CATHOLICS IN AMERICA

A History

Patrick W. Carey

Greenwood
PUBLISHING GROUP

CATHOLICS IN AMERICA

This page intentionally left blank

CATHOLICS IN AMERICA

A HISTORY

PATRICK W. CAREY

PRAEGER

Westport, Connecticut
London

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Carey, Patrick W., 1940–
Catholics in America : a history / by Patrick W. Carey.
p. cm.
Rev. ed. of: The Roman Catholics. c1993.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-275-98255-6 (alk. paper)
1. Catholic Church—United States—History. 2. Catholics—United States—Biography. 3. United States—Church history. I. Carey, Patrick W., 1940- Roman Catholics. II. Title.
BX1406.3.C36 2004
282′.73—dc22 2004014662

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data is available.

Copyright © 2004 by Patrick W. Carey

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced, by any process or technique, without the express written consent of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 2004014662
ISBN: 0-275-98255-6

First published in 2004

Praeger Publishers, 88 Post Road West, Westport, CT 06881
An imprint of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.
www.praeger.com

Printed in the United States of America

The paper used in this book complies with the Permanent Paper Standard issued by the National Information Standards Organization (Z39.48-1984).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

To Phyllis

A Pearl of Great Price

This page intentionally left blank

CONTENTS

	Preface	ix
	Abbreviations	xi
1	Colonial Catholicism: 1492–1840	1
2	A Free Church in a Free State: 1776–1815	17
3	Internal Conflicts, Nativism, and Immigrant Catholicism: 1815–1866	27
4	Reconstruction and Expansion: 1866–1884	47
5	Americanism: 1884–1899	55
6	Catholicism in the Progressive Era: 1900–1920	67
7	The Roaring Twenties, the Depression, and World War II: 1920–1945	79
8	Catholicism in the Cold War: 1945–1965	93
9	Post–Vatican II Catholicism: 1965–1990	115
10	Troubled Times: 1990–2003	141
	Biographical Entries	171
	Chronology	235
	Notes	241
	Bibliography	267
	Index	271

This page intentionally left blank

PREFACE

CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN CATHOLICISM, like its earlier forms, appears to many outside the tradition as a monolithic unity because of its centralized forms of government and its reliance on institutions as signs of its strength and authority. Yet within Catholicism there are movement and change, adaptation and renewal, a manifold and dizzying diversity, and an openness and freedom that challenge neat historical categories. Whether the historian focuses on the elite articulators and institutional implementations of the Catholic tradition or on the people's reception and the popular, or folk, amalgamative appropriations of that tradition, he or she is in constant danger of overlooking or minimizing something that is significant to the total historical experience. History is not an exact science, and that is nowhere more evident than in the attempts to describe religious traditions—and especially in my own attempts here to make sense of American Catholicism.

This text is divided into two sections, the first being a narrative of selected themes and the second a series of biographical essays. The narrative focuses on the themes of continuity and change, unity and diversity, growth and decline, alienation and reconciliation, as these recur in the institutional, intellectual, spiritual, ethnic, and political or social developments of the church. The first section analyzes in particular how the American experience itself (with its predominantly Protestant and republican culture) has influenced the reception and modification of the Catholic tradition.

The second section of this book contains a series of biographical sketches of significant ecclesiastical and lay leaders in American Catholicism. Because of the limits of space, I have selected only those deemed most important to the church's development. Most, although not all, of the individuals included in the biographical sketches are mentioned in the historical narrative, and where a name is first mentioned it is followed by an asterisk.

This volume also contains a basic chronology of the most important historical events in American Catholicism and a selected list of books for further reading and research.

I am indebted to my teachers Colman Barry, O.S.B., Gerald Fogarty, S.J., and Robert Handy in particular for introducing me to the study of the religious and specifically Catholic dimension of American life. Many other teachers and historians also have a share in this work, some are acknowledged in the notes, but many others remain unacknowledged simply because I have, over the years, appropriated so many of their interpretations that I no longer remember where

I first got them and have unconsciously made their insights my own. I hope, however, that I have given proper citation to sources where I have been explicitly aware of my debt.

I am also grateful for grants from Marquette University's Religious Commitment Fund, the Graduate School, and the sabbatical leave program that enabled me to complete this revised text as well as the original on which it is based. I am thankful, moreover, to my chairmen, Philip Rossi, S.J., and John Laurance, S.J., for periodically providing me with a reduced teaching load to complete this text.

In preparing much of the text I had the pleasure of being aided by a number of graduate research assistants. For their help I would like to thank David Schimpf, Dominic Scibilia, Michael Naughton, Rebecca Kasper, Jonathan Zemler, and Pam Young, C.S.J. Nathan Schmeidicke was particularly helpful in preparing the balance of the text for publication.

This text is dedicated to Phyllis, who has been for over thirty years of married life the pearl of great price of which the Book of Proverbs (31:10) speaks: "A perfect wife—who can find her? She is far beyond the price of pearls."

ABBREVIATIONS

AER	*American Ecclesiastical Review*, 1889–1975 (also called *Ecclesiastical Review*, 1905–1943).
CDF	Congregation (Roman) for the Doctrine of the Faith
CH	*Church History*
CHR	*Catholic Historical Review*
CTSA	Catholic Theological Society of America
JCP	*The John Carroll Papers*, ed. Thomas O'Brien Hanley, 3 vols. (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1976).
NCCB/USCC	National Council of Catholic Bishops/United States Catholic Conference (1966), successor to NCWC
NCR	*National Catholic Reporter*
NCWC	National Catholic War Council (1917); National Catholic Welfare Council (1919); National Catholic Welfare Conference (1922).
NYT	*New York Times*
PL	*Pastoral Letters of the United States Catholic Bishops*, ed. Hugh J. Nolan, 5 vols. (Washington, D.C.: NCCB/USCC, 1989); *Pastoral Letters and Statements of the United States Catholic Bishops*, vol. 6, *1989–1997*, ed. Patrick W. Carey (Washington, D.C.: NCCB/USCC, 1998)
RACHS	*Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Pennsylvania*
TS	*Theological Studies*
USCC	United States Catholic Conference, see NCCB/USCC
USCCB	United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (2000), successor to NCCB/USCC
U.S.CH	*U.S. Catholic Historian*

