion, although not responsible for Oates's arrival on the scene, "it cannot be supposed that the informer's subsequent steps were without [Shaftesbury's] knowledge and approval." According to Pollock, once Oates came forward, Shaftesbury "created the atmosphere for Oates to work in." Shaftesbury encouraged various Whig peers to provide Oates with monetary support, hospitality in their homes, transportation to the polls to assist the election of fellow Whigs, and with united visible support at his trials. For a time "Oates had become...the representative of the aspirations of the Whig party." 23

In November of 1678, the King gave a speech in which he declared that he would consent to any bills which would "make you safe in the reign of my successor, so [long as] they tend not to impeach the right of succession, nor the descent of the Crown in the true line, and so [long] as they restrain not my power, nor just rights of any Protes-

22 Pollock, THE POPISH PLOT, 232; Tanner, CONFLICTS, 240; Trevelyan, ENGLAND/STUARTS, 5:322.

tant successor." However, the King's promises did not calm the fears concerning a Catholic successor. By December 1678, an effort was underway in Parliament to exclude James from the throne and substitute Charles II's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth, in the line of succession. 24

J. R. Jones asserts that the public frenzy produced by the plot and the apparent ties between the English and French Courts were "ruthlessly exploited by Shaftesbury during the Exclusion Crisis of 1678-81...." Shaftesbury worked at keeping the public in a state of heightened anxiety. He tirelessly argued that with the existence of an already pro-French, pro-Catholic Court and the prospect of a future Catholic King England's existing political and religious structure was threatened. Pointing to the despotic Louis XIV's imposition of high tariffs and belligerent trading strategy as an example of what an absolute, Catholic ruler was capable of, Shaftesbury maintained that England's economy was in grave jeopardy. The Whig leader presented Exclusion as a means to make England politically, religiously, and economically secure. In so doing, Shaftesbury made the argument for Exclusion attractive to a great number of Englishmen. Nearly every segment of society which fostered a major complaint viewed the Exclusion Bill as a way to eliminate their problems. Shaftesbury

24 Feiling, HISTORY/TORY PARTY, 181, citing MEMOIRS of SIR JOHN RERESBY, 149; Hill, CENTURY/REVOLUTION, 196.
deliberately presented the Bill in such a way as to make it seem that its passage would produce a favorable atmosphere wherein all of England's political, religious, and economic problems would be solved. The fact that the proposed Bill was offered in this light was a major reason for the political success and dominance of Shaftesbury and the Whigs during this period. Their influence is reflected in the fact that following the election of the pro-exclusion House of Commons in 1678, Charles II was forced to remove Shaftesbury's political rival, Lord Treasurer Danby, from office, install Shaftesbury as the new Lord President of the Council, and send James into exile.25

Although Danby was primarily a political competitor, Shaftesbury believed that Danby's aim had been to impose absolute rule under Charles II and that he had almost succeeded in doing so. Shaftesbury argued that having his brother established as a despot would be pleasing to James since it would enable him to succeed quietly to the English throne as a Catholic King. Shaftesbury maintained that even with James in exile he continued to be a dominant force at Court whose power would increase with his homecoming. According to J. R. Jones, "The introduction of the bill to exclude James from the succession was therefore the

logical outcome of his character, which was known to be arbitrary, arrogant, and unforgiving, his religion, and his alleged connexion with the plot...."  

Jones further declares that Shaftesbury believed that under Charles II's rule English Protestantism and freedom were both threatened. In Shaftesbury's opinion, those things would not be safe "...until the influence of the Court and Crown was drastically reduced and power and office permanently entrusted to men who possessed the confidence and support of Parliament and the nation. It was to bring this about that Shaftesbury introduced and fought for Exclusion."  

Three Parliaments sat during the Exclusion Crisis of 1679 to 1681. The elections to these Parliaments were characterized by violence and confusion in an attempt to frighten the opposing party or to give an excuse to nullify the results of the election. Both sides employed propaganda as a tool to influence these elections. According to M. Dorothy George, the Court Party largely employed "trickery over the possession of the writ, over the place and date of polling, the sudden closing of the poll, the riot (either for simple intimidation or to give occasion for a petition), and the false return...." As for the pro-Exclusion Whig Party, George points out that it relied

26 Ibid., 55, citing THE SHAFTESBURY PAPERS, VI A, 334.
27 Ibid., 17.
heavily on "The splitting of freeholds and the faggot-vote." The use of this device contributed largely to the success of the Whig Party in the returns to the Exclusion Parliaments. Bribery was also used in an effort to control the outcome of these elections. The anti-Exclusion factions of Church and Court also exerted pressure in an attempt to influence the elections.  

Ephraim Lipson has declared that, "...the exclusion parliament expressed the sentiments...of a great body of the nation" and "...the violent proceedings must therefore attach to the electors...." The constituents who elected the members of the Exclusion Parliaments expected the men they elected to vote the will of the people rather than to vote with freedom of conscience. Voicing the views of a majority of the nation, the pro-Exclusion Whigs called for the exclusion of the Duke of York from the throne, complete prosecution of all individuals involved in the Popish Plot, some form of Parliamentary reward for individuals who revealed the existence of the plot, the total eradication of Popery, dispersion of all standing armies, and no Parliamentary supplies voted until the country was made safe.

---

from the forces of Popery and absolute power. The anti-
Exclusion Tories supported the preservation of the King's
prerogative and the royal succession, preservation of
Church and State, and the continuation of monetary supply
by Parliament to the King. Constituents also demanded that
the corrupt practices which were such an integral part of
Parliamentary elections be eradicated.\textsuperscript{29}

While the issue of Exclusion dominated the three Par-
liaments of 1679-1681, a concerted effort was made by the
opposition Whig Party to lessen prosecution of Protestant
Dissenters under Elizabethan and Jacobean statutes origi-
nally intended for use against Catholics. Although the
Tory constituents who elected members to the Exclusion
Parliaments opposed any lessening of Dissenter persecution,
support for religious reconciliation within Parliament was
given by both moderate supporters of the Court and support-
ers of Exclusion. Although several bills were put forward
to modify the existing religious settlement, they all
failed. As the Whig leader, Shaftesbury, pushed doggedly
for James's exclusion, Charles II repeatedly prorogued
Parliament and ultimately dissolved it in March of 1681.
In spite of the immediate failure of Parliament to secure
religious reconciliation during the years of the Exclusion
Crisis, these efforts were ultimately successful. In the

\textsuperscript{29}Ibid., 68-69.
proposed bills of 1680 are found "...the direct and imme-
diate ancestors of the Comprehension and Toleration Bills
of 1689." The Toleration Act of 1689 was a direct result
of the proposed Bill of Indulgence of the second Exclusion
Parliament. The real accomplishment of these individuals
is that the attempts they made to secure Toleration during
these years predisposed them to put forward identical
ideas in 1689.30

Although the Parliamentary movement to exclude James
from the throne began during the winter of 1678-1679, the
first Exclusion Parliament sat from March to July 1679.
This Parliament was preparing an Exclusion Bill when the
King prorogued it and later dissolved it. Following this
session, the King's illegitimate son, the Duke of Monmouth,
was sent into exile in Holland, and the Duke of York was
sent to govern Scotland. The second Exclusion Parliament
opened in October 1679, was promptly prorogued, and then
recessed for a year. When this Parliament resumed, the
House of Commons passed an Exclusion Bill. The Marquis of
Halifax was fiercely opposed to the Exclusion effort and
was largely responsible for securing the defeat of this
particular Bill. In January 1681, the House of Commons

30H. Horwitz, "Protestant Reconciliation in the
Exclusion Crisis," THE JOURNAL OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY 15
(1964):202-203 (hereafter cited as Horwitz, "Protestant
Reconciliation"); Lipson, "Elections/Exclusion Parlia-
ments," 69; Horwitz, "Protestant Reconciliation," 203-205,
213-14, 216-17, citing THE CONDUCT OF THE EARL OF
NOTTINGHAM, 130.
agreed not to consent to future requests for supply until the passage of the Exclusion Bill was a reality. Shortly thereafter, Parliament was dissolved. In March 1681, the third and final Exclusion Parliament met. The House of Commons attempted but failed to get a third Exclusion Bill passed. Charles II dissolved this Parliament after only a week in obvious triumph over the Exclusionists.31

Although the Government offered proposed limitations upon James's succession on several occasions, the Exclusionists doggedly pursued their goal. Two members of the House of Commons were expelled for slandering Oates's reliability. Samuel Pepys was charged with Popery and sent to the Tower, while several judges were impeached for "'favouring Papists.'" Grand Juries were jailed for statement of devotion to the King. The Parliamentary Exclusionists also aimed to bring suit against members of the clergy for preaching "'foolish sermons'" against Exclusion.32

The intensity of feelings in Parliament concerning Exclusion was equalled by the arguments expressed in the political pamphlets of the day. This was especially true of


the literature written by the Whigs. Adopting many of the same arguments that Shaftesbury had used in support of Exclusion, most of the Exclusion pamphlets attacked James directly and defended Exclusion as a legal solution to the problem of James's succession. In the assault against James directly, reference was made to the fact that he was a Catholic and that he had been linked with the Popish Plot. Behind these words lay the spectre of Louis XIV of France. In being compared with the French monarch, the future James II was portrayed as an acknowledged foe of Parliament and as a military dictator who, once he became King, would surely subvert the Protestant religion with French aid. The Exclusionists expressed one of their major arguments against James's succession with the phrase "'popery and arbitrary government.'" The Exclusionists argued that with the succession of a Catholic imminent, the Protestant religion was in jeopardy. The Exclusionists contended that upon becoming King, James would promptly destroy English Protestantism since a Catholic King would not and could not defend and maintain the religion of the largely Protestant nation. Developing this argument further, the Exclusionist pamphleteers maintained that if English Protestantism were in fact destroyed, the inhabitants of the entire world would become slaves of the Pope. English Protestants in particular would be deprived of
their lands, their titles, and whatever political authority they wielded.  

The Whigs saw the Exclusion Bill not as a danger to the monarchy but as a means to protect it. The Whigs disputed the Tory theory of government which held that the King was divinely instituted by God and that a cruel and despotic ruler was a fulfillment of God's wrath on the people, whose duty it was to obey the sovereign under all circumstances. The Whigs believed rather that the purpose of government was to safeguard those it governed, maintaining the doctrine of "natural justice and right reason." The Whigs held that if a government did not uphold this responsibility the subject could, in good conscience, repudiate it. Since the Whigs maintained that a Catholic sovereign could not protect the rights of his predominantly Protestant subjects, the people had a right to abandon a future ruler before he ever became King. The Whigs also bolstered their Exclusion arguments by playing upon the fervent anti-Catholic feelings generated by the Popish Plot. The Exclusionists called to mind individuals and episodes from England's past which held negative anti-Catholic recollections in the public mind: Queen Mary, the Armada, the Gunpowder Plot, and the Irish Massacre of 1641.

According to one Exclusionist pamphleteer, if Catholicism ever supplanted Protestantism as England's dominant religion, the Papists would burn London to the ground, rape Protestant women, kill Protestant children, and plunder Protestant homes and businesses.  

In opposition to Exclusion, the Tories contended that barring James from the throne and placing another candidate upon it would make the King's title subject to election and would destroy England's tradition of hereditary monarchy. Supporting the theory of "divine right," the Tories argued that God alone could bestow kingship upon an individual by placing him on a throne; therefore, the individuals governed did not have a right to interfere with God's decisions. If Parliament obtained the right to dethrone the heir, they could assert a power to dethrone all future heirs and to demolish the institution of monarchy completely. The Tories insisted that the Whig effort to exclude James was really aimed at establishing a republic. 

