2012

The Foreign "Other": Uses of the International Context in English Political Propaganda of the Late Seventeenth Century

Hilary White
Wellesley College, hwhite2@wellesley.edu

The Foreign "Other":
Uses of the International Context in English Political Propaganda of the Late Seventeenth Century

By Hilary White

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the
Prerequisite for Honors
in History

April 2012

ABSTRACT

This thesis explores the use of the international context in the English political propaganda campaigns during the 1688-9 Revolution. The study focuses on how propagandists used Ireland, Scotland, France, and the United Provinces to impact and influence political sentiments regarding issues of religion, toleration, and rights of the monarchy within England. Both Williamite and Jacobite propagandists used allusions to international political, religious, and ideological issues to garner support for their distinct ideas for the future of England's development. As these two groups consistently placed England in ideological opposition to foreign 'others' within their writings, these parties struggled to define a unique and unified identity for the Kingdom of England and its people.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to thank the Wellesley College History Department for all their intellectual support in enabling me to complete this honours thesis. In particular, I would like to thank Professor Nikhil Rao, Professor Alejandra Osorio, and Professor Megan Kerr for serving on my defense committee.

Additional thanks go to the staff at Clapp Library of Wellesley College and the Bodleian Library of Oxford University for their assistance in my endless quest for more primary sources. To the Schwartz family, I am incredibly grateful for the research funding.

My greatest gratitude goes to my thesis advisor, Professor Ryan Frace. Professor Frace has served as my constant source of motivation, encouragement, and much needed criticisms. I still remember our first meeting in fall of 2009, my sophomore year, in which he declared that he was going to serve as my thesis advisor. Two and half years later, the prediction proved right. Thank you Professor Frace, for the years of advice, mentorship, and friendship, even when I was an ocean away.

I also give many thanks to my parents, Cynthia and Jeffrey White, who dealt with my stress and mental preoccupation all in stride.

Table of Contents

Introduction

The late 1680's in England witnessed an unprecedented rise in the quantity, variety, and complexity of political pamphlets and tracts being produced, a consequence of the development of the world's first political party system a decade earlier. In 1679, the Exclusion Crisis gave rise to the first political parties, the Whigs, who advocated excluding Catholic King James from succeeding the throne, and the royalist Tories. This emergence of opposing parties meant that, for the first time, people were willingly associating themselves with organizations based on a set platform of issues. Unlike the political conflicts of the late Medieval Era, political parties had a wider program of concerns than ensuring territorial gains or hierarchical succession. By the 1680's, the Whig and Tory parties were opposed in their conceptions of political power and role of the national Church of England. This birth of the political party enabled the development of modern propaganda machinery. As these parties had real and distinct platform differences, there existed a need for these political groups to advertise their causes and assert their influence among individuals within the political space.

In particular, there existed a tremendous need for political propaganda during the 'Glorious Revolution' of England. On 5 November 1688, William of Orange, the prince-stadtholder of the United Provinces landed on the shores of England, officially initiating the Revolution of 1688-9. As William made his quest for the throne explicit, the English people became preoccupied with the future of the monarchical settlement. Two opposing camps emerged; the Jacobites supported the existing monarch, King James II, while the Williamites campaigned for the new contender of the throne, William of Orange. Yet, both political groups were faced with tackling formidable issues regarding public perception, which required both sides to develop extensive and effective propaganda campaigns. The

Williamite regime endeavored to justify that William was the best contender for the throne, despite his foreign origins and invasion of the nation, while the Jacobites faced criticisms that James placed England under imminent threat of French-Catholic subjugation.

Explicitly, this thesis asks: why did a prolific body of propaganda focusing on international events emerge from two distinct and opposing political parties during the Revolution of 1688-9? By the end of the seventeenth century, Europe had developed a distinctly cosmopolitan identity, which placed internationalism at the center of both Jacobite and Williamite propaganda campaigns.[1] The people of England were extremely interested in the political activities of their neighbouring nations, which can be seen through the sheer preoccupation English propagandists had for engaging with international events in their domestic publications. Such political propagandists were attempting to influence domestic opinion by making frequent and explicit references to international events. Issues of religion and the monarchical settlement were all presented with allusions to and comparisons with recent events in Europe, effectively acting as warnings about the future of the English state. Collectively, these propagandists provided a key reminder that the English isle was not merely a peripheral island off of the Atlantic coast. By this period, England was emerging as a central player in the international politics, trade, and warfare across Europe.