This page intentionally left blank

1

COLONIAL CATHOLICISM: 1492–1840

FROM THE SIXTEENTH to the early nineteenth century, Spanish, French, and English missionaries, merchants, explorers, soldiers, governors, and their servants and slaves brought a Catholic presence to the New World. As part of the colonial expansion of their respective empires, the missionaries came to sustain the religious life of their compatriots and to evangelize the newly discovered peoples who inhabited the lands the colonials explored. They intermittently established parishes and missions to the Indians on the southern borderlands of the present United States from Florida to the Southwest, along the California coastland, on the northern borderlands from the St. Lawrence Seaway to the western Great Lakes, down the Mississippi River to New Orleans, and on the Mid-Atlantic coastlands of Maryland and Pennsylvania.

From the mid-sixteenth century onward, Catholicism existed in numerous isolated and loosely organized religious communities shepherded primarily by missionaries who were, until 1790, without the benefit of the episcopacy and other major ecclesiastical institutions. The missionary enterprise was motivated by the long Christian tradition of spreading the faith and by the exploratory, colonizing, commercial, and military aims of the empires it represented. The execution of these mixed motives produced both good and bad results, from the establishment of the first stable Spanish parish and mission in St. Augustine, Florida, in 1565 to the eventual secularization of the Spanish Indian missions in California in the 1830s. Because the missionary efforts were so closely aligned with the strengths and weaknesses of the states they represented, they generally experienced the fate of the political bodies with which they were identified. Spanish and French Catholicism waned as soon as did Spanish and French political power; English Catholicism persisted because it was hitched to Anglo-American fortunes.

SPANISH MISSIONS

On 12 October 1492, under the patronage of the Spanish, the Italian navigator Christopher Columbus and his sailor companions landed on one of the

Bahamian Islands and named it San Salvador. That discovery opened up for the Spanish empire a new era of discovery, colonization, and evangelization, but also expansionism, cupidity, and rapacity. By the mid-sixteenth century, Spanish commercial and military powers as well as a full complement of ecclesiastical institutions (including dioceses, bishoprics, schools, and numerous missions) were well established throughout the Antilles, Mexico, and Central and South America. By that time, too, the Spanish had explored the regions north of their central power bases—from Florida across the southern part of the United States into Texas and Mexico; from Mexico into the northern interiors of New Mexico, Arizona, and Kansas (discovering in the process the Colorado River, the Rio Grande River, and the Grand Canyon); and from Mexico along the California coast to San Francisco.

The Spanish decided to establish military and ecclesiastical institutions on the northern reaches of their southern empire not because they discovered gold or commercial advantage in these lands, but primarily because they feared foreign—French, English, Russian, or American Indian—encroachments upon their southern American empire. In 1565, for example, Spain established a military outpost and a mission at St. Augustine in Florida once it learned that French Huguenots had planted a colony north of St. Augustine. Later, because of the threat of English colonies to the north, Spain sustained St. Augustine as a strategic outpost in the defense of the empire. New Spain established permanent settlements and supported missionary efforts in Texas only at the beginning of the eighteenth century because of French presence at New Orleans and along the Mississippi River. The early establishments in Arizona at the end of the seventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth centuries were in response to the threat of American Indian invasions of Spanish territories further south. The late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century Spanish movements into Upper California were reactions to the Russian settlements in Alaska. The one exception to this defensive posture appears to be the motivation for building Santa Fe and other New Mexican military and missionary outposts in the early seventeenth century.

The missions to the Indians as well as the presidios were, in Herbert E. Bolton's phrase, "outposts of empire." The intersecting of religious and military objectives was clear in the establishment of these two characteristic institutions of the Spanish empire on the northern frontier.[1] The presidio protected the Spanish empire further south, provided military assistance to the Indian missions, and helped enforce Christian discipline within them. The missions themselves provided the benefits of religion to the military, served as buffer zones between the Spanish military outposts and unfriendly Indians, became listening posts that provided the military with intelligence about warring Indian tribes and the movements of the French and English, and supplied the military with Christianized Indians to wage war against unfriendly Indians and invading foreigners.

For three centuries, Spanish missionaries developed five major mission territories on the North American frontiers and worked to convert the Indians to Christianity. Although the duration of these Indian missions varied from

territory to territory, they all passed through three similar phases of historical development: establishment and organization, a golden age of success and prosperity, and, because of various internal and external problems, a period of decline and ruin from which they never rebounded even though some Spanish Catholic influence lingered on in these territories. The Florida missions lasted 198 years (1565–1763), those in New Mexico 230 years (1598–1680; 1692–1840), those in Texas 134 years (1659–1793),[2] those in Arizona 142 years (1700–1842), and those in California 65 years (1769–1834).

The Spanish established the missions to evangelize the Indians and thereby save their souls. To accomplish these goals they frequently sought to separate the Indians from their former way of life and to introduce and incorporate them into Spanish culture. The two complementary methods, separation and incorporation, were so integrally related that it was difficult for the Spanish or the Indians to distinguish between them. The missionaries believed that all people, Indians and Spaniards alike, were subjects of sin and redemption. The missionaries' task was to preach the good news of Christian redemption and free the Indians from their condition of sinful bondage. Many missionaries, however, identified the universal condition of sin with the Indian culture, which they saw as pagan and corrupt. Redemption and conversion meant more to these missionaries than freedom from the universality of sin; it meant that Indian civilization itself had to be replaced by a Christianized Spanish culture.[3] Such a conception of the missionary task remained the dominant tradition among the Spanish from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.