During the period of Parliamentary prorogation and dismissal between July 1679 and October 1680, the idea of imposing limitations upon James's succession was frequently debated by men of temperate views. However, the intensity of Whig-Exclusionist arguments had continued, and, to

34 Ibid., 29-30; Lipson, "Elections/Exclusion Parliaments," 75.
observers closest to the Court, Exclusion began to seem unavoidable. During this period, as the prospect of Exclusion became more menacing, several attempts were made to reconvert James to the Protestant faith. Efforts were made by the Anglican bishops, and by James's friends who hoped to demoralize the Exclusionists. The Duchess of York, hoping to avoid further time in exile, counselled the Duke to yield to some degree. The King pleaded with James and told him that the Exclusion Bill would certainly pass unless he relented and again attended the services of the Church of England. As the time for Parliament to reassemble approached, it seemed as if James might give way. However, in the end he would not be moved. He argued that even if he recanted and declared himself a Protestant, Shaftesbury would insist that the future King had received a Papal dispensation and so was Protestant in name only. James expressed his real feeling about the possibility of renouncing his Catholic faith when he said he was resolved "never to do so damnable a thing."\(^{36}\)

With James's refusal to change his views, the Exclusionist tide rolled on at a furious pace. When Parliament again met in 1680, a motion was adopted to the effect that, "the Duke of York being a papist and the hopes of his coming such to the crown have given the greatest countenance

and encouragement to the present conspiracies and designs of papists against the king and the Protestant religion" and that the Duke of York had involuntarily been the source of the origin of the Popist Plot. A resolution was then passed "that a bill be brought in to disable the Duke of York to inherit the Imperial Crown of this realm." Several days later, an Exclusion Bill was introduced and appeared unstoppable. In the final debate before a vote occurred, Shaftesbury argued fervently in favor of the Exclusion Bill. However, favoring limitations on James's succession, the Marquis of Halifax, in a series of speeches, masterfully refuted the pro-Exclusionist arguments. As a result of his efforts, the minds of many who had been inclined to support the Exclusion Bill were changed and with the combined backing of the anti-Exclusion bishops, the Exclusion Bill was soundly defeated in the Lords.37

Thus the strength of the Exclusion movement led by Shaftesbury came to a climax and then began to decline. In light of the vehemence with which Shaftesbury had pushed for a successful outcome of the Exclusion project, what were Shaftesbury's aims? Although the fervour created over Exclusion worked to Shaftesbury's advantage in the removal of his political rival, Danby, and while it is true that a

37 Ibid., 190; Macaulay, HOE, 1:239-40, 252, citing MEMOIRS of the EARL of PETERBOROUGH; Trevelyan, ENGLAND/STUARTS, 5:335.
certain amount of personal hostility manifested itself between Shaftesbury and James, the fact that Shaftesbury initially supported a plan calling for the King to divorce, remarry, and father a Protestant heir, indicates that Shaftesbury was willing to place the good of the nation above his own personal interests. Had the King remarried and produced a Protestant heir, fears about the succession would have been dispelled, and Shaftesbury would have had little hope of wielding any influence over the King's decisions. However, unable to persuade the King to even consider divorce, Shaftesbury then turned all his energy toward securing the exclusion of the Duke of York from the throne. In John Pollock's view, "the storm [over Exclusion] gave Shaftesbury his power; when calm returned it would dissolve. This is his claim to real statesmanship. He was willing...to sacrifice power to principle, and to plan...advantage to the nation, while he contemplated for himself a relapse into insignificance. What followed under Charles II's successor justified his position...."38

After Shaftesbury's hopes for a royal divorce were shattered, he pursued the aim of Exclusion with determined singlemindedness. Shaftesbury supported the candidacy of the Duke of Monmouth, an illegitimate son of Charles II, to

fill the vacancy which would be created by James's exclusion from the throne. Shaftesbury favored Monmouth's cause for several reasons. Monmouth was popular with a large following, especially with individuals who were opposed to James's succession in order to protect the Protestant religion. Monmouth's support was also strong in Scotland, where Lauderdale's leadership was detested more with each passing day. Yet Monmouth's support was strongest in the area where the Whig Party found its greatest support, the city of London. Most importantly, Shaftesbury believed that Monmouth could be more easily influenced to support the policies of the Whig Party than would the other possible candidate for the vacant throne, William of Orange. Conversely, there were equally strong reasons why many people opposed Monmouth as a proposed future King. Since Monmouth's mother had been a prostitute, the mention of his candidacy was viewed as an insult by many people. In the eyes of many individuals, the idea that Monmouth would impinge upon the claim of the legal heir simply for refusing to go against his conscience was deplorable.

While acknowledging that Henry VIII had changed the succession by having Parliament declare his children illegitimate, those individuals opposed to Monmouth argued that Henry VIII's children were, in fact, produced within the bonds of legal matrimony. If forced to choose, those
people who espoused this argument would favor the Duke of York.  

So, just as the nation was split over the prospect of Exclusion, the supporters of Exclusion were equally split over the question of who should be chosen as James's replacement. Shaftesbury's decision to back Monmouth tore the Whig Party apart and ultimately ruined its efforts to secure James's exclusion. Once it became apparent that Shaftesbury insisted upon giving his complete support to Monmouth, he lost the backing of early influential supporters of Exclusion such as Halifax. When Halifax threw his support to the King, he carried many former supporters of Exclusion with him including members of the old Presbyterian Party headed by Lord Holles. Shaftesbury also lost the support of many moderate members of the Whig Party who like the King began to favor limitations on James's succession. During the years 1680-1681, the idea of Exclusion began to be viewed as too drastic a solution to the problem of James's succession by moderate Whigs. Just how divisive Monmouth's candidacy was to the Whig Party is evidenced by the fact that Monmouth's name never appeared in the pro-Exclusion pamphlets of the time. However, in spite of the deepening fissures in the Exclusionist Party, radical supporters of Exclusion refused to consider any notion of

\footnote{Ibid., 232-34.}
limitations. They argued how impracticable in reality it would be to "limit" James once he became King. They declared that the idea of a Bill of Limitations was based on the false notion that Parliamentary acts could legally restrain James's future actions. Finally, they asserted that even if a Parliamentary Act were passed, the nation would be placing its faith in the tenuous hope that James would follow Parliament's decrees.40

In spite of the animosity most Englishmen felt toward Roman Catholicism, their intrinsic conservatism produced within them an unshakeable belief in the institution of hereditary monarchy and in the doctrines of nonresistance and divine right. In light of Shaftesbury's support of Monmouth's candidacy, the adherence of moderate men to these beliefs both within and without the Whig Party was stronger than their hatred of Popery. With the increasing division within the Whig Party and the final dissolution of the Oxford Parliament in 1681, it became apparent that the only way to exclude James was through Civil War. Memories of the Civil Wars and of Charles I's execution were painfully fresh in the public mind. No matter how much Englishmen of the 1680s might desire James's exclusion, they had no wish to cause a repetition of the turmoil of

40 Ibid., 232-33; Furley, "Pamphlet Literature," 31-32.
the 1640s. In the end, this refusal to support active resistance sealed the doom of the Exclusion campaign.41

At the start of the third Exclusion Parliament, Shaftesbury was still urging the King to abandon his brother and support the Duke of Monmouth's candidacy in the best interest of the nation. However, by March of 1681, Charles II had become impatient with the Exclusionist movement and had decided to reassert his sovereign power. The King's hopes of success were greatly strengthened in this effort by the knowledge of the fact that he was financially secure for the next three years as a result of a recently concluded treaty with France. In addition, the King knew that the Exclusionist opposition was severely divided over the issue of selecting a successor. Since the ultra pro-Exclusionists refused to agree to any compromise involving limitations on James's succession, Charles II was able to influence the moderate Whigs in his favor and to draw support away from Shaftesbury's program of absolute Exclusion. The King sensed the conservative mood of the nation and used it to his political advantage in the third and final Exclusion Parliament. During this session of Parliament, Charles II outmaneuvered the Exclusionists at several turns. The King called for Parliament to meet in the Tory citadel of Oxford rather than in London, the center of

41 Kenyon, ed., CONSTITUTION, 452-53.
Whiggism. Intending to intimidate the Whigs, Charles II placed regiments of armed guards throughout the city. He quickly called Parliament into session and, without allowing any further action to be taken on the Exclusion Bill which Parliament had voted on March 26, he had this Parliament, which had been sitting for only a week, dissolved. Leaving the opposition in a state of stunned disarray, he promptly left the chamber. Following the King's abrupt dissolution of the Oxford Parliament, Shaftesbury tried unsuccessfully to hold his forces together. Robbed of the opportunity to secure James's exclusion legally in Parliament, the only other option open to the Exclusionists would have been armed resistance. However, sensing the repugnance with which the nation held the idea of Civil War, the Exclusionists knew that they were defeated, and the opposition was blown asunder.\(^4\)

The dissolution of the Oxford Parliament effectively destroyed the Whig Exclusion Party. Following this Parliament, a political reaction was imposed against the Whigs by the Court. No Whig was to hold a position in the navy or in any department of revenue. The Rye House Plot of 1683, an unsuccessful attempt to murder Charles II and the Duke of York, which will be discussed below, resulted in the

\(^{42}\)Pollock, THE POPISH PLOT, 257; Hill, CENTURY/ REVOLUTION, 196; Feiling, HISTORY/TORY PARTY, 186-87, citing HALIFAX, 1:290; Aylmer, STRUGGLE/CONSTITUTION, 199-200, 203-204; Pollock, THE POPISH PLOT, 257-59.
wholesale removal of Whigs from local governmental positions. By 1685, all of Shaftesbury's leading supporters had suffered death, exile, punitive fines, or been subjected to episodes of trivial persecution out of spite. The extent of governmental anti-Whiggism shocked moderate Tories. The scope of the reaction against the Whigs was clearly reflected by the attitudes and actions which were prevalent at the University of Oxford. As the University was completely under Tory control, Whig parents removed their children to prevent any possibility that they might be corrupted by exposure to Tory doctrine. In September of 1683, a Fellow of Lincoln College was ousted on a charge of "'Whiggism,'" and in 1684 the King ordered John Locke driven from Christ Church College. As for Shaftesbury himself, in 1682 he was charged with treason, acquitted, and died in self-imposed exile in the Netherlands the next year. After his death, the cries of radical Exclusionist pamphleteers were silenced.43

However, before his flight to the continent in 1682, Shaftesbury made one final effort to strike a blow against the Government and thereby alter the course of the succession. This attempt was to take the form of an armed insurrection combining both Scottish and English forces. The

Duke of Monmouth was to replace Charles II after the successful outcome of the uprising. However, in September 1682, Monmouth was arrested in Cheshire. Yet Shaftesbury continued to push the plan. A date to initiate the proposed scheme was set for mid-November 1682. But when that time came, Shaftesbury's cohorts, fearing that the plan was ill-advised, refused to put it into motion. It was then that the Earl of Shaftesbury hurriedly made his departure to Holland and died shortly thereafter. Despite Shaftesbury's flight, the plans for the proposed uprising were still supported by the most prominent members of the Green Ribbon Club, including Monmouth, Essex, Russell, Sidney, Hampden, and Howard.

At the same time the radicals among the Green Ribbon Club were planning the uprising, the lesser members of the same association, aided by two former supporters of Cromwell named Rumbold and Rumsey, were plotting the assassination of the King and his brother. According to G. M. Trevelyan, except perhaps for Shaftesbury, no member of the leading group played an active role in the assassination scheme. However, Trevelyan asserts that it is likely that the Council of Six was aware that an alternative scheme was entertained by certain members of the Green Ribbon Club.

since both groups of conspirators met there to discuss the proposed general uprising.\footnote{Ibid., 5:349.}

As plans were being finalized for the uprising which was to involve recruiting sailors to initiate a naval mutiny, initiating uprisings in Taunton, Bristol, York, Exeter, Chester, and London, overwhelming London Guards, taking control of the Tower, the Exchange, the Mews, the Savoy, Whitehall, and Westminster Bridge, and preventing the Court from fleeing to Windsor, a date was set for the assassination plot. As the King's party returned from the races at Newmarket, the conspirators planned to station themselves at the Rye House, which had been leased by the conspirator Rumbold. From this house, they had an unobstructed view of the road from Newmarket for at least a mile. In this assassination attempt which became known as the Rye House Plot, the plan was to block the King's coach as it returned from Newmarket and then open fire on it. However, the plan was almost doomed to fail. According to Rumbold, the King's coach passed the Rye House on March 22, being "very slenderly guarded, only with five or six persons, and those tired and ill-appointed." Unfortunately for the intended participants in the assassination plot, described by John Reresby as "...forty men well armd," a
fire at Newmarket caused the King to leave there eight to ten days before the intended date of his departure. 46

In June of 1683, one of the conspirators divulged the existence of both plots to the Government. Once the secret was out, several of the plotters emerged to give evidence against their cohorts. Upon learning of the plots, the majority of the English people felt a great sense of revulsion. The King now had an excuse to retaliate against the Whigs for all the times he had suffered checks and embarrassments at their hands. All the participants in both plots from the Council of Six to the lesser conspirators paid for their involvement. Shaftesbury had already died in exile. Although Monmouth begged for and received his father's forgiveness, he soon chose to go into exile after once again offending the King. Essex took his own life while imprisoned in the Tower. For lack of evidence, Hampden was convicted only of a misdemeanor. Rumbold was captured in 1685, hanged, drawn and quartered, and had his limbs put on view at Hoddesdon, site of the Rye House. Both Russell and Sidney were put to death. About their fates, T. B. Macaulay has declared that "Russell...appears to have been guilty of no offence falling within the definition of high treason, and Sidney, of whose guilt no legal

evidence could be produced, were beheaded in defiance of law and justice...."47

During the Rye House Plot prosecutions, the impartiality of the Bench varied with each trial. During the trials of Thomas Walcot and William Hone, Chief Justice Pemberton urged the juries to return the guilty verdicts which they rendered on July 12, 1683. At Russell's trial, the Chief Justice showed the defendant every courtesy, overruling hearsay and making no effort to sway the jury's verdict. Both supporters and opponents commended the Chief Justice's conduct at the trial. Generally, the assessment of historians is that the trial was as just as the existing legal system allowed. Yet the consensus also holds that the Crown's lawyers, especially Jeffreys, and the jury impanelled by the Tory sheriffs, are accountable for the guilty verdict returned against Russell.48

Sidney was tried on a charge of high treason for plotting the overthrow and death of the Sovereign, for attempting to "alter and utterly subvert the ancient government of the Kingdom of England," and for penning "a certain false, seditious and traitorous libell." During his trial, Sidney appeared composed and competent as he

presented his defense. In defending himself, he depended so heavily on legal technicalities that his disavowals of the truth of the prosecution's assertions of his guilt were given little consideration. In planning his defense, Sidney adhered to Tudor statutes which maintained that two witnesses were needed to testify to each open treasonous act. Chief Justice Jeffreys ruled that only two witnesses in all were necessary. One witness, named Howard, and a paper, _since scribere est agere_, were produced to give evidence concerning Sidney's guilt. Other testimony against Sidney was merely hearsay. However, Sidney was able to discredit Howard's testimony.