The Spanish missionaries emphasized not so much individual conversions as the communal means necessary for living a sanctified Christian life. Prior to baptism, the missionaries gave their prospective converts a basic introduction to the *Credo*, believing that such a rudimentary knowledge of Christianity was all that European Catholic peasants possessed. But even this elementary introduction to Christianity could take years, because the missionaries had to learn the Indian languages, discover concepts that could communicate the message of Christian redemption, and convince their prospective converts of the benefits of Christianity.

The missionaries also provided new forms of communal and cultural supports for the Christian neophytes. Once baptized, the Indians were generally separated from their tribes to form new Christian communities. Under the guidance of the missionaries, the new Christians lived a routine quasi-monastic life of worship and work. In this ideal setting they were to experience regular hours of prayer, a cycle of annual liturgical celebrations, a cult of Mary and the saints, seasons of fasting, and daily catechetical instruction. Within such a communal life, the children of the new converts would receive baptism and likewise be nurtured in the Christian life.

Life in an Indian mission also demanded Christian discipline. Those who offended the moral and civil standards of mission life were duly punished, and those who ran away were brought back to the missions by military force. Once

baptized and initiated into the Christian community, the converts were expected to live in conformity with Christian and moral standards of Spanish social life.

The Spanish conceived of the Indian missions as transitory institutions that would provide the means of redemption, a basic evangelical introduction to and experience of Christian living, communal support, discipline, and a system for weaning the Christian neophytes away from their former pagan lifestyle. Regular hours for work in fields, tending cattle, preparing food, and building homes, churches, and other institutions for the mission became a significant part of mission life for the Indians and their clergy. Such a sedentary lifestyle fitted the Spanish pattern of civilization and religion, but it was frequently contrary to the nomadic style of life led by many Indians. Although the missionaries learned how the Indians lived off the land, they taught them how to use the implements and arts of Spanish culture to provide for themselves in a Spanish Christian society.

On occasion, some Spanish missionaries adapted themselves to Indian culture as a means of evangelization. This second method, although frequently a part of the practice of separation and incorporation, demonstrated respect for Indian customs and used Indian languages as a means of communicating the Christian gospel. From Bartolomé de Las Casas in the sixteenth century to Eusebio Kino,* S.J., in the eighteenth, moreover, missionaries here and there—horrified by the soldiers' rapacity, the merchants' and traders' cupidity, and the state's destruction of the Indians and their way of life—saw themselves as defenders of the Indians' natural rights and as barriers against the harsh and unjust governmental treatment and official massacres of the Indians. Although some missionaries were rigorous disciplinarians within the Indian missions, they rarely exercised the kind of violence that issued from other quarters of Spanish society. The line between the missionaries' complicity and their actual participation in the demolition of Indian culture was generally very thin, however.

Although the missions had some successes, they did not flourish for long nor did they serve a significant percentage of the Indian population. Eventually they all came to an end. In 1859 John Gilmary Shea, a historian of American Catholicism, wrote that the cause of their annihilation was not some inherent weakness in the mission system. For him, "the interference of government alone crushed them; . . . their ruin is chargeable to the English and Mexican governments, and to the inborn hostility of the Anglo-Saxon race to the Indians."[4] Internal difficulties, however, as well as external forces created, even in times of success, setbacks and eventually a period of decline and ruin.

Most of the missions shared similar internal reasons for their ultimate decline and failure. For almost three hundred years, Catholicism on the northern frontiers of the Spanish empire was much like a preparatory school that had no available higher education. The Spanish Indian missions, although here and there temporarily successful, never developed Indian churches with native dioceses, bishops, parish priests, and all the sacramental and educational means necessary for nurturing and sustaining a mature Christian community. The

Spanish commitment to the missionary efforts on the northern borderlands was never more than tenuous and marginal. Spain did not have the resources or the power to build the institutions necessary to sustain the Catholic Church in North America. The establishment of the Spanish church would have brought with it the full complement of Spanish political, financial, and military power—as it had in Mexico and other Spanish dominions—but this never happened in the North American Spanish colonies. In the larger conception of Spanish policy in the Americas, as Bolton pointed out, the borderland missions were from their origins to their end mere defensive "outposts of empire."

Missionary success, even with the full complement of Spanish resources, would have been limited because of the clash of cultures. The Spanish Christian and the Indian cultures never accommodated themselves very easily to one another. The missionaries, soldiers, and governors, moreover, generally agreed that the best way to Christianize the Indians was to destroy their culture or at least keep the baptized Indians separated from their pagan backgrounds. Frequently the converted Indians living in the sedentary missions felt the pull of their former nomadic way of life and ran away, only to be brought back forcibly by the arm of the law. Some missionaries, though, believed that it was unrealistic to expect the Indians to separate themselves completely from their former cultures. In 1714, Antonio de Miranda, O.F.M., recommended that the missionary have patience in weaning the Indians from their former lifestyles: "Little by little he [the missionary] removes the weeds, and through patience he comes to see the garden free of darnel. But to will that the new plant bear leaves, flowers, and fruit all at once is to will not to harvest anything."[5]

Not all missionaries were as patient or hopeful about Christianizing the Indians or retaining the new converts. Father Joseph Perez, O.F.M., complained in 1817 that, after 130 years of missionary preaching at San Ignacio Mission in Arizona, only those Christian Indians who had died were safe (i.e., saved). "The grownups are full of superstitions, and no matter how the ministers work they do not believe them because they have more faith in their old medicine men."[6] After generations of missionary preaching and teaching, the missionaries could not eradicate the pull of the Indian way of life, and the Indians continued to practice their old religions.

Other internal forces eventually brought the missions to an end. Many missionaries failed to learn the Indian languages and cultures and failed to translate Christianity into Indian ways of thinking. The Indians themselves, because of the harsh treatment they received, periodically rebelled against Spanish military intrusions and missionary tactics. The cycle of revolt and Spanish retaliations increased the instability of mission life and, in many cases, brought about the ruin of the missions. Church–state conflicts, usually between the missionaries and the military governors over jurisdiction and control of the Indians, also contributed to the decline. The inability of the Spanish to provide a constant supply of food and other material benefits, which were used to induce the Indians to remain in the missions, caused Indians to abandon their Christian

missions. Deadly diseases, some of them brought by the Europeans, were also frequent visitors at the missions, and many Indians feared that the missionaries and the missions themselves were causes of death.