During the course of the trial, the prosecution introduced examples of Sidney's writing in which he expressed his views concerning government. According to Sidney, "the prince elect enters into a treaty before he becomes fully prince. Rulers may be deposed for misgovernment or if they differ in religion from the majority of their subjects." He believed that subjects had a right to depose an unfit ruler, but he did not hold that subjects had a right to put a deposed ruler to death. In fact, Sidney was critical of the execution of Charles I. In a passage from _DISCOURSES CONCERNING GOVERNMENT_ which was read at his trial, Sidney declared that "a King is subject unto the law of God, as he

---

is a man to the people that makes him King: the Law sets a measure unto that subjection, and the Parliament judges of the particular cases thereupon arising." In this work, Sidney argued against the doctrines of patriarchalism and divine right monarchy espoused in Filmer's **Patriarcha**. Sidney also disputed Hobbes's contention that only the establishment of monarchy could prevent anarchy. In light of the bias directed against Sidney and the weakness of the evidence presented concerning his part in the general conspiracy, Christopher Hill maintains that Sidney "was convicted only of defending the view that governments might be resisted in certain circumstances: this too in an unpublished treatise..." Nonetheless Sidney was convicted and executed in November 1683. A. F. Havighurst describes this episode as "one of the really gross miscarriages of justice in the reign." 50

While the leading Whigs were being made to pay for the Rye House Plot, many lesser Whig politicians either fled the country or were hanged. The Government began dozens of suits for treason, libel, and conspiracy. Tory juries readily convicted those individuals so charged, and stiff punishments were imposed by county magistrates. Suits were brought against individuals for libelling or slandering the

---

character of the Duke of York. Heavy damages were sought in these suits, and easily won.\textsuperscript{51}

While exacting legal retribution, the Government was able to use the discovery of the Rye House Plot to proceed with a decisive assault against members of the opposing party in the Exclusion Parliaments. The Crown demanded and received the forfeiture of London's charter. Thereafter, the Government relentlessly pursued and obtained the surrender of the charters of numerous boroughs which generally elected Whigs to sit in Parliament. The new charters which were granted gave Tories unquestioned political control.\textsuperscript{52}

Thus, the Court and the Court Party were triumphant in the aftermath of the Rye House Plot, an episode which John Pollock describes as "...the perfection of Whig failure." With this abortive attempt, the Whigs had made their last serious effort to alter the course of the succession. Both Charles II and the Duke of York had survived all the storms of the last few years--the Popish Plot, the Exclusion Crisis, and the Rye House Plot. All attempts to displace

\textsuperscript{51}Macaulay, \textit{HOE}, 1:248

the Catholic successor had failed. Now, with the prospect of a Catholic King, the nation could only look to the future and wait apprehensively.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{53} Pollock, \textit{THE POPISH PLOT}, 260.
CHAPTER III

DOWNFALL OF A CATHOLIC KING:

THE REIGN OF JAMES II AND THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION

When it became apparent that Charles II was near death in early February of 1685, the Anglican clergy at his bedside encouraged him to receive communion according to the rites of the Church of England. He refused. His brother James cleared the room and summoned a Catholic priest to administer extreme unction to the dying King. Although done in secret, this series of events heightened suspicion among those individuals waiting without about Charles's religion. Having been received into the Catholic fold, the third Stuart monarch died peacefully on February 6, 1685.

Immediately upon Charles II's death, James succeeded to the throne. Shortly after his accession, the new King addressed the Privy Council and declared:

...I have been reported to have been a man for arbitrary power; but that is not the only story has been made of me, and I shall make it my endeavour to preserve this Government, both in Church and State, as it is now by law established. I know the principles of the Church of England are for monarchy, and the

---

members of it have showed themselves good and loyal subjects; therefore I shall always take care to defend and support it. I know too, that the laws of England are sufficient to make the King as great a monarch as I can wish, and as I shall never depart from the just rights and prerogatives of the Crown, so I shall never invade any man's property. I have often heretofore ventured my life in defence of this nation, and I shall go as far as any man in preserving it in all its just rights and liberties.

James's speech was such a relief to the Councillors that they sought and received the King's permission to have it published. According to John Reresby, James's declaration "...in a great measure did quiet the minds and apprehensions of people...." Although there was no great outburst of joy over his accession, as there had been in 1660 at the time of the restoration of the monarchy, there was, in the words of one of his biographers, "restrained but sincere rejoicing" throughout the kingdom.

At the time of his succession, James's position was seemingly as secure as any ruler could hope. Politically, James had the unflagging support of the Tories, while the power of the Whigs had been broken in the aftermath of the Exclusion Crisis and the Rye House Plot. His position was

---

made more secure by the fact that the English people's dread of Civil War made the occurrence of armed resistance a virtual impossibility at the time of James's accession. Finally, the Anglican Church had customarily adhered to the doctrine of obedient nonresistance to the Crown. Upon becoming King, James felt confident that the Church of England would continue to support him under any circumstances. However, within four years James managed to destroy the trust of subjects who have been described as "...the most loyal and subservient people faced by an English king in the seventeenth century." 3

Although James had promised to "...maintain the established government both in Church and State" and to "defend and support" the Church of England, his intentions were in fact quite the opposite. In March of 1685, James told the French Ambassador, Barillon, that his goal was to reestablish Catholicism in England. The King declared, "...that he knew the aversion the people of England had to the Catholic religion, but...he could never be in entire safety till the Catholic religion was established in England in such a manner as not to be ruined or destroyed...." Almost from the time of James's conversion

---

to Rome in 1669, he was determined to reconvert the English people to Catholicism one day. As time progressed, he became so obsessed with this goal that he was willing to use any means to achieve it. Bishop Burnet of Salisbury quotes James as declaring that he considered himself to be "above the law." With his loathing of Parliament, the King wished to give free rein to his absolutist tendencies. James himself declared, "I will either win all or lose all." Refusing to abandon the course he had chosen, James's catholicizing actions ultimately alienated the loyal kingdom which he inherited upon his accession in 1685. The Revolution of 1688 resulted from his stubborn and inflexible adherence to his religion. In the end, he chose to give up his throne rather than renounce his plan to convert England to Catholicism.  

---

Soon after his accession, it became apparent that James's religious convictions would dominate his actions throughout the reign. On March 2, 1685, he publicly attended Mass. At his coronation on April 23, he ordered that the custom of observing the sacraments of the Church of England be omitted, which caused great dismay among most Englishmen. Also excluded from the coronation ceremony was the recitation of the Communion Service and the presentation of a copy of the English Bible with the admonition "...to prize [it] above all earthly treasures...." One contemporary declared that during the coronation ceremony, "...the queen gave the responses most solemnly, [but] the king seemed indifferent throughout the service."5

Although James ordered that all men on the Privy Council and in Government positions at the time of his brother's death be retained "untill His Majesties further pleasure," he did not intend to be guided by their counsels, which soon became apparent. During the weeks immediately following his accession, James was secretly advised by a group of Catholics who included Lords Arundel, Bellayse, Talbot, and Jermyn. The King retained

---

this Catholic Cabal throughout his reign, gradually expanding its number to seven. Ultimately included in this group were the King himself, Lord Sunderland, the Jesuit Father Petre, who was the Queen's confessor, and Lords Bellayse, Powis, Arundel, and Dover. Sunderland maintained throughout that affairs of State and religious matters were closely linked; therefore, he brought most important governmental business before this council for consideration. The chief aim of this secret council was the placement of Catholics into office through repeal or nullification of the Test Acts and Penal Laws. According to Sir John Dalrymple, "By these means, but chiefly by the distribution of offices, when the tests were removed, James flattered himself, that he should insensibly draw his subjects over to his religion, without the aid of persecution...."6

Initially the new King hoped that both the Church of England and a Tory Parliament would support him in his aim to reconvert England to Catholicism. To ensure that a favorable Parliament was elected in 1685, James made his presence felt in certain constituencies. The Earl of Sunderland, principal Secretary of State, director of this campaign, sent letters to local government officials and

---

6 Bramston, AUTOBIOGRAPHY, 166; Ogg, JAMES II/WILLIAM III, 142-43; Dalrymple, MEMOIRS, 67-68.
prominent local citizens urging their aid in the election of "good members for the Parliament" whose political views were "approved." Whig boroughs had been forced earlier to relinquish their charters. The reestablished boroughs were completely loyal to the Crown. The Lord Lieutenants formed committees to pressure constituents to vote in the Crown's interest. Englishmen were admonished from the pulpit to vote exclusively for Tories. The Court's efforts were well rewarded. The King himself remarked that "there were not above forty members, but such as he himself wished for."7

When the King met with the Lords and Commons on May 22, 1685, he restated his promises to the Privy Council and added that he had not uttered his words accidentally. He assured the members that he would keep the promises he had made. The pleasure James's statement produced among the members seems to have blinded them to the threatening tone which the King used to express his expectations concerning the session. James advised them not to try to force him to call frequent meetings through tight control of the purse strings. James warned that "It would be a very improper method to take with me, and the best way to engage me to

meet you often is always to use me well." Since the Government could not function without funds, the hidden inference in these words was that if Parliament did not give James the money he wanted, he would take it without their consent. Despite James's belligerent tone, the members voted him the same revenue for life which Charles II had enjoyed, plus an additional £800,000 yearly for the next three years to be used to refurbish the navy. Parliament's action can be attributed to the conciliatory mood accompanying the new King's accession, to the influence the Court had brought to bear to assure the election of a favorable Parliament, and above all, to the Tory House of Commons' belief that James would honor his pledge to uphold the Church of England.8

Prior to the opening of Parliament in 1685, the Earl of Argyll, a Scottish Whig leader who had gone into exile in Holland after being convicted of treason in 1681, had returned to mobilize his kinsmen, the Campbell clan, and other Scotsmen for a rebellion against James. Lacking adequate preparation or support, Argyll was captured in Scotland on June 18, 1685. Three weeks after Argyll had reappeared in Scotland, the Duke of Monmouth landed at Lyme

8 Davies, ESSAYS/STUARTS, 47; Kenyon, STUARTS, 149; Macaulay, HOE, 1:463, citing Evelyn's DIARY (May 22, 1685); Kenyon, STUARTS, 149; Foxcroft, HALIFAX, 1:445; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 26.
with 150 supporters. Upon disembarking, he read a declaration in which he labelled James as a "usurper" and accused him of murdering both the Earl of Essex and Charles II. He asserted that he was the late King's legitimate heir and declared that the Parliament then in session was illegal. However, he would allow his right to rule to be determined by a freely elected Parliament. Subsequently Monmouth's band urged him to declare himself king, which he did at Taunton on June 20, 1685. The strength of Monmouth's Rebellion lay in Puritan dissatisfaction with the Clarendon Code, the goal of most of the rebels being to topple the Catholic King and the Anglican Church.9

During the Rebellion, James had the support of the army, Parliament, the city of London, the universities, the corporations, country gentlemen and judges, and the Tory Party. Fearing that if Monmouth succeeded to the throne there would be a conflict over the succession with the House of Orange, the Whigs did nothing to aid Monmouth's cause, and James thus had popular opinion on his side. Monmouth had no support beyond the Southwestern counties of England. He was supported almost entirely by the less politically informed and politically influential Noncon-

9 Maurice Ashley, THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION of 1688 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), 60 (hereafter cited as Ashley, GLORIOUS REVOLUTION); Clark, LATER STUARTS, 118-19; Macaulay, HOE, 1:527-28, citing Burnet's HOT, 1:641; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 27.
formists. Monmouth had 150 supporters when he arrived. By the time he was confronted by the King's forces, his army numbered over 3,000 men. However, Monmouth's rebels were poorly trained and poorly organized. He and his followers were defeated in the Battle of Sedgemoor on July 6, 1685. After throwing himself at James's feet and begging for mercy, the Duke of Monmouth was executed nine days later. The ease with which the King suppressed this revolt, so soon after the defeat of Argyll's Rebellion, contributed to James's unrealistic sense of security. 10

To meet the threat of Monmouth's Rebellion, James had raised an army of 20,000 men. However, he had felt compelled to request that William of Orange send three English and three Scottish regiments from Holland to help in quelling Monmouth's Rebellion. The Somerset militia had refused to take up arms against Monmouth. Many of its members defected to his cause. Others of the Western militias were half-hearted in their support of the King, and many of the county militias were ineffective fighting

10 Ibid.; Macaulay, HOE, 1:526, 528-30; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 27; Lacey, DISSENT/POLITICS, 173; Ashley, GLORIOUS REVOLUTION, 61; Clark, LATER STUARTS, 119; Godfrey Davies, "Three Letters on Monmouth's Rebellion, 1685," THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW 35 (January 1920):115; Macaulay, HOE, 1:556-57, citing Evelyn's DIARY (July 15); Bramston's MEMOIRS; Reresby's MEMOIRS, et al.; Ashley, GLORIOUS REVOLUTION, 60; Trevelyan, ENGLAND/STUARTS, 5:359; Ashley, GLORIOUS REVOLUTION, 62; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 28.
forces. The incompetence of the few persuaded James that all English militias were undependable.  