Even if the missions could have held up under the burdens of their own internal difficulties, they could not withstand the external forces that eventually destroyed them. The Anglo-American military force against the missions in Florida, the constant raids of unfriendly Indian tribes in Texas and the Southwest, the loss of Spanish political power and stability in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the Spanish removal of the Jesuit missionaries in the late eighteenth century, the Mexican War of Independence (1810–1820), the struggle for Texas independence (1820–1836), and the Mexican secularization of the California missions in the 1830s–all of these diverted political and economic attention away from the missions, leaving them without the supports necessary for their survival.

In terms of Christian intention, the missions were successful even though they had only a few lasting monuments to their credit. The gospel was preached, the kingdom of Christ was being spread to the "ends of the earth," genuine converts undoubtedly were made, salvation was made possible for numbers of natives, and missionaries fulfilled their own Christian responsibilities with zeal. These kinds of successes are not easily measured by the historian.

Although Spanish Catholicism was unsuccessful in making many Christian converts of the Indians, it did leave a remnant of Catholic presence in the territories the Spanish missionaries originally discovered and evangelized. That remnant became the foundation of an episcopally organized church. Cuba established a diocese in New Orleans in 1793 and sent a bishop, Luis Ignacio Marie de Penalver y Cardenas-Porro, there until 1801; Mexico appointed Francisco Garcia-Diego y Moreno to the two Californias in 1840. For the most part, though, the Americans would be responsible for establishing the institutional church in those areas. They erected dioceses and sent bishops to Galveston in 1842, Santa Fe and Monterey in 1850, St. Augustine in 1857, and Tucson in 1868. That is a story, however, for nineteenth-century American Catholicism.

FRENCH MISSIONS

The acquisition of fish and fur and a desire to spread the faith brought French Catholics to North America in the seventeenth century. From Acadia to the St. Lawrence Seaway to the Great Lakes and down the Mississippi to the Gulf of Mexico, the French established a colonial empire that encircled the English colonies to the south and east and provided a buffer for the Spanish to the west. Although the French built a few missionary outposts within the present boundaries of the United States, they had little success in sustaining them except in New Orleans, where the French presence continued to have a significant impact throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Detroit, Vincennes, and St. Louis, too, maintained some French Catholic connections into the early

nineteenth century, but for all practical purposes, Americans overtook those towns shortly after the American Revolution. French missionary efforts to evangelize the Indians, although zealous and heroic, also had minimal lasting effects.

After a period of discovery and exploration in the early sixteenth century under Jacques Cartier and a few missionary efforts among the Indians in Acadia in the early seventeenth century, Samuel de Champlain founded Quebec (1608), which became the center of French commercial, political, and ecclesiastical work in the New World. Like Spain, France was a Catholic confessional state. The Gallican church and state enjoyed an alliance in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries that made it very difficult at times to distinguish political, commercial, and missionary goals; the three were so intertwined that the successes and failures of one depended on those of the other two. Financial support for the missionaries, for example, periodically depended on their benefit to the state's military and commercial objectives, which periodically warred with religious concerns. Church and state used each other to advance their own causes, even when those causes were not entirely compatible or reconcilable. In such circumstances of alliance, tensions between the church and the state were almost inevitable.

By the end of the seventeenth century, New France had developed both a colonial and a missionary church.[7] The colonial church, an extension of the Gallican church, had its headquarters in Quebec, where the first bishop, François de Montmorency de Laval, was consecrated in 1674 and where the French constructed a number of parishes, hospitals, seminaries, schools, and convents to serve the French and the Indians. Quebec was the structural backbone of the colonial church. Within the present borders of the United States, the colonial church was for the most part far removed from the center of ecclesiastical power and supervision. Parishes for the French were established, for example, in Cahokia (1698), Biloxi (1699), Detroit (1704), Mobile (1710), New Orleans (1718), Vincennes (1734), Duquesne (1754), and a few other places in the Midwest during the mid-eighteenth century. Although the stories of these churches are significant, the most dramatic of the French efforts to plant the church in New France are found in the missionary efforts toward the Indians.

The French developed a missionary church to the Indians alongside and at times as part of the colonial church. French missionaries (Capuchins, Recollects, and especially Jesuits) evangelized, baptized, and established mission stations among the Abenakis in Nova Scotia and Maine periodically from 1610 to 1763, when France ceded Canada to England; among the Indians along the St. Lawrence Seaway (at Tadoussac, Quebec, Sillery, Three Rivers, and Montreal); among the Hurons below the Georgian Bay from 1634 until the Iroquois massacres of 1649; among the upstate New York Iroquois from the early 1650s to the 1680s; among the Hurons and other tribes in the far west at Sault Ste. Marie (Michigan) and Keweenaw Bay on Lake Superior in the 1660s; and, after Louis Jolliet and Jacques Marquette* explored the Mississippi River in 1673, a few missionaries were sent to the Illinois and other tribes in Michigan, Illinois, and Indiana.

Although the French Indian missions had the same ultimate purposes as the Spanish, they did not always engage in the same missionary strategies. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, many of the Jesuit missionaries tried to adapt themselves to the nomadic Indian life, but soon abandoned this procedure because it proved ineffective in establishing a stable Christian life among the tribes. Later they tried to convert the Indians to a sedentary life that would enable the missionaries to evangelize the Indians more effectively, instruct them in the Christian rituals, wean them from customs and practices that were inconsistent with Christian morality, and preserve them in a disciplined Christian way of life. Like the Spanish to the south and like their Jesuit brethren in Paraguay, the French Jesuits built missions they referred to as "reductions" to separate the Christian Indians from the villages of unconverted Indians.[8] The Jesuit missions to the Georgian Bay Hurons, although brief, were the most effective of the French reductions. There the Jesuits built prayer huts (or churches) within the Indian tribal territories and, like the Spanish, tried to develop a regular cycle of Christian life and discipline within a Christian communal context.