During Monmouth's Rebellion, many Catholic officers were commissioned into the army. After the Rebellion, the King still retained ninety Catholic officers in the army in defiance of the law, and he continued to maintain the standing army which he had assembled. In this age, all Englishmen, especially those who remembered the days of the New Model Army or of Cromwell's Ironsides, dreaded the existence of a standing army with or without Catholic members. The Tories strongly maintained that a regular standing army threatened the Constitution. They firmly believed that England could be adequately protected by a powerful navy and the county militias under the control of local officials. The country's aversion to a standing army was made even greater by the fact that the people found the behavior of the army raised during Monmouth's Rebellion intolerable. Since no provision had been made to provide quarters for the soldiers, the populace was forced to lodge them. The soldiers were not legally subject to court martial. Therefore, the soldiers were infrequently disciplined. In Parliament, complaints were heard of "the  

11Feiling, HISTORY/TORY PARTY, 208; Ashley, GLORIOUS REVOLUTION, 60-61; John Miller, "The Militia and the Army in the Reign of James II," THE HISTORICAL JOURNAL 16 (December 1973):661 (hereafter cited as Miller, "Militia/Army").
oppression of the soldiers, free quarters, plunder and some felons."¹²

Because of the extensive Nonconformist support which Monmouth's Rebellion received, royal retaliation for the Rebellion was levelled almost solely at the Protestant Dissenters. The punishments were excessively harsh, and in notable cases, ordered upon doubtful legal practices. Under the direction of Chief Justice Jeffreys at the Bloody Assizes, about 300 persons were put to death. In addition some 800 individuals were given to Court favorites to sell as slaves in the West Indies. The bestowal of prisoners on courtiers to sell into slavery was regarded as "indecent" by many Tory nobles. Above all, the public viewed the punishments of Elizabeth Graunt and Alice Lisle as shocking and extreme. Both women were highly respected and their only crime was that of harboring fugitives. Yet, Graunt was burned alive, and Lisle was beheaded.¹³

In writing of the "Bloody Assizes," the King jokingly referred to them as "his Lord Chief Justice's campaign in the West." As a reward for his role in the Bloody Assizes, Jeffreys was made Lord Chancellor, and the LONDON GAZETTE

¹²Feiling, HISTORY/TORY PARTY, 208, citing HATTON CORRESPONDENCE, ii:60; AILESbury MEMOIRS, 1:121; Kenyon, STUART ENGLAND, 229; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 29-30.

¹³Lacey, DISSENT/POLITICS, 173-74; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 28.
printed the statement that "...this honour was the reward of the many eminent and faithful services which he had rendered to the crown." However, in later years, both James and Jeffreys each attempted to shift responsibility for the Bloody Assizes to the other. The Bloody Assizes alienated loyal men within the Tory Party and the Church of England.\textsuperscript{14}

The cruelty displayed during the Bloody Assizes coupled with the barbarity which followed the revocation of the Edict of Nântes in France and the presence of a standing army in England increased English Protestants' fear of Catholicism. Louis XIV of France had employed violence in an attempt to get French Protestants to convert during the period of the dragonnades. In October of 1685, he ordered the revocation of the Edict of Nântes under which the Huguenots had legally been afforded protection from religious persecution. Following the revocation, about 200,000 Huguenots fled France. Of this number, approximately 40,000 individuals sought safety in England. Accounts of the horrors which these individuals had suffered at the hands of the French King quickly circulated throughout the country. John Evelyn describes the persecu-

\textsuperscript{14}Macaulay, HOE, 1:593-94, citing Granger's BIOGRAPHICAL HISTORY; Burnet's HOT, 1:648; James to Prince of Orange (Sept. 10 and 24, 1685); Lord Lonsdale's MEMOIRS; LONDON GAZETTE (Oct. 1, 1685); Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 28.
tion as "raging with the utmost barbarity, exceeded even what the very heathen used...." Throughout James's three-year reign, the cruel tales recounted by these persecuted people constantly reinforced the English people's aversion to Catholics and Catholicism. Louis XIV's persecution of the Huguenots made James's subjects fear that the King's enthusiasm for Catholicism might lead him to attempt to follow in the French King's footsteps. The presence of French Huguenots in England was a constant reminder of the lengths to which a Catholic sovereign had gone in an attempt to convert his Protestant subjects to Catholicism.15

Regarding the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, James chose to disregard reports of cruelty inflicted on the Huguenots as merely anti-Catholic propaganda, comparable to that which was so prevalently used as a justification for Exclusion during the period of the Popish Plot. In fact, James told the French Ambassador "...that he was delighted at the virtual disappearance of heresy in France." The fact that he never publicly expressed disapproval of Louis XIV's treatment of the Huguenots was a severe blow to James's credibility. A book written by a French Protestant minister attacking the persecution of the Huguenots was dispersed in London in French and English. James ordered

15Hill, CENTURY/REVOLUTION, 235; Davies, ESSAYS/STUARTS, 51-53; Trevelyan, ENGLAND/STUARTS, 5:364; Ashley, GLORIOUS REVOLUTION, 62; Kenyon, SUNDERLAND, 123.
the book burned and defended his action saying, "dogs defend each other when attacked; so do kings."\footnote{Jones, \textit{REVOLUTION}, 112-13; Ashley, \textit{GLORIOUS REVOLUTION}, 63-64.}

At the same time that the revocation of the Edict of Nantes was creating shockwaves, James told his Privy Council that he planned to retain Catholic officers in the army permanently and that it was his wish that Catholic peers would again sit in the House of Lords in the very near future. The Marquis of Halifax reminded the King that the Test Acts would prevent his wish from becoming a reality. Halifax also pointed out that James's intention to retain Catholics in the army was a clear violation of the Test Acts. James angrily declared his intention to support his appointment of Catholic officers and stated that he expected support for his aims from his ministers.\footnote{Trevelyan, \textit{ENGLISH REVOLUTION}, 29; Foxcroft, \textit{HALIFAX}, 1:448.}

Halifax had already shown a hesitancy to support James in regard to his religion when he refused to accompany the new King to Mass. Privately the King inquired of Halifax whether he favored repeal of the Test Acts and the Habeas Corpus Act. Courageously Halifax refused to promise to vote for repeal of those acts. James immediately removed him from his position as Lord President of the Council. In dismissing Halifax, who has been described as "perhaps the
ablest politician and finest orator of his generation and one of the greatest pamphleteers of any age," James made plain his intention to follow a pro-Catholic policy thereafter. Reresby remarked that Halifax's dismissal just prior to the opening of the second session of Parliament "astonished a great many and made them fear that there was a change of councils as well as councillors." 18

Following Halifax's dismissal, Lords Rochester, Guilford, and Clarendon lost their influence at Court. Their positions in the inner circle of royal advisors were assumed by Sunderland and Jeffreys. These two men were willing to follow every command of the King in order to displace their political rivals. Sunderland, who would eventually convert to Catholicism, had already allied himself with Father Petre and other members of the radical Catholic Party against the Protestant faction at Court. These men in the ultra-Catholic Party totally disregarded the Pope's admonitions to follow a moderate course. Although it was illegal for Roman Catholics to serve in a Protestant government, it soon became apparent that one had to be a Catholic to obtain a position of favor under the Crown. Rapidly Anglicans and High Tories either gave up their places in government or were forced out of office. 19

18 Ibid., 440, 448-49; Davies, ESSAYS/STUARTS, 52.

19 Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 29; Trevelyan, ENGLAND/STUARTS, 5:360; Aylmer, STRUGGLE/CONSTITUTION, 210.
The King's actions following the defeat of Monmouth's Rebellion undermined his strongest bases of support. By the fall of 1685, a breach had developed between James and his loyal Parliament. Jeffreys' Western Campaign sickened even James's most avid Tory supporters. The brutal execution of Alice Lisle and the extreme lengths taken to arrest hundreds of the loyal Whig aristocracy were viewed with distaste by the House of Commons. Fear of the standing army James had raised in the face of the Rebellion heightened the hatred of popery which the English people felt. This fear of popery was increased also by the fact that the King placed Scottish forces under Catholic command; James even ordered Irish Catholics armed, and he was commissioning Catholics in England's army.20

Personally, James was doing all he could to bring Catholicism to a predominant place in English life. As early as March of 1685, the King demanded that Archbishop Sancroft and Bishop Compton of London stifle anti-Catholic preaching. With these demands, James made it plain that his earlier promises to protect the Church of England were dependent upon its obedience to his wishes. His public attendance at Mass disconcerted his Tory Ministers. Ormonde would only accompany the King as far as the vestibule of the Chapel. Rather than refuse the King's request

20 Feiling, HISTORY/TORY PARTY, 208.
directly to accompany him to Mass, Rochester chose to be absent in the country. In September of 1685, Bishop Leyburn was received in partibus infidelum. At the same time the Huguenots were streaming into England, Ferdinando D'Adda was received as a nuncio from the papacy. After a lapse since 1558, formal diplomatic relations were reestablished with Rome, and envoys were exchanged. During the fall of 1685, James urged priests and monks to resettle in England from abroad, and small religious establishments were reopened in London. Jesuit schools were opened, and Catholic presses were established which turned out large numbers of pro-Catholic pamphlets aimed at winning converts. 21

All of these catholicizing actions served to intensify public fears by the fall of 1685. James reinforced these fears when Parliament reconvened on November 9, 1685 by informing the members of his intention to retain Catholic officers in the army permanently. The King cited the inadequacy of the local militias in the face of Monmouth's Rebellion saying, "There is nothing but a good force of well-disciplined troops in constant pay that can defend us from such as, either at home or abroad, are disposed to disturb us." He then asked for additional funds to maintain the army. Concerning the Catholic officers within the army, the King declared himself certain of their loyalty.

21 Ibid., 208-209; Kenyon, STUART ENGLAND, 230.
In light of their recent support, he stated that "I will neither expose them to disgrace, nor myself to the want of them, if there be another rebellion to make them necessary for me." James's promises to protect the Church of England which had formed the conclusion to his opening speech to the first session of Parliament were notably absent in this second speech.22

Responding to the King's belligerent tone, the House of Commons agreed to a supply bill but refused to declare its use "for the support of the additional forces." It brought forward another bill to upgrade the condition of the militia. Speaker after speaker supported the militia and argued that "a standing army is destructive to the country." The Commons then decided to deliberate the question of Catholic officers in the army before considering the issue of supply. To the irritation of the King, this motion had the backing of several officials and army officers. On November 14, the House agreed to deliver an address informing the King that the Commons viewed the retention of Catholics illegal. While the House of Commons attempted to suggest several compromises to the King by which provision for these Catholic officers could be made, while making certain that no others were commissioned, James angrily declined. Of the King's reaction, one member

22 Clark, LATER STUARTS, 121; Miller, JAMES II, 143, 146.
of Parliament declared, "We are all Englishmen and we ought not be frightened out of our duty by a few high words." A Parliamentary grant of £700,000 was finally agreed upon. However, during the next few years, the King would only receive £30,000 yearly. James found this arrangement most unsatisfactory. On the 19th of November, the King attended a series of debates concerning the Catholic officers in the House of Lords. A succession of speakers urged the upholding of the laws against Popery, and "horrible things" were expressed about Catholics. On November 20, James prorogued Parliament. This prorogation was to have lasted only three months. However, this Parliament never met again.23

The King's efforts to persuade Parliament to give its consent to the retention of Catholic officers in the army thereby repealing the Test Acts caused a core of opposition to develop in Parliament. Among members of Parliament, there was apprehension that the King's persistence would result in the eventual abolition of the Test Acts. Many members recalled the spectre, raised during the Exclusion debates, of a Catholic King presiding over a Catholic army. The King was unable to appreciate the sense of dread which a Catholic King with a large army produced among his Protestant subjects. James's loyal Tory Parliament refused

23 Ibid., 146-47.
to acquiesce in the King's wishes concerning a standing army and repeal of the Test Acts. James realized that to get the Test Acts repealed he had to dismiss this Parliament and remodel the local boroughs again. G. M. Trevelyan has described this assembly as "the most loyalist Parliament that ever was chosen to support the House of Stuart." In Trevelyan's view, "The refusal of the Tory Parliament to repeal the Test Act excluding Roman Catholics from office was the true beginning of the sequence of events that led to the Revolution."24

Since Parliament would not agree to repeal the Test Act, James decided to take matters into his own hands. In late November, he pardoned about sixty army officers from the provisions of the Test Act. He then proceeded to obtain a favorable ruling in the Courts concerning his right to dispense with the Test Act. James wanted to secure a unanimous decision in his favor. To do this, the King first asked most, if not all, of the Justices of the King's Bench whether or not they supported the King's right to dispense with the Test Act and Penal Laws. Lord Chancellor Jeffreys also pressed the judges to acquiesce. Six justices who refused to support James's right to dispense were replaced. According to John Reresby, "This

24 Ogg, JAMES II/WILLIAM III, 160, citing THE SEVERAL DEBATES of the HOUSE of COMMONS in the REIGN of the LATE JAMES II, 1697, 8-10; Bramston's AUTOBIOGRAPHY, 221-23; Miller, JAMES II, 86; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 30-32.
made the greater noise because several of those turned out were knowing and loyal gentlemen...." The Solicitor-General, Heneage Finch, was also removed from office for opposing the Crown's right to dispense with the laws.  

The King next sought legal sanction for the use of the dispensing power by means of a test case. In the collusive case, Godden vs Hales, a coachman named Godden brought suit against his Catholic master, Sir Edward Hales, for holding a commission in the army in violation of the Test Act. Hales claimed exclusion from the provisions of the Test Act under the King's dispensation. Eleven of the twelve Justices, meeting together in the Court of King's Bench, delivered the opinion that it was "an inseparable prerogative of the kings of England to dispense with penal laws in particular cases and upon particular necessary reasons" and "that of those reasons and those necessities of the King himself is sole judge." According to Reresby, it was commonly believed that the lone "no" vote rendered by Justice Street was encouraged by the Crown with the intention of making the Bench appear independent of the Crown. Reresby declares that among the populace "This judgement was very surprizeing, and occasioned much discours in the kingdome." John Evelyn echoes the surprise the verdict

---

engendered saying, "Great jealousies as to what would be the end of these proceedings." Upon hearing the verdict, Anthony Wood exclaimed, "This tends to the destruction of the Church of England." 26

With the decision in Godden vs Hales in June 1686, the King was now free to appointment whomsoever he wished to office. The King's advisor, Sunderland, told the Papal Nuncio, D'Adda, that repeal of the Test Act would soon be accomplished. The efforts which James had already put forward to catholicize the government and the country were now accelerated. Catholic chapels, schools, and religious houses opened throughout the country. An attempt was made to establish a Catholic ruling body by consecrating bishops, and the King coerced corporations like the Inns of Court in an effort to get them to allow Catholics in their midst. 27

Although James had obtained legal sanction for dispensing with the Test Act, his actions were not supported by public opinion. The public was offended by the pressure James had exerted on his judges to bow to his wishes. Englishmen also resented the way the King had used

26 Ibid., 429; Miller, JAMES II, 156-57; Browning, ed., RERESBY MEMOIRS, 429; Bray, ed., EVELYN'S DIARY, 2:253; Davies, ESSAYS/STUARTS, 63.

27 Carswell, DESCENT/ENGLAND, 73; Miller, JAMES II, 157; Clark, LATER STUARTS, 123-24.
the dispensing power by placing more Catholics in the army and permitting Catholics to retain college fellowships. The decision in *Godden vs Hales* allowed Catholics to hold civilian governmental posts. People were afraid that ultimately Catholics would obtain benefices in the Church of England and would sit in the House of Commons. According to A. F. Havighurst, "Hales case determines the rest of the reign, for it marks the first serious alienation of the Tories." The increased presence of Catholic clergy and institutions produced riots throughout the country. In Cheapside, a Catholic chapel was attacked. Insults were hurled at the priests. In attempting to calm the crowd, the Lord Mayor heard cries of "No wooden gods." When called out to subdue the crowd, militiamen declared, "We cannot in conscience fight for Popery."28

James was depending heavily on the faithful support of the Anglican Church as he pushed forward his pro-Catholic policies. However, the favor which the King had already shown to Catholics had so agitated the Anglican clergy that they began to admonish their parishioners from the pulpit not to fall prey to the Church of Rome. In an effort to halt these attacks against Catholicism, the King ordered Bishop Compton of London to suspend a prominent clergyman

of the Capital for such preaching. Compton refused. Following the suggestion of his secret circle of Catholic advisors, James then established an Ecclesiastical Commission. This Commission was empowered to silence clergy by means of trial, suspension, or removal from their livings. The Commission also had the power of excommunication. The duties of this group also included overseeing the administration of schools, colleges, and universities. In July 1641, on the eve of the Civil War, the Long Parliament had abolished the Court of High Commission and "...declared that no similar court should be erected for the future." However, claiming the power granted in Godden vs Hales to dispense with laws in specific cases, James exercised his royal prerogative in the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission. The decision in Godden vs Hales and the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission were vital for the success of James's pro-Catholic policy. The first official act of this body so important to the recatholicizing of England was to suspend Bishop Compton.

Although James contended that he was not violating the Act of 1641 since the old Court of High Commission reprimanded both laymen and clergy, and his Ecclesiastical
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29 Ashley, JAMES II, 190; Tanner, CONFLICTS, 255; Dalrymple, MEMOIRS, 68; Jones, REVOLUTION, 72; F. W. Maitland, THE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND (Cambridge: The University Press, 1908; reprint ed., Cambridge: The University Press, 1965), 311-12 (hereafter cited as Maitland, CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY); Jones, REVOLUTION, 72; Tanner, CONFLICTS, 256.
Commission punished only clergy, the finest legal minds of the time viewed it as illegal, and almost all historians concur. However, more important than whether James had the right to establish this Ecclesiastical Commission was the use to which it was put. The Court of High Commission had been employed by Anglicans against Puritans. James's intention was to use the Ecclesiastical Commission as a means to force the Anglican Church to accept the recatholicizing of England.30

James's action in regard to Bishop Compton and the Ecclesiastical Commission antagonized the majority of Englishmen. Concerning Compton's suspension in September of 1686, Evelyn says, "This was thought a very extraordinary way of proceeding, and was universally resented...." The Marquis of Halifax relates that the King's actions produced feelings of apprehension among the clergy in general. They rightly believed that they would all feel the weight of the Ecclesiastical Commission before the King was done. They speculated that eventually they would all be reproved for their preaching. While James was successful in his initial objective of making Compton an example and thus causing the Anglican clergy to be less blatant in

their criticism of Catholicism, he hurt his cause in the long run. The broad authority given to the Ecclesiastical Commission heightened anxieties that James was attempting to establish a despotic form of government. The King's attack on the Church left the English people with the impression that their Sovereign would go to any lengths to bring Catholicism to the forefront in England, and would, in the process, destroy English Protestantism entirely. Thus, James fanned the flame of the long-held popular belief of a close link between Popery and absolutism. Finally, James's attack on Compton was unwise because it made Compton, an able and influential man, a steadfast foe of the King. In 1688, Compton worked zealously to bring about the overthrow of the King. Most importantly, James's actions antagonized the leadership of the Church of England. The public depth of feeling against this action is reflected in the fact that the Bill of Rights of 1689 declared that James II's establishment of an Ecclesiastical Commission was "illegal and pernicious."  

Late in 1686, James had decided to remove from office all individuals who did not support his policies. This included anyone in office at Court, the army, or within the administrative hierarchy. The King continued to commission
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Catholic officers into the army. By 1688, over a fourth of the command positions in the army were held by Catholics. By removing judges in opposition, he also succeeded in having desertion declared a felony. This decision allowed the King to maintain a standing army without calling Parliament into session. James also ordered that Protestant Justices of the Peace be replaced by Catholics. By February of 1687, 455 new Justices of the Peace had been appointed. Of this number, almost two-thirds were Catholics. By 1688, 1714 additional Justices of the Peace had been appointed, of whom 410 or almost a fourth were known Catholics. By the close of 1686, there were also five Catholics on the Privy Council: Lords Tyrconnel, Dover, Bellayse, Powis, and Arundel of Wardour. Significantly the King chose Christmastime of 1686 to open a Catholic chapel at Whitehall.32

James had initiated this purge of Protestants from office upon the advice of Sunderland, who argued that Parliament would comply with the King's wishes if opponents of his policies were dismissed from Court. At Christmas,

32 Miller, JAMES II, 163; Tanner, CONFLICTS, 253-54, citing Bramston's AUTOBIOGRAPHY, 251, 304, 311, 234; John Miller, "Catholic Officers in the Later Stuart Army," THE ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW 80 (1970):49 (hereafter cited as Miller, "Catholic Officers"); Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 37; Tanner, CONFLICTS, 254-55, citing Bramston's AUTOBIOGRAPHY, 300; Miller, POPERY/POLITICS, 209, 219; Tanner, CONFLICTS, 255, citing Bramston's AUTOBIOGRAPHY, 300.
James began to "closet" members of Parliament concerning their support of his aims, and judges and peers questioned members of the local gentry. The results of this polling of public opinion revealed that the next session of Parliament would be no more favorable to James's pro-Catholic aims than the last. The public viewed closetting as a means of harassment and as an assault against Parliament's rights. These attempts to influence public opinion through "closetting" merely antagonized the English populace.33

As the year 1687 opened, James II continued to alienate both loyal Tories and the leadership of the Church of England. Both Lawrence Hyde, Earl of Rochester, the Lord Treasurer, and his brother, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, the Lord Privy Seal and Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, were removed from office because they refused to feign conversion to Catholicism as Sunderland had done. With their eclipse, the Anglican Church was deprived of its last defenders at Court. Louis XIV's ambassador, Barillon, was overjoyed and called the dismissal of the Hydes "the definite victory of the 'Catholic Cabal'." It was James's intention to intimidate less important men into compliance with his pro-Catholic policies by making an example of the Hydes. However, the King now realized that he could not

33 Miller, James II, 163-64; Jones, Revolution, 65.
rely on Tory support to make his Catholic aims a reality. At this point, Tories began to realize that their Sovereign's actions made it difficult, if not impossible, to support him and still maintain their religious, constitutional, and political beliefs, and Anglicans recognized that the King had betrayed the Church of England. In the public view, James's actions toward the Hydes had a decidedly adverse effect. These men were the former brothers-in-law of the King, uncles of his two daughters. Their only crimes had been adhering to the State Church. If their positions were unsafe, then whose could be? It became clear that the King was not seeking only freedom of worship for Catholics, as he had long claimed. Rather he was doing all within his power to make Catholicism the dominant religion of the State to the detriment of all other denominations. From this time forward, more and more men began to think of seeking relief from James's oppressive aims. John Evelyn describes the state of the kingdom as "Popish justices of the peace established in all counties, of the meanest of the people; judges ignorant of the law, and perverting it—so furiously does the Jesuit drive, & even compel Princes to violent courses, & destruction of an excellent Government both in Church and State."  

---
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By the summer of 1687, James realized that he would never receive any support from his current Parliament for his pro-Catholic aims. In July of that year, he formally dissolved that body. In explaining his decision to finally end his only Parliament, James declared that "'he saw no reason to expect any co-operation in his holy designs, for he judged all other advantages far inferior to the principal one, which was the advancement of the Catholic religion.'" In the King's view, monarchy and Parliament could not work together. He had an intense dislike of Parliaments. The ease with which Monmouth's and Argyll's Rebelsions had been quelled, and his belief in the use of an unquestioned royal prerogative made James feel that he was free to rule dictatorially. He did not recognize the importance of Parliament nationally since the end of the Civil War and the need to maintain a good working relationship with it. He always considered compromise a sign of weakness. James believed that his father, Charles I, had been executed because he had been too willing to compromise, which shows how poorly he understood the events of the past.

The King revealed his decision to dissolve Parliament on July 2 during a Council meeting. The next day he publicly paraded his favoritism of Catholicism by

---
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officially receiving D'Adda as the Papal Nuncio to the
English Court. In May D'Adda had already been recognized as
Archbishop of Amasia in partibus infidelum. When D'Adda
was formally received as Papal Nuncio, James knelt before
him to the abhorrence of his Protestant subjects.
Believing that he could soothe their stunned sensibilities,
James stated that he was kneeling before D'Adda in the
capacity of Archbishop rather than as Papal Nuncio. In
November of 1687, Sir John Bramston related that the King
continued to flaunt his Catholicism by appointing the
Jesuit Father, Edward Petre, to the Privy Council.
Bramston notes that "This man is by order a Jesuit, and the
only man of that order of the Public Council to any prince
in Christendom." Complete control of all affairs of State
was then bestowed upon three Catholics: Petre, Sunderland,
and Sir Nicholas Butler. 36

During the Spring of 1687, James realized that he
could not depend on the Anglican Church to help him achieve
his aims as he had hoped. He therefore determined to form
an alliance of Catholics and Protestant Dissenters, whose
combined strength would overwhelm the opposition of the
Anglicans. To forge this new alliance, James issued a
Declaration of Indulgence in April of 1687. Claiming the
power to suspend laws by right of his royal prerogative,
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the King declared the Clarendon Code, the Test Act of 1673, and any other laws by which the Catholics or Protestant Dissenters were persecuted to be lifted. As a result of this Declaration, Papists and Protestant Dissenters were free to hold office and worship openly as they pleased. In 1672, Charles II had tried to impose a more conservative Declaration of Indulgence. However, Parliament had declared that Declaration illegal, forcing Charles II to recall it.

In the Declaration of Indulgence of 1687, the King declared,

> We cannot but heartily wish...that all the people of our dominions were members of the Catholic Church. Yet...it is, and hath long time been, our constant sense and opinion (which upon divers occasions we have declared) that conscience ought not be constrained, nor people forced in matters of mere religion....