Although the French Jesuits in particular accepted and lived with many of the existing Indian customs and sought to show the Christian dimension of indigenous beliefs and morals, they resisted those things in the Indian way of life that they considered contrary to Christianity. Polygamy especially had the force of tradition within the Indian communities and frequently pulled the new converts away from the disciplined Christian life. One Jesuit reported, "of all the Christian laws which we propound to them, there is not one that seems as hard to them as that which forbids polygamy, and does not allow them to break the bonds of lawful marriage."[9] The Indians hated these restrictions on their liberties, and the Jesuits discovered that the Christian Indians often found a monogamous marriage too difficult and frequently entered into scandalous relationships after conversion. The Indians resisted not only assimilation into a French life-style but also into a Christian moral life that conflicted with their own former religious traditions and customs, which had the sanction of their own communities. The Indian missionaries, like their third-century Christian predecessors, tried to separate the newly baptized and the catechumens permanently from former practices and customs that were opposed to Christian tradition, but they were successful only where they were able to sustain a mission for a period of generations.

Even within the sedentary missions, however, the missionaries soon discovered that the strategy of separation would not be effective unless it were accompanied by a genuine attempt to accommodate themselves to those things in the Indian lifestyle that were not inherently repugnant to Christianity. As one Jesuit put it in 1667–1668:

> We must then follow them [because we cannot expect to instruct them when they only occasionally come to us] to their homes and adapt [*s'accommoder*] ourselves to their ways, however ridiculous they may appear, in order to draw them to ours. And, as God made himself man in order to make men Gods, a Missionary does not

> fear to make himself a Savage, so to speak, with them, in order to make them Christians. *Omnibus omnia factus sum.*[10]

Whatever their methods, the French missionaries believed that God alone was the founder of the Indian as well as the primitive church. The Jesuits in particular believed that martyrdom was the premier providential sign that God was directing the establishment of the churches in the wilderness. In 1639 the Jesuit Jerome Lalemant feared that the missions might be in bad shape because no priest had yet been martyred for the cause.[11] His fear was unwarranted. In subsequent years the *Jesuit Relations* (reports the Jesuit missionaries sent back to France) were filled with accounts of the martyrdoms of the Jesuits Isaac Jogues,* Jean de Brébeuf, and numerous other Jesuits and Indian converts.[12] The story of Indian brutality against Jogues reads like stylized early Christian martyrologies:

> He was greeted with a hundred beatings at the entrance to the Village where he was first conducted; there was no good mother's son who did not fling his paw or claw on this poor victim,—some struck him with heavy blows of cords, others with blows of sticks; some pulled and carried away the hair of his head; others, in derision, tore out the hair of his beard. A woman, or rather a Megera, takes his arm and cuts off, or rather saws off, with knife the thumb of his left hand; she cuts a gash, and goes in quest of the joint, with less skill, but with more cruelty than a butcher exercises upon a dead beast; in short, she lacerates and removes the whole mass of the thumb. Another bites one of the fingers of his right hand, injures the bone, and renders that poor finger crippled and useless; others tear out his nails, then put fire on the end of those poor fingers,—laid bare, in order to render the martyrdom more keenly felt. For all these pains, the poor Father had no other Physician or other Surgeon than patience; no other salve than pain, no other cover than the air which surrounded his wounds.[13]

Jogues found the "Royal Road of the Holy Cross" in the *Imitation of Christ* to be a fundamental source of "great peace, and repose in occasions of suffering."[14] Denying self, taking up the cross daily, and shedding one's blood as a witness to the Christian faith were the means of establishing God's glory in the missions. Repeatedly the missionaries recalled for their French-reading audience the maxim of early Christianity that the "blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church."

Measured by the rod of human efficiency, historical efficacy, and ecclesiological stability and permanence, the French Indian missions within the present borders of the United States were generally failures. They produced few lasting results and collapsed for many of the same reasons that the Spanish missions miscarried. The French efforts were also doomed by the cession of Canada to England in 1763, the decline of Jesuit presence after the papal suppression of 1773, and a more general lack of sufficient personnel to serve the huge geographical expansion from the Niagara to New Orleans. By the end of the eighteenth century, for all practical purposes, the French Indian missions ceased to have any major impact, although a few Indians in the interiors of Indiana and

Illinois throughout the latter half of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth century continued to be served by French priests and would for years carry memories of the French blackrobes within their communities. Measured by the missionaries' standards of Christian witness or by the criterion of human courage and dedication, the Indian missions were a major achievement.

ENGLISH MISSIONS

From 1634 to 1776, English Catholics planted and sustained their religion in the colonies of Maryland and Pennsylvania, and, unlike their Spanish and French neighbors, they did so without the benefit of governmental financial or legal support and without the burden of serving in vast geographical territories. Unlike the Spanish and French, too, English Catholics were geographically surrounded by and lived in the midst of Protestants, who had previously built colonies in Virginia and Massachusetts and who were, from the beginning, a majority even within Maryland. Unlike their coreligionists to the north and south, moreover, the English Jesuits very quickly (i.e., by the 1640s) abandoned any efforts to evangelize and serve the Indians in Maryland (even though they originally intended to do so) and concentrated their religious efforts on the Catholic colonists. Catholic presence in the English colonies, furthermore, unlike that of the Spanish and French missions, provided a firm foundation for a lasting influence of Catholicism in the United States.

In 1633 the English Catholic Cecil Calvert,* who had inherited his father George's* possessions and intention to establish a colony in the New World, obtained from King Charles I a charter that acknowledged Cecil's "laudable, and pious Zeal for extending the Christian Religion, and also the Territories of our Empire."[15] The charter made Cecil the sole proprietor. It indicated that Maryland—like other English, Spanish, and French colonies—was established with mixed political, commercial, and religious motivations. Calvert appealed to Protestant and Catholic investors to initiate the Maryland project, but he received his greatest financial support from seventeen young Catholic gentry. In fact, Catholics had, at least during the seventeenth century, a predominance of financial and political clout in the colony. The charter also gave Calvert the same patronage rights over the colony that the bishop of Durham had over that English province—that is, the power to erect and found all churches and chapels and the exemption from all laws of mortmain. To provide for the religious needs, Calvert invited the Jesuits to join the colony and, appealing to their missionary zeal, indicated that he wanted them to evangelize the Indians.

With these purposes in mind, Calvert's two ships, the Ark and the Dove, set sail and landed in Maryland in 1634. The 150 or so persons on board, mostly Protestant, included Calvert's brother Leonard, who was appointed governor of the new colony, three Jesuits (Fathers Andrew White and John Altham and Brother Thomas Gervase), and a number of young Catholic investors. Although the colony was erected under the authority of a Protestant king, no Protestant

ministers came with the first expedition, and in fact, ministers of the Church of England would not appear in the colony until twenty years later.

Throughout the colonial period, the Jesuits provided the only Catholic religious leadership in Maryland and Pennsylvania and, as R. Emmett Curran has noted, "constituted, almost exclusively, the institutional church in British America."[16] During the first 150 years, 113 Jesuit priests and thirty brothers served within the Maryland Province—although no more than five priests and four brothers served at any one time during the seventeenth century. The numbers of priests increased slightly in the eighteenth century, but by 1772 there were only twenty-three priests in the colony.[17] In terms of numbers, the English Catholic colony was far less impressive than the Catholic colonies to the south and north.

The Jesuits built plantation manors, much like those of other Maryland gentlemen, upon lands they received or purchased from the proprietor. Like other gentlemen planters, moreover, they eventually bought and sold black slaves to farm their plantations. By 1785 black Catholics, primarily slaves, made up more than 20 percent of Maryland's total Catholic population.[18] These plantations became the primary temporal support for the Jesuits' religious activities. Although the plantations forced the Jesuits to become involved in managing temporalities, which took time away from their religious mission, they freed the Jesuits from the temporal authority and control of the landed gentry (who had controlled the Jesuits in England) and enabled them to enjoy a certain amount of de facto separation from the proprietor and local Maryland government. This separation also, as Gerald Fogarty has noted, "planted the seeds from which would grow the American Catholic tradition of religious liberty."[19]

The Jesuits were primarily responsible for sustaining and developing Catholic spiritual life not only in Maryland throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries but also in Pennsylvania, where Irish and German immigrants and Maryland migrants had established Catholic communities at Conewago, Goshenhoppen, and Philadelphia during the eighteenth century. Like itinerant preachers in the nineteenth century, the Jesuits carried the chalice and Bible into the outlying regions of Maryland and Pennsylvania. On Sundays, either at the plantations, which became the liturgical centers of Catholic life during the entire colonial period, or at the mission stations outside the plantations, they observed a regular routine of hearing confessions, celebrating Mass, preaching, and giving catechetical instruction to adults and children.

The Jesuits fostered an Ignatian spirituality by leading prominent laity through the *Spiritual Exercises* and by encouraging study, reading, prayer, and meditation. They also tried periodically to establish some schools in Maryland for the education of Catholics, but because of a lack of resources and the penal laws, these schools never lasted beyond a few years. What little religious education there was took place within the manors, at the liturgical centers, and through the lending libraries some Jesuits set up at their plantations. Jesuits circulated Bibles, theology texts, apologetic works, and particularly devotional and spiritual manuals to the laity.[20] They also established religious confraternities to encourage

personal meditation, adoration of the Blessed Sacrament, and devotion to the Sacred Heart—traditions that Jesuits had fostered in their European colleges and universities. It appears from some sources that these Jesuits were trying to erect in the Maryland wilderness quasi-collegial Catholic communities. Small prayer groups and reading circles served as cells of Christian growth and development within the larger communities—much like the schools of Lutheran pietism or the class meetings of John Wesley. Building up a devotional elite within the community was consistent with the sixteenth-century Jesuit tradition.

Eighteenth-century Maryland Catholic spirituality, like that in England, was also influenced to a considerable extent by the writings of Richard Challoner, vicar apostolic of London. His *Catholic Christian Instructed* (1737) and *Garden of the Soul* (1740) typified the kind of spirituality that was proposed for eighteenth-century English-speaking Catholics. The *Garden of the Soul* was a spiritual manual intended, as its subtitle indicated, for the English Catholic laity who, "Living in the World, Aspire to Devotion."[21] It prescribed spiritual practices that individuals could perform at home and in the ordinary conditions of their life in English society, and fostered a type of piety that was simple, sober, and unostentatious, befitting cultural circumstances of English and colonial Catholicism. Colonial Catholics did not always have the benefit of clerical and sacramental services, and those who were far removed from the liturgical centers probably conducted their own religious practices and observances within their homes. Colonial religious life was a low-profile experience; Catholics carried on their religious traditions as quietly and privately as possible so as not to offend their neighbors and create a cause for open oppression. As the number of clergy and churches increased in Maryland during the latter half of the eighteenth century, the center of religious life, as Jay Dolan has pointed out, shifted from the home to the parish churches,[22] making the public expression of Catholicism more visible than had been the case earlier.