However, James's actions concerning toleration were not consistent, and were guided by political expediency. In letters written before he became King, James revealed that he favored toleration for Catholics but not for Protestant Dissenters. In James's mind, Nonconformists were equated with Republicans. On several occasions during Charles II's reign, James opposed religious toleration when it seemed politically advantageous to do so. However, he was particularly hostile toward the Protestant Dissenters

---

because they supported the Exclusion cause and Monmouth's Rebellion. Yet, his hostility lessened when he realized that he needed the Protestant Dissenters to help him achieve his pro-Catholic aims. Even so, James only befriended the Dissenters with promises of relief after the Anglicans abandoned him and only when he felt that he had no other choice. 38

Having failed to convince his Protestant subjects and the Church of England to support his aim to reestablish Catholicism, James issued this Declaration in an attempt to force them to support him. Reresby expressed the public's view of the Declaration when he declared, "Whatever reasons were alleged, the true reason appeared to most men to be a design thereby to weaken the Church of England."

Concerning the Declaration, Evelyn commented, "This was purely obtained by the Papists, thinking thereby to ruin the Church of England, being now the only Church which so admirably and strenuously opposed their superstition." The King's Declaration met with resistance at every turn. The Anglican clergy opposed it and refused to bow to governmental pressure to issue an address of appreciation for it. With the appearance of the first Declaration of
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Indulgence, James completed his break with the Church of England. 39

James also failed to secure the support of the Nonconformists. The Dissenters realized that the King was only offering them relief as a means of securing his pro-Catholic aims. They believed that once these aims had been achieved he would desert them. The Protestant Dissenters were also disquieted by the fact that Catholics were also to be allowed to worship freely in public and to hold places in Government. James was asking Protestant Dissenters to accept his promises in good faith. However, in that time, Protestants viewed Catholics as untrustworthy and unprincipled. No matter how appealing the offer, it was not possible for them to accept unquestioningly. 40

The Marquis of Halifax took advantage of the Protestant Dissenters' wariness about placing their trust in Catholics to dissuade Nonconformists from supporting James's policies. In his famous 1687 pamphlet, Letter to a Dissenter, Halifax asserted that no credence could be given to Catholic promises, and that Catholicism and religious
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freedom were incompatible. If the Dissenters supported James, Halifax declared, their action delay chances of gaining toleration legally. Any support they gave to the King would lessen the possibility of their gaining full toleration. They could only expect Anglican antagonism toward themselves and the King's policies to increase. Halifax advised the Dissenters to adopt a wait-and-see attitude. He reassured them that James's policies were doomed to fail. The Dissenters could then rely on the Anglican Church to support full legal toleration for them. Halifax's brilliantly argued pamphlet carried great weight in the Dissenters' decision not to support the King.41

James nevertheless received about 200 addresses thanking him for his Declaration. Those Dissenters who thanked the King did so under pressure, but they refused to give their approval to the use of the King's prerogative.42

James had now failed to obtain the support of the Dissenters, while losing that of the Church of England. Since the Church would never willingly support his pro-Catholic aims, James decided to assert control of the universities and use them to further the reconversion of England. Because of the important role which the universities played in preparing young men for the clergy and in
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shaping the religious beliefs of the sons of aristocratic families, James believed that if Protestants were exposed to Catholic views through the universities they would be won to Catholicism. Because of a small number of conversions at Oxford in 1685 and 1686, the King also felt that many of the universities' instructors and students wished openly to declare themselves Catholics and would do so if Catholicism was freely introduced into the universities. 43

Even before the first Declaration was issued in 1687, James made a concerted effort to catholicize the universities. According to the law, in order to attend either Oxford or Cambridge, receive a degree, or obtain a fellowship, subscription to the oaths of allegiance and supremacy was required. Thus, Dissenters and Catholics were barred from attending the universities. Yet, in the fall of 1686, James named Obadiah Walker Master of University College, Oxford. He also bestowed fellowships on three Catholics. Walker's presence was highly resented in Oxford. Fearing his Catholic influence, Protestant parents kept their children away from the university, and Walker became known as "'Obadiah Ave-Maria!'". 44

43 Trevelyan, ENGLAND/STUARTS, 5:362; Miller, JAMES II, 169.

In October 1686, James named John Massey, who was by early 1687 felt to be a confirmed Catholic, Dean of Christ Church College. During this time, the King bestowed a Magdalen fellowship on another Catholic, Robert Charnock. Three months later, James had Joshua Bassett, a Catholic, installed as Master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. Although his installation was in violation of their statutes, the Fellows of the College bowed to the King's will. In February of 1687, the King also attempted unsuccessfully to have a Master of Arts degree bestowed on a Benedictine monk, Alban Francis, by Cambridge University. As a result of the university's refusal to grant the degree, the Ecclesiastical Commission removed John Peachell, Vice-Chancellor and Master of Magdalen College, from office and dismissed eight members of the University Senate.

In March of 1687, James continued his effort to catholicize the universities. When the President of Magdalen College died, the King ordered the college Fellows to select Anthony Farmer as President. The statutes under which Magdalen College had been founded stipulated that any President of the college must either be a Fellow of Magdalen or of New College. Farmer was neither. He was a disreputable person whom members of the Ecclesiastical
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Commission called "'a very bad man.'" He was also believed to be a Catholic. 46

Their founding statutes required that the Fellows elect a new President within a period of fifteen days following a vacancy. The Fellows informed the King of the disabilities connected with Farmer's nomination, asked him to withdraw Farmer's name, and offered to consider another qualified candidate of the King's choosing. The only answer their petition received was Sunderland's reply "that the King expected obedience to his will." Failing to receive further word from the King, the Fellows waited until the fifteenth and final day and chose Dr. Hough, a man of solid character, as their new President. 47

Although Hough's election was completely legal, the Ecclesiastical Commission declared it void, and the King ordered the Fellows of Magdalen to install Samuel Parker, Bishop of Oxford, as President of the college. They refused on the grounds that Hough's election was in complete agreement with their statutes. The King was enraged. He declared that he had "no enemy...but among those who call themselves Church of England men." The Fellows of Magdalen were urged to seek the King's pardon. However,
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they refused to avow any wrongdoing. As a result, the Ecclesiastical Commission removed twenty-five of the Fellows from office and filled most of the vacancies with Catholics.48

The political damage resulting from James's treatment of the universities was immense. Oxford and Cambridge were viewed as "Pillars of the Church of England," and James's attacks upon them totally alienated the Anglicans. This episode further incensed the Tories since Oxford was the seat of both Toryism and Anglicanism. The complete alienation of Oxford was revealed in Anthony Wood's comment just prior to the landing of William of Orange, "All public houses are full waiting for good news." Finally, James's actions toward the Fellows of Magdalen College were opposed by members of his own Court of King's Bench. Subsequently, in the final year of his reign, the Court's support for the King's policies was greatly reduced.49

James had been relying on the use of his dispensing power in his attempt to place the army, the Civil Service, the Privy Council, and the universities in Catholic hands. However, he viewed all his efforts as temporary until a

48 Feiling, HISTORY/TORY PARTY, 220; Miller, JAMES II, 170; Bloxam, ed., MAGDALEN COLLEGE, 169-70; Ashley, JAMES II, 210.

49 Miller, JAMES II, 171; Ashley, JAMES II, 210-11; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 38; Davies, ESSAYS/STUARTS, 69; Havighurst, "James II/Scarlet," 536-37.
Parliament obliged him by repealing the Penal Laws and Test Acts. His plan to secure the election of a favorable Parliament required a restructuring of local governments responsible for electing members to the House of Commons. This attack on local government was two-pronged: it required the remodelling of town corporations and county government. Within the town corporations, local borough charters were recalled, and the make-up of the corporation was changed. The new membership consisted of Catholics, Dissenters, "or anyone who seemed prepared to collaborate in the King's designs." At the county level, James removed local officials who opposed the repeals he sought: Lord Lieutenants, Deputy Lieutenants, Justices of the Peace, and others. These individuals were replaced by Catholics, Nonconformists, and Whigs. 50

In the towns, the King's policies won some approval from Puritan merchants. However, in the country, his policies found little or no support except among a small group of Roman Catholics many of whom felt they were "pressed" into service and disliked it. By 1688, of a total number of forty-three Lord Lieutenants, sixteen were Catholics, and one-third of the Deputy Lieutenants in local county government were Catholics. These Lord Lieutenants were to ask prominent local Whig and Tory gentlemen, the
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Sheriffs, Deputy Lieutenants, and Justices of the Peace in their local counties three questions. These questions were: (1) if elected to Parliament, would they support repeal of the Penal Laws and Test Acts? (2) would they vote for individuals who did support repeal of these pieces of legislation? and (3) would they uphold the spirit of the Declaration of Indulgence by abiding peaceably with believers of all religious denominations?  

The response from the gentry was decisively negative. Evasion was commonly employed by noblemen to whom the questions were put, and the roster of gentlemen who refused to answer was "impressive." Sir John Knatchbull, a Tory gentleman, relates in his diary that a mixture of flattery, threats, and intimidation was employed by a supporter of the Court in an attempt to secure favorable responses to the three questions from him. Because of the obvious likeness of the answers rendered to the three questions, Whig and Tory gentlemen apparently conferred with one another concerning the form their answers would take. Thus, the unity necessary to make the later Glorious
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Revolution a success was emerging, though its aim at this stage was passive resistance.  

Less than ten percent of those individuals questioned committed themselves to support the King's aims. James's efforts to secure the election of a favorable Parliament through his three-questions scheme met with resistance on all sides. The episode of the Three Questions, which the Royalist Ailesbury referred to as a "'damnable project,'" caused the Tories to turn completely against the Crown. After the Exclusion Crisis, the Lieutenancies had been filled with Tories. They now resented their loss of power. The consensus of Tory opinion concerning James's attack on local government is reflected in the statement, "All the jolly, genteel citizens are turned out, and all sneaking fanatics put into their places." A major cause for the lack of success of the three-questions campaign was the fact that the landowning class in rural England shared an independent nature and a sense of social unity, and this group viewed the three questions as a an assault on their privileges.
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The three-questions episode greatly antagonized the Anglicans, and the King failed to win any further Dissenter support from this effort. In fact, James lost the support of Dissenters who previously had looked favorably upon his efforts to secure the repeal of the Penal Laws and Test Acts. As a result of their combined opposition to the three questions, a Dissenter-Anglican alliance began to emerge which was to play an important part in the course of the Revolution. The King's three questions brought the Revolution one step closer because those individuals questioned were forced to take a stand. In the words of William Penn, "'the method of questions has angered and united the nation'."54

Opposition to the King's actions was now so intense that he could not be sure that even those men he had hand-picked to sit in Parliament would support the repeal of the Penal Laws and Test Acts. Therefore the idea of calling a new Parliament had to be shelved. The King altered some town corporations three or four times in a single year. Indeed the corporation of Maldon was remodelled six times. This constant tampering with local government lessened regard for authority, increased opposition to the Crown,
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and caused the English populace to be more inclined to support an upheaval.\textsuperscript{55}

Even though the King's three-questions scheme met with strong opposition and further antagonized the populace, long-suffering Englishmen were willing to tolerate James's pro-Catholic policies in the belief that they were temporary. By 1684 James's wife, Mary of Modena, had endured eight pregnancies. As a result of either miscarriage or early childhood death, none of James's children had survived. Now fifty-four, James was beyond middle age by seventeenth-century standards. In light of the fact that by 1687, James and Mary had been trying unsuccessfully for fifteen years to produce a healthy heir, it seemed unlikely that they would have any more children. Because of these past failures, people felt that James was unable to produce healthy offspring. Mary had not been pregnant since 1682, and it was therefore supposed that either she or her husband had become sterile, especially since it was rumored that James suffered from venereal disease. Given the King's age, people believed that he would not live much longer. Therefore, in anticipation of the succession of James's Protestant daughter, Mary, and her Protestant husband, William of Orange, Englishmen were willing to bide
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their time in expectation that they would right the wrongs James had committed. However, in the winter of 1687, these hopes were shattered. For on December 23, 1687, it was announced that Mary of Modena was again pregnant.56

Once the Queen became pregnant, James resolved to do everything in his power to establish his pro-Catholic policies and to place Mary and her child in a secure position so that neither would be vulnerable to an assault by William of Orange should he himself die before the child came of age. To achieve his aim, James decided to continue his efforts to remodel the town corporations. His three-questions scheme was begun in the fall of 1687 and continued until the fall of 1688. He also decided to issue a second Declaration of Indulgence.57

In determining which of James's actions provided the greatest spark for the Revolution of 1688, David Ogg cites two: (1) the attack upon Parliamentary boroughs and (2) the reissue of the Declaration of Indulgence. Since the King and Court had been repulsed in the attempt to secure
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the election of a Parliament favorable to the repeal of the Penal Laws and Test Acts, and the attack on local government had been unsuccessful, James decided to issue a second Declaration of Indulgence as a reaffirmation of his resolve to have the Penal Laws and Test Acts repealed. On April 27, 1688, James reissued his Declaration of Indulgence and vowed that he would call Parliament into session by the following November. On May 4 he commanded that the Declaration be read in churches throughout the kingdom on four consecutive Sundays in May and June. 58

James's hope in issuing a second Declaration was that he would gain enough Dissenter support to allow him to forge an alliance of Dissenters and Roman Catholics which would be strong enough to force the Church of England to support his policies or bring about the Church's demise. If the Anglican clergy read the Declaration, they would be accomplices in the King's schemes and would be forced to adhere to the doctrine of nonresistance which they had long preached. If they refused to read it, they faced the charge of insubordination. By ordering the clergy to read the second Declaration, James was demanding that they declare

58 Ogg, JAMES II/WILLIAM III, 186; Ashley, JAMES II, 222; Robert Steele, ed., A BIBLIOGRAPHY of ROYAL PROCLAMATIONS of the TUDOR and STUART SOVEREIGNS 1483-1714 (New York: Burt Tranklein, 1910), 468 (hereafter cited as Steele, ed., PROCLAMATIONS); Davies, ESSAYS/STUARTS, 77.
emphatically whether their true loyalty lay with the Crown or with the Church.  