From the very beginning of the Maryland enterprise, Catholics and other Christians enjoyed an unprecedented degree of religious toleration. In 1632 Cecil Calvert gave his brother Leonard some instructions about conduct on board ship that indicate the low religious profile that would characterize the colony in the future: "be careful to preserve unity and peace amongst all the passengers on Shipp-board." They were to give no offence to Protestants, perform their religious services "as privately as may be," and should not even engage Protestants in discussions of religious matters. Calvert's highest priority as proprietor of the new colony was to maintain the colony's political and social harmony. Religion, he warned, should not be a source of civil disturbance.[23]

Until 1649, religious toleration derived from the proprietor's fiat, and thereafter it became the result of a legal enactment that Cecil Calvert had encouraged the Maryland Assembly to make. In 1649, Calvert argued that God desired unity and peace and "commands us to love one another; Christian Religion teaches us soe to doe for the accomplishment of Eternal happiness and human polity also adviseth it [for] our temporal felicity in this World."[24] Religious toleration was

a necessary means to civil peace and was the surest way to secure God's blessings on Maryland. The Maryland Assembly wrote an Act Concerning Religion (1649) that privileged Christianity, provided for toleration of all Christians, and imposed civil penalties and fines for blasphemy, derogatory talk against Mary, the apostles, and the evangelists, and for profanation of the Sabbath.[25] The colonials had learned from experience, as the act indicated, that the legal establishment of religion had frequently "fallen out to be of dangerous Consequence in those commonwealthes where it hath been practiced."[26]

In 1654 a Puritan-controlled assembly revised the Act of 1649, excluding Catholics from general toleration. The revision, however, did not take permanent effect, and the colony continued to enjoy a general toleration for all Christians until the Glorious Revolution, in 1689, when the king replaced the lord proprietor, and gradually thereafter Catholics were excluded from the colony's political life. In 1702 the Church of England was established by law, and Catholics were finally disfranchised in 1718. The Jesuit Peter Attwood complained that the earlier Maryland tradition, unlike that of other colonies, had extended traditional English freedoms to Catholics. The great reversal of that tradition in the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution was a violation of the common law.[27] The complaint was of no avail. Catholics would thereafter become second-class citizens and feel the sting, if not the rigors, of the establishment and penal law system.

From the beginnings of Maryland until the Glorious Revolution, prominent land-owning Catholic families, many related to the proprietor by marriage, had enjoyed social and economic prestige in the colony and an almost privileged status in its political life. These court Catholics helped to preserve Catholic freedoms but also caused a great deal of jealousy within the Protestant majority. Such political circumstances help to explain some of the dynamics behind the great reversal after the Glorious Revolution. Prominent Maryland Catholics continued to maintain some of their social and economic prestige, but because of legal restrictions, they no longer took part in Maryland's political activities. This situation enabled them to develop their plantations and commercial interests. The first Charles Carroll illustrates the point. He came to Maryland in 1688 to be Calvert's attorney general, but because of the revolution he was unable to serve in that capacity. Instead, he began to lay the foundations for what would become a significant fortune for the Carroll family. Prominent land-wealthy Catholics like the Carrolls continued to intermarry and pass on their fortunes to their heirs, giving them economic security in a colony where they did not have much political security or exercise any political functions. It would be from many of these prominent Maryland Catholics that significant support for the American Revolution would come between 1765 and 1776.

In 1765, the year of the Stamp Act, 256 Maryland Catholic gentlemen and in 1773 a few Jesuits, desirous of maintaining their low-profile Catholicism, protested against rumors that the vicar apostolic of London, Richard Challoner, wanted to establish a Catholic bishop in Maryland. They saw such an action as an occasion for increased Protestant opposition to Catholicism.[28] These Catholics,

moreover, could not have been unaware of the increasing American resistance to the establishment of an Anglican episcopacy in the colonies. Many Anglo-Americans feared what Sydney Ahlstrom has called the "deeply ingrained 'anti prelatical' bias" that was a part of "the drift of American opinion" during the pre-revolutionary years in the American colonies.[29] The establishment of an Anglican episcopacy would mean, they feared, the imposition of greater restrictions on colonial freedoms. The episcopacy was seen as an instrumental means for reinforcing political oppression, a view that only gradually died out in American consciousness.[30] Maryland Catholics did not have any anti-prelatial biases, but they did fear the Protestant animus against the episcopacy and what that animosity might do to their own already limited liberties within the colony.

By 1773, the year of the Boston Tea Party, Charles Carroll of Carrollton,* the third Charles of that family, emerged as a significant political figure in Maryland. Carroll took up his pen in the *Maryland Gazette* to defend local autonomy and the constitutional rights of the Maryland legislature against what he perceived to be the usurpation of governor Robert Eden's proclamation establishing officers' fees in the colony.[31] Under the pseudonym "First Citizen," Carroll criticized the governor's proclamation as an abuse of power and defended the legislature's constitutional rights.

Daniel Dulany, a Maryland attorney who had supported the governor, took issue with Carroll's position and charged, in ad hominem fashion, that Carroll, a Catholic, was disqualified from the debate. He was legally incapable of belonging to any branch of the legislature, could not even vote for representatives, and in fact was disabled by his own Catholic principles, which were distrusted by the laws, from interfering in the election of members.[32] Carroll shot back that his own "speculative notions of religion" and religious affiliation were private matters that had nothing to do with the interpretation of constitutional principles.[33]

Like other Enlightenment figures, Carroll had clearly separated religion and politics, had done much to raise the issues of natural rights and constitutional procedures, and was hailed as a rising star in the revolutionary generation. The fact that he was a Catholic did not seem to bother those who sided with him. His political prominence in this debate, though, did much to bring about a new era of religious toleration and eventually of religious liberty for Catholics.

Toleration for Catholics, however, was not easily won in America, as evidenced by the American reaction to the British Parliament's Quebec Act of 1774. Among other things, that act officially and legally acknowledged the Catholic Church in Canada, providing Catholics with the full enjoyment of their religious rights. The First Continental Congress of 1774, like the "Suffolk County Resolves," protested against this act, which was interpreted as "dangerous" not only to the Protestant religion but to the "civil rights and liberties of all Americans."[34] The protests manifested the long-standing colonial Protestant antipathy toward Catholicism as well as a fear of the British Parliament's increasing political tyranny.

The American oratory against the act made it impossible for the colonials to win the Canadians over to the cause of the Revolution. In 1776, however, the

Continental Congress appointed a committee of Samuel Chase, Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and Benjamin Franklin to seek an alliance with the Canadians in the revolt against England. They also sent John Carroll,* Charles's cousin and a priest, to accompany the committee, hoping that his Catholicism would help win over the French-Canadian Catholics. The trip was doomed to failure from the start, but it did reveal a growing awareness of the political, if not religious, openness to and perhaps usefulness of Catholics in the war effort. Religious affiliation could not be overlooked entirely in the common project of war and independence.

During and after the Declaration of Independence, a number of Catholics from Maryland and Pennsylvania participated in the war effort and joined in the political process of constitution-building at the state and federal levels.[35] Daniel Carroll II, Charles's cousin and John's brother, was elected a Maryland state senator and, together with fellow Catholic Thomas Fitzsimmons of Philadelphia, served in the U.S. House of Representatives during the formation of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights. Charles Carroll, however, was by far the most significant Catholic involved in the movement toward American liberty. He had written in favor of a constitutional government, acted as an adviser to the Continental Congress since 1774, made a trip to Canada on behalf of the revolutionary cause, helped form the Maryland State Constitution (1776), which acknowledged religious toleration for all Christians, was for a brief period a member of the U.S. Senate, and was a signer of the Declaration of Independence. In 1829, Carroll told a friend that when he signed the Declaration, he had in view "not only our independence of England but the toleration of all sects, professing the Christian religion, and communicating to them all great rights."[36] For many nineteenth-century American Catholics, Carroll was the paramount symbol of the compatibility of American and Catholic identities.

With the end of the war and the beginning of the process of political reorganization, a new era was dawning for American Catholics—one that would bring greater toleration and eventually religious liberty in the states as well as in the nation as a whole.

This page intentionally left blank

2

A FREE CHURCH IN A FREE STATE: 1776–1815

FROM 1776 UNTIL 1815, John Carroll was the central figure in the transformation and institutionalization of American Catholicism. Elected as the first American bishop in 1789, he presided over the initial stages of the development of the Catholic community from a tiny, geographically and politically restricted, colonial priestly mission into a free, geographically expansive, and episcopally organized national church. The Revolutionary War, the subsequent establishment of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights, the French Revolution and the consequent arrival of French émigrés, and westward expansion were crucial events in these developments. By 1815 Catholicism had already undergone what Carroll in 1783 had called "a revolution, if possible, more extrordinary [*sic*], than our political one."[1]

The Catholic Church took institutional shape in a new nation that was significantly influenced by the values of the Enlightenment and republicanism. Carroll, too, had been influenced by a moderate Catholic Enlightenment and had adopted the "language of a Republican."[2] Like many other Christian leaders in American society, he rejected what he considered the dangerous tendencies of an excessive rationalism, but he also tried to accommodate Catholicism to those values in the Enlightenment and in republicanism that he found genuinely consistent with the Catholic tradition.

Like the new nation itself, the American Catholic Church was initially shaped in an atmosphere of unprecedented liberty; it became a free church in a free state. This revolutionary and constitutional arrangement meant more than the removal of civil and political restraints on Catholics. It meant that the church was on its own with regard to internal and external operations. The church was free to communicate the gospel, promote its spiritual and liturgical life, teach its distinctive doctrines, organize its institutions, and encourage its membership to support Catholic life and institutions voluntarily. Of its very nature, moreover, voluntaryism in religion demanded a spiritual revival that was built on personal persuasion. Furthermore, Catholic identity, institutions, and particularly the

Catholic understanding of freedom and religious authority would have to be established anew amid the changing political and cultural circumstances.

Catholics such as John Carroll enthusiastically accepted civil and religious liberties not only because they were beneficial to Catholicism but also because they were thought to be based on principles of reason and revelation.[3] Religious liberty and toleration, however, were not something American Catholics could take for granted in the early years of the new republic. A few states (e.g., Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, the Carolinas), although granting toleration to Catholics, still retained restrictions on full Catholic participation in the political process. Some individuals, too, periodically advocated more rigorous civil and political strictures on Catholics in the new nation. Such circumstances made John Carroll apprehensive and anxious about the future of full religious freedom for Catholics. In the *Columbian Magazine* in 1787, the *Gazette of the United States* in 1789, and in a 1789 joint address with Catholic laity to George Washington,[4] Carroll advocated the full extension of religious liberty in all state constitutions on the grounds that Catholics like other Americans had contributed their blood for the country's independence, and in justice they deserved equal political opportunity under the law.

The American Catholic encounter with modernity in the form of religious liberty, separation of church and state, and voluntaryism was not worked out with systematic reflection. American Catholics simply accepted the new dynamics and principles of the age and began to make the practical adjustments that were necessary to fortify Catholic religious life and institutions.

Like that of many religious leaders in the new nation, John Carroll's first and abiding concern was for a revival of religious practices. In 1785 he reported that the religious vitality of Catholicism was at an ebb. Catholics in Maryland and Pennsylvania were "rather faithful" to their religious obligations. Most of them went to confession and received the Eucharist once a year, fulfilling their Easter duty, but they rarely received the sacraments at other times during the year, and even when they did they had little religious fervor. By comparison, though, the new immigrants in the trading centers were weak Catholics, not even fulfilling their Easter duty. Almost all Catholics in the United States, too, failed to instruct their children and slaves in the basic elements of the faith. Consequently, many of the young were very lax in their morals.[5]

Carroll's extant sermons,[6] his diocesan synod of 1791, and his letters and instructions to his clergy stress the need for a general renewal of American Catholic piety. That reformation, made possible by the new political circumstances, centered on the two things he perceived to be most wanting—namely, the restoration of traditional Catholic practices, especially the frequent celebration of the Eucharist and Penance, and a conversion of the heart that was essential for a fruitful reception of the Sacraments.

The diocesan synod of 1791 gave its highest priority to the revitalization of sacramental practices.[7] Canonical prescriptions, like those of the diocesan synod, indicate the ideals, not the historical reality. Catholics who lived at great