Since the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, the Church of England had strongly asserted its devotion to the doctrine of nonresistance. James was aware that for at least a generation the Anglican Church had instructed its flock that there was no situation in which defiance of the divinely appointed monarch could be condoned. Because of the Anglican Church's long-held adherence to the doctrine of nonresistance, there was no doubt in James's mind that he could treat its members any way he pleased and still have their unquestioning and complete support.

James had an unshakeable belief in the doctrine of Divine Right. God had put him on the throne, and James expected complete obedience from those subjects whom God had given him to rule. However, he failed to understand that the doctrine of Divine Right forbade active but not passive resistance. When the clergy preached obedience to the Sovereign, they did so in the belief that he would never deliberately challenge the Church's or their


authority. Bishop Morley had admonished the King that "'if ever he depended on the doctrine of nonresistance he would find himself deceived. The clergy might not think proper to contradict their doctrine in terms, but he was very sure they would in practice.'" The clergy's response to the second Declaration of Indulgence convinced James of the truth of Morley's statement.61

On May 18, 1688, after a conference among the heads of the Church of England concerning the second Declaration of Indulgence, seven bishops, among them Archbishop Sancroft, presented a petition to the King. In explaining their opposition, they declared that it was not the result of "any want of duty or obedience,...or of due tenderness to dissenters, which they would prove in parliament...but from this especially, that the declaration was founded upon such a dispensing power as had been declared illegal in parliament in 1662 and 1672 and at the beginning of the present reign." After asserting the illegality of the Declaration, the bishops declared that they could not support it and asked the King to excuse them from his command to read and to distribute the Declaration to their congregations. After receiving the petition, James declared, "This is a great suprise to me...This is a standard of rebellion...Is
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this what I have deserved, who have supported the Church of England, and will support it?...I will be obeyed...."62

By presenting this petition, which had been written by the Archbishop of Canterbury and signed by himself and six of the Established Church's most respected bishops, the bishops were asserting the belief that only Parliament had the power to make or repeal laws. The King did not have the power to suspend laws wholesale to achieve his ends as he had done with the Declaration of Indulgence. The bishops' intention in presenting the petition was to make a strong stand and to rally the support of all Englishmen against the King's effort to cause the downfall of the Anglican Church and the Protestant religion. The bishops' action has been described as "...one of the greatest public demonstrations of protest in modern English history." Two hours after the bishops presented their petition to the King, copies of it were being sold to an eager, receptive public, for some people even left their beds to obtain copies.63

James was to discover the intensity of opposition to the Declaration when the date appointed for reading it
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arrived. Of one hundred churches in the Capital, on the first day set aside for reading the Declaration, only four London churches complied with the King's order to read it, and his command was generally ignored in the countryside. During the total period in which the Declaration was to be read and dispersed, the clergy read it in just seven churches in the Capital and distributed it in six dioceses. The Anglican clergy were even more obstinate in their refusal to read the Declaration than English laymen had been about the issue of the Three Questions. It has been estimated that fewer than one in ten obeyed the King's command to publicize the Declaration. In those churches where the Declaration was read, the congregation either stayed away on those designated Sundays or completely ignored its contents as it was read. When Bishop Sprat attempted to read the Declaration in Westminster Abbey, his entire congregation deserted him.

Opposition to the second Declaration of Indulgence was evident not only among members of the Established Church but among Protestant Dissenters as well. The Dissenters sought toleration founded on Parliamentary sanction. Hoping to regain and strengthen Dissenter support, James promised in his second Declaration to work to obtain
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approval for toleration in a new Parliament. Yet, the King destroyed any chance of gaining Dissenter support by initiating a series of steps beginning with his command that the Anglican clergy read the Declaration in their churches. James attempted to extract an address of thanks for his second Declaration from the Protestant Dissenters. However, the body of Protestant Dissenters refused to bow to the pressure exerted by the King to issue such an address.

Far from drawing Dissenters to him, by issuing the second Declaration and ordering the Anglican clergy to read it, James's actions served to encourage the continuing development of a coalition of moderate Anglicans and Protestant Dissenters which had begun to form. Indeed, the bishops' petition was drawn up with the consent and support of moderate Dissenters, for within their petition the bishops declared that Anglican churchmen were "willing to come to such a temper as shall be thought fit when that matter [of toleration] shall be considered and settled in Parliament and Convocation." The Anglican Church's promise to work for a new religious settlement for Dissenters legally established by Parliament was a major factor in increasing the strength of the growing opposition to the King. The support of the Nonconformists was essential, for it
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provided the element of unity among the English clergy which allowed the Seven Bishops to present their petition to the King.66

Given the apparent strength of the alliance between the Anglican Church and the Protestant Dissenters, James felt the need to reaffirm his power, for he believed that his father, Charles I, had lost his throne and his life because he had been weak. In the matter of the Seven Bishops, Jeffreys and his Ecclesiastical Commission declined to become involved in the case, and the King's chief advisors, Sunderland and Petre, counselled James not to take action against the bishops because it would result in increased opposition to the King's policies.67

Contrary to the advice of his closest advisors, the King determined to initiate legal action against the Seven Bishops, reasoning that once they were convicted he could exercise his right to extend leniency to them. Having chosen his course, James believed that he had to adhere to it at all costs. He could only trust that the judiciary would support him with a decision against the bishops. On the first of June 1688, James decided upon the course he would follow with the bishops. On the eighth, the bishops were called before the Privy Council where they admitted
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having signed the petition but would answer no further questions for fear of incrimination. They were then charged with seditious libel. As spiritual peers, they refused to put forward a bond of recognizance and were ordered imprisoned in the Tower of London.68

John Evelyn relates that the bishops' presentation of their petition to the King had been "universally applauded." According to Evelyn, the public's continued support of the bishops was evident when they were sent to the Tower, for there were "infinite crowds on their knees begging their blessing, and praying for them, as they passed out of the barge along the Tower wharf." While the bishops were imprisoned, the King's Tower Guard toasted the prelates' health. When ordered to cease, they refused. During their incarceration, ten Dissenting ministers called upon the bishops. According to Reresby's account, when the King rebuked the ministers, they replied, "that they could not but adhere to them as men constant to the Protestant faith...." The nobility affirmed its support of the bishops when twenty-one nobles came forward to post bail. Once imprisoned, the bishops were viewed as martyrs. Evaluating the intensity of public support shown to the bishops when they were sent to the Tower, one historian maintains that,
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"It was the moment at which Episcopacy concluded, as it were, its alliance with the people of London." 69

Two days after the Seven Bishops were committed to the Tower, Mary of Modena gave birth to a son. During the preceding months, the impending birth had been viewed with a mixture of anticipation and foreboding. According to John Reresby, although there was much rejoicing at Court over the birth of the Prince of Wales, throughout England "...little notice may be said to have been taken of it. The imprisonment of the Bishops was now uppermost in the minds of most of the people." The English populace insisted on believing this baby to be an imposter for several reasons: (1) James and Mary were felt to be incapable of producing an heir; (2) James had failed to secure support for his pro-Catholic policies from his future heir, Mary, and her husband William of Orange; (3) Mary never let any of her ladies of the bedchamber be present when she dressed, which fuelled rumors that she was not really pregnant, and caused the Earl of Clarendon to declare in January of 1688 "It is strange to see how the Queen's great belly is everywhere ridiculed as if scarce anybody believed [it] to be true..."; and (4) among those individuals present at the birth, there was a dispute as to
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whether anyone actually heard the baby cry or saw the birth itself. Because the baby was immediately removed to an adjoining room and not actually seen by most of the individuals present until that time, greater weight was given to the rumor that the baby had died and an imposter put in its place.  

Although the legitimacy of the Prince is unquestioned today, at the time of the birth, James made matters worse by attempting to prove the legitimacy of the child by calling witnesses to give evidence regarding the birth. The birth of this male heir increased fears that England would now see a succession of Catholic rulers on the throne. The birth also helped to intensify apprehensions about James's efforts to recatholicize England. James fuelled these fears by naming the Pope as the Prince's Godfather.  

The King's chief advisor, Sunderland, was keenly aware of the growing uneasiness which the birth of the Prince of Wales produced in Protestant Englishmen. Therefore, he urged James to free the Seven Bishops in honor of the Prince's birth. Believing that it would be a sign of
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weakness if he backed down, James failed to seize the ideal chance to extricate himself from the predicament he had created by attacking the bishops, for he still trusted that they would be found guilty. James viewed the birth as a sign of God's blessing upon his efforts to bring England back to the Roman Catholic Church. Believing this, James refused to halt the prosecution of the Seven Bishops.\footnote{Ashley, JAMES II, 229; Miller, JAMES II, 187; Jones, REVOLUTION, 54-55; Trevelyan, ENGLAND/STUARTS, 5:364.}

In the case of the Seven Bishops, the important constitutional issue of the legality of the suspending and dispensing powers was confronted. The defense contended that the Sovereign did not have the legal right to suspend laws wholesale concerning religion. Counsel for the defense declared, "If the King may suspend the laws of our land which concern our religion, I am sure there is no other law but he may suspend; and if the King may suspend all the laws of the kingdom, what a condition are all the subjects in for their lives, liberties and properties! All at mercy!" Finally, the defense argued that the issue was if, in fact, the prelates possessed the privilege of petitioning the King; the bishops' counsel strongly maintained that the bishops did have this legal right.\footnote{Tanner, CONFLICTS, 293; Ashley, JAMES II, 230.}

The prosecution argued that the bishops were guilty of seditious libel because they had lessened the King's
authority by declaring that he had acted illegally. The royal prosecutors pointed to the Hales Case to support the legality of the dispensing power. They also maintained that the bishops did not possess the right to petition the King privately and could only do so in Parliament. However, even the Justices of the King's Bench were aghast at this assertion. One of them declared, "It is the birthright of the subject to petition." 74

Public support for the bishops was widespread. More than thirty peers gave the bishops moral support by attending the trial. Their presence had a great effect on both the judges and the jury. There was a large crowd of spectators at the trials, and the onlookers were fiercely biased toward the bishops. The King's advisor, Sunderland, had just converted to Catholicism, and when he took the stand, the crowd drowned out his testimony with hissing sounds. Although the judges were divided on the issue of the bishops' innocence, two of the Justices of the King's Bench showed their support of the bishops by openly denouncing the dispensing power. Justices Powell and Holloway declared, "If this be once allowed of, there will need no Parliament: all the legislature will be in the King." 75
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Throughout his reign, James had appointed Justices to the Bench whom he expected to support his pro-Catholic policies. As a safeguard, he met with the Justices prior to the trial. Clarendon declared it was believed that the bishops' petition was discussed. The jury was selected by the sheriffs who were advocates of the King's cause. In accordance with tradition, the jury was deprived of food, heat, and light as it deliberated throughout the night. This placed the members of the jury under mental and physical strain. Yet, in spite of the many efforts by the King and his men to influence the outcome of the trial, the Seven Bishops were found 'Not Guilty'.76

The public reaction to the acquittal was immediate and intense. After it was announced, one of the Justices expressed satisfaction at the verdict. The audience at the trial cheered for half an hour. The Pope was subsequently burned in effigy by a crowd gathered at St. James's Palace. In Somerset, an effigy of the Prince of Wales was burned. In London, church bells rang; candles were placed in all the windows; and more bonfires were lit than at the news of the birth of the Prince of Wales. These bonfires were lit not only in London but throughout the country. According to Gilbert Burnet, Englishmen were "transported with joy." Of even greater importance is Burnet's description of the
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army's reaction. He declared that there was "universal shouting" within the ranks of the King's army "as if it had won a victory." 77

The 'Not Guilty' verdict was rendered largely because of the pressure of public opinion, and with the trial of the Seven Bishops, the power of the doctrine of nonresistance was broken. James's use of the suspending power as set forth in his Declaration of Indulgence was found to be illegal. The decision in the Seven Bishops' Case was an indictment of the King's form of government. J. P. Kenyon asserts that with the 'not guilty' verdict "began the slide which ended in James's deposition. The legality of his main policy...had been challenged and found wanting...." 78

With the prosecution of the Seven Bishops, James had tried unsuccessfully to make the law courts subservient to his will. After the trial, he removed the two Judges, Powell and Holloway, who had shown favor to the Seven Bishops at the trial. The Dutch envoy, Frederick

77 Havighurst, "James II/Scarlet," 539; Miller, JAMES II, 187; Burnet, HOT, 470.

Zuylestein, declared, "The King will continue none but those who will help to maintain his prerogative." 79

To James, the outcome of the trial was both surprising and degrading. Following the trial, he attempted to reassert his power to govern. He ordered the Ecclesiastical Commission to discipline all clergy who had failed to read the Declaration of Indulgence. It was obvious that most of the clergy had failed to read it, but the Ecclesiastical Commission failed to take action against them. James commanded that those individuals who had lit bonfires in recognition of the bishops' acquittal should be reprimanded. However, Grand Juries refused to indict offenders. The King also demanded that when Parliament next met, it should abrogate the Penal Laws and Test Acts. Upon royal orders, judges on circuit encouraged the populace to support candidates favorable to Liberty of Conscience. These judges and those who criticized the bishops met with insults. With the bishops' acquittal, Englishmen who had been silently hostile to the King now openly defied him and his subordinates. 80

The trial of the Seven Bishops further antagonized both the Anglican Church and the Nonconformists whose aid James needed to secure toleration in the next Parliament.
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With the bishops' promise of support for toleration in their petition, this resulted in a strengthening of the alliance between the Anglican Church and the Nonconformists. 81

In April of 1688, William of Orange had been invited by Admiral Russell and the Whigs to come and help England free herself from the domination of a Catholic King, but it was the birth of a male heir and the attacks on the Seven Bishops and the Church of England which precipitated the final stage of the Revolution. Because of the birth of the Prince of Wales and the prospect of a succession of Catholic kings, Englishmen realized that they must take action. It was no longer possible to cling to the long-held doctrine of nonresistance. 82

On the evening of the bishops' acquittal, an invitation was sent to William of Orange to come over to England. That the invitation was sent on June 30th was significant for the Seven Bishops had had the courage to challenge the doctrine of nonresistance. The invitation was signed by the Earl of Danby, the Earl of Devonshire, Sir Henry Sidney, Admiral Russell, the Earl of Shrewsbury, Lord Lumley, and Bishop Compton of London. Devonshire, Sidney, Ashley, JAMES II, 230, 234, 231; Kenyon, STUART ENGLAND, 245.
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and Russell were Whigs. Danby and Bishop Compton represented the Tory and Church Party. Lumley and Shrewsbury had recently become Protestants, and they signed the petition to show the nation's strong support of Protestantism. The future of England seemed to them to be in danger unless they took action to halt the King, and they did not feel that they could secure a rebellion without the help of William of Orange. William wanted to make sure that a predominantly Catholic England would not develop, become allied with and dominated by Louis XIV of France, and threaten the security of the Netherlands. William had led a lifelong campaign to reduce Louis XIV's power in Europe. 83

In the invitation, the signatories declared,

...the people are so generally dissatisfied with the present conduct of the government in relation to their religion, liberties and properties (all which have been greatly invaded), and they are in such expectations of their propsect being daily worse, that your Highness may be assured there are nineteen parts of twenty of the people throughout the kingdom who are desirous of a change, and who we believe, would willingly contribute to it if they had such a protection to countenance their rising as would secure them from being destroyed before they could get to be [in] a posture able to defend themselves.

---

83 Foxcroft, HALIFAX, 1:508; Feiling, HISTORY/TORY PARTY, 224, citing Ballard MSS., 21, f. 19, Bodleian Library (Sykes to Charlett, 14 Aug.); Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 50; Prall, BLOODLESS REVOLUTION, 204-206.
In regard to the birth of the Prince of Wales, they asserted, "not one in a thousand here believes [him] to be the queen's...." 84

Once James became aware that the Dutch were making naval preparations directed against him, he began to make concessions in an attempt to avoid the impending attack. In an effort to secure the support of the Church of England, he: (1) issued a blanket amnesty for all political offenses; (2) stated that he would consider the bishops' advice; (3) reinstated the charter of the city of London; (4) removed Catholic Lord Lieutenants from their offices and rebuked those men who had tried to "regulate" the boroughs in order to pack Parliament; (5) restored borough charters altered or recalled since 1679; and (6) reinstated Henry Compton, Bishop of London. 85

On their part, the bishops demanded that James: (1) right the abuses done to the Church of England; (2) cease to issue quo warranto warrants; (3) refrain from using the dispensing power until a new Parliament met and determined its legality; (4) return the members of the aristocracy to their rightful places of authority in local government; (5) abolish the Ecclesiastical Commission; (6) restore the President and Fellows of Magdalen College; (7) prohibit

---

84 Browning, ed., ENGLISH HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS 1660-1714, 8:120-21.
85 Ashley, JAMES II, 242.
Catholics from teaching in the schools; and (8) remove the ecclesiastical power of foreign bishops who should not be used to fill vacant bishoprics.  

In return for these concessions, James asked the bishops to sign a document denouncing William's imminent invasion. This they refused to do. The only aid they offered the King was to pray for him. They sensed that he had only granted concessions out of fear. If William's invasion were repelled, and James managed to obtain the election of a packed Parliament favorable to his pro-Catholic aims, the clergy believed that he would fail to keep his promises. Anglican Churchmen and Lords presented a petition to the King urging him to summon a freely elected Parliament in order to prevent the imminent invasion. James issued a proclamation in September promising to try to obtain religious toleration legally, not to allow Catholics to sit in Parliament, and to remedy grievances after William's invasion had been successfully repulsed. However, almost as soon as the writs were issued for the calling of a new Parliament, the King had them withdrawn citing the need to concentrate on the approaching invasion.

---

86 Ibid.
87 Ibid., 242-43; Agar-Ellis, ed., THE ELLIS CORRESPONDENCE, 2:307-308; Steele, ed., PROCLAMATIONS, 468-69; Feiling, HISTORY/TORY PARTY, 228.
During the Revolution itself, the English clergy played a decisive role. Bishop Compton obtained the support of important men of the kingdom because of his widespread family connections and because of the fact that he was viewed as a martyr for the Church of England. When James's own daughter, Anne, deserted to join William's camp, she was assisted in her flight by the Bishop of London. Her desertion was psychologically devastating to James. Through their sermons, the clergy did not encourage Englishmen to actively oppose the King, but rather simply not to come to his aid. In the words of Halifax, "The people can seldom agree to move together against a Government, but they can sit still and let it be undone." 88

James also failed to secure the full support of the militia and the army in the Revolution of 1688. Because the militia had shown itself to be incapable during Monmouth's Rebellion, the King had permitted it to deteriorate. When he called upon it to come to his defense in 1688, it was in complete disorder. The Catholic officers and Lord Lieutenants James had placed in office were untrained, despised by their subordinates, and failed to perform their duties properly. Members of the militia

even rallied to William's cause against their King in 1688. 89

The fact that James had contantly been changing the Lord Lieutenants over the last several years added to the disorganization. The King tried to get the Tories whom he had removed from office to serve either as Lord Lieutenants or as deputies under Catholics or under Protestants that had been returned to office. When William landed, the populace was alienated from James, and the Lord Lieutenants either failed to act or were disloyal. This was especially true in light of the fact that those officials who returned to their former positions did so with great hesitancy, feeling that "one kick of the breech [was] enough." 90

There was a steady stream of desertions to William's cause by both Tory "country gentlemen" and members of the army. The King lacked the support of the navy as well. Some of the King's highest-ranking commanders deserted his cause from the army that had raised shouts of joy when the Seven Bishops were acquitted. The men of the army resented James's action of bringing regiments from Ireland to serve with them. Seven officers were dismissed because they refused to accept Irish Catholics in their companies, and other soldiers resigned in a show of support for them.

89 Miller, "Militia/Army," 659, 661-63.

90 Ibid., 667-68, 671; Davies, ESSAYS/STUARTS, 84.
Rumors spread throughout the army that Irishmen were being sent over to slash the throats of Protestant officers. The fact that James had neither the support of the militia, the army, the gentry, nor the peerage enabled William with an army of fourteen thousand men to repulse the efforts of a King with an army of forty thousand men.91

The actions and inaction of both the Dissenters and the nobility were decisive factors in James's defeat. In spite of the King's efforts to gain Dissenter support, the Nonconformists failed to rally to James. William of Orange had the active support of Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Other Dissenters were so strongly critical of James that they would not actively oppose William. According to J. P. Kenyon, "It was the inactivity, as well as the activity of [the nobility] that decided the issue in 1688." James's campaign to pack Parliament had assured the alliance of the aristocracy and the gentry in the Revolution.92

Finally, James did not obtain much assistance from Louis XIV of France during the Revolution. Louis XIV's support of James was more talk than action. Louis was

---

91 Feiling, HISTORY/TORY PARTY, 232-33, citing DER FALL des HAUSES STUART (Hoffman's Despatch, 6 Dec.); Davies, ESSAYS/STUARTS, 83, 87; Miller, "Militia/Army," 672, 679.

92 Lacey, DISSENT/POLITICS, 215-16; Kenyon, STUARTS, 160; Jones, REVOLUTION, 131.
interested in expanding France's influence into both Germany and Spain. Therefore, he did not want to tie down his forces by committing them to a defense of England. The French King viewed James's position as both weak and unpopular. Louis also feared that if he aided England directly or actively opposed William of Orange, a strong Anglo-Dutch alliance would form against him. By doing nothing, Louis XIV hoped that England and the Netherlands would cancel each other's strength, leaving France free to pursue its expansionist aims.¹³

As a result of a long series of unwise acts, James had no real support behind him when William of Orange landed with his forces on November 5, 1688. According to John Evelyn, the country prayed "incessantly for an east wind" to aid the landing of William's forces. Unlike the response to Monmouth's Rebellion, Anthony Wood relates that the country failed to rally behind the King when William's invasion appeared imminent.⁹⁴

Rather than try to fight William from such a weak position, James fled to France. He fled for two reasons: (1) he feared that his life was in danger; and (2) he

---

¹³ Prall, BLOODLESS REVOLUTION, 107; Aylmer, STRUGGLE/CONSTITUTION, 214-15.

⁹⁴ Ashley, JAMES II, 250; Bray, ed., EVELYN'S DIARY, 2:278; Clark, ed., WOOD'S LIFE, 267.
believed that he would be in a stronger position in France to handle the situation. He fully believed that he would be allowed to return once calm was restored. However, his fears for his safety were groundless. Had James been harmed, he would have been viewed as a martyr, and William's cause would have been irreparably damaged.  

With his final flight, the King displayed a total disregard for the well-being of England's people and government. He destroyed the writs calling for a new Parliament and ordered the army disbanded. Finally, in what can only be viewed as an act of contempt, James threw the Great Seal into the River Thames as he fled. In such a manner James II lost his throne during the Glorious Revolution.

---
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CONCLUSION

The origins of the Glorious Revolution were mainly religious in nature, although questions of religion had led to serious disputes about government, law, and the constitution. The English people's fear of Catholicism had given rise to the episode of the Popish Plot. The fear of a Catholic monarch on the throne had resulted in the Exclusion Crisis of 1678-1681. The attempt to exclude James failed, and he ultimately ascended the throne. In an effort to reestablish Catholicism in England, he proceeded to alienate every segment of society. He antagonized Parliament by trying to force it to repeal the Test Act. He irritated the Anglican Church by his attacks on the Seven Bishops and the universities. His actions against the bishops alienated the Nonconformists as well. He antagonized the landed class by attempting to pack Parliament with his three-questions scheme and by taking local government out of their hands and placing Catholics and Royalist supporters in the position of Lord Lieutenants. Finally, the ultimate blow was the birth of a male heir. It was then that the nation felt that it must take action, and the Revolution of 1688 resulted. Ultimately, the Revolution was the result of the anti-Catholicism of the English people and of their disgust with James II's pro-Catholic policies.
The animosity which most Englishmen felt concerning the recent actions of their King was reflected in the Revolution Settlement of 1689. This Settlement ensured that there could be no repetition of the assaults upon Church and State suffered under the rule of James II. The suspending power was declared illegal, and the dispensing power as employed by James during recent years was also declared illegal. Tenure for judges on the bench was secured following the Revolution, making them independent of the King's wishes. The law could now only be changed with Parliamentary consent. No standing army could be maintained without Parliamentary approval. Following the Revolution the King was forced to seek Parliamentary grants of money on a yearly basis. This financial arrangement made certain that the King would never again be granted such large amounts of money as to render the calling of Parliament unnecessary. Finally, under the Toleration Act of 1689, religious persecution of Protestant Dissenters ceased, and they were given the right to worship freely. Although no relief was granted to Catholics, William III made every effort to deter attempts to prosecute them for their religious beliefs. Yet, whatever political or religious disabilities remained, the Revolution of 1688 opened
the way to a time of increased tolerance, and it was in reaction to the pro-Catholic policies of James II that all of these changes resulted. ¹

¹Havighurst, "James II/Scarlet," 545-46; Trevelyan, ENGLISH REVOLUTION, 88, 87, 94, 95-96, 82, 84; Carswell, DESCENT/ENGLAND, 64.
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