These propaganda campaigns represent an attempt to construct an English identity through an understanding and awareness of the larger European context. Such writings reveal a struggle to understand what defined the English nation as unique and how the

[1] I define internationalism as an understanding of and concern for international affairs and events. I further define that internationalism implies a willingness to actively engage with foreign proceedings.

monarchical settlement would affect this proto-national identity. Throughout the Revolution of 1688-9, Williamites and Jacobites found themselves in confrontation with influences from the United Provinces and France, and these two parties defined themselves and their conception of the future of England against these foreign Others. As Linda Colley argues in her book, *Britons,* which explores the formation of 'Britishness,' national identities are constructed when distinctions are made between the 'collective self' and another entity. She writes, "Men and women decide who they are by reference to who and what they are not. Once confronted with an obviously alien 'Them,' an otherwise diverse community can become a reassuring or merely desperate 'Us.'"[2]

Furthermore, the frequency with which Jacobites and Williamites attempted to situate England in comparison to the other kingdoms of an increasingly interconnected Europe demonstrates a deep-rooted anxiety within both parties to interpret the significance of this growing internationalism, particularly during a regime shift. In this light, we can understand that the English people were deeply conflicted about the meaning behind the settlement of the throne, which represented a turning point in the future of the English nation. The Revolution of 1688-9 was a very divisive moment for the people of England, as Jacobite and Williamite propagandists offered two competing notions of developing English modernity.

Throughout Jacobite propaganda, there exists a visible anxiety about the preservation of traditional English institutions, such as the primacy of the hereditary monarch and the confessional state model under the national Church of England. For Jacobite writers, the Dutch origins of the Prince of Orange represented a threat to the

---

[2] Linda Colley. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. (New Haven, 1992), 7.

practice of English government, as a foreign monarch was not expected to understand the political needs of his people, while his forcible entry into the nation challenged the principle of hereditary monarchy. Additionally, these propagandists contended that William could never have full allegiance to the people of England due to his Dutch background. A similar set of anxieties surrounded the Church of England. By frequently alerting their English counterparts about the events in Scotland between 1688 and 1689, Jacobite propagandists were warning that the dominancy of the Church of England was in threat of crumbling just like the episcopacy in Scotland in 1689. Such concerns gained greater traction in 1689 following the passing of the Toleration Act in England, which granted freedom of worship to Non-conformists, relegating the Church of England to a new position as the established rather than the official national church. Jacobites further warned that that the United Provinces was an Erastian state, and the Dutch Prince of Orange would attempt to subjugate the Church of England to the civil government.

In contrast, the Williamite regime visualized a competing idea of modernity in which government and religion had a different relationship. The Williamites contended that while William was of Dutch origin, his actions as a defender of English liberties, particularly in ensuring the practice of a free Parliament, granted William greater legitimacy in his claim for the throne than James, who placed the nation at risk of invasion by the French or Irish Catholics. Furthermore, the Williamite regime created a propaganda campaign that depicted William as the defender of both Protestantism and European liberties against Louis XIV's growing ambitions for a universal monarchy. Williamite propagandists warned that James had substantial admiration for Gallicanism, and the English monarch was likely to imitate Louis' absolutist actions within the English kingdom. By emphasizing the need

for defense against Louis XIV and spreading Gallicanism, William was seeking to break England's traditional isolationist foreign policy through entering the kingdom into war with France. Paradoxically, however, the Williamite regime was driven by Jacobite opposition to adopt a rhetoric that was increasingly focused on preserving Protestant liberties, in an attempt to win greater support among English High Churchmen, despite William's belief in religious plurality and toleration.

Consequently, studying the role of internationalism in the political propaganda of the late 1680's reveals the defining and conflicting features that comprise both Jacobite and Williamite conceptions of modernity. Jacobites envisioned an England that increasingly resembled France in terms of a strong centralized state, professional army, and religiously uniform society. In opposition, the Williamites conceived of an idea for a religiously tolerant English society in which political participation was encouraged alongside a limited monarchy, modeled loosely upon the United Provinces. By looking internationally, both political groups found inspiration for their conceptions of the future of England. Through the study of such propaganda, one gains a better understanding of how the English conceived of their nation, particularly in opposition to the neighbouring kingdoms of Europe. Therefore, such a study is useful in determining popular attitudes and conceptions of English proto-nationalism. Before this study goes further in-depth, it is necessary to recognize the historiographical inheritances that have helped shape this thesis.

Historiographical Framework

Historians have defined propaganda in a number of ways. Lois Schwoerer described propaganda as, "Any systematic scheme or concerted effort for the propagation of a

particular doctrine or point of view."[3] Propaganda has also been described as the spreading of ideas and information, often of a misleading nature, for the purpose of promoting or injuring a cause, institution, or person. From these definitions, we can discern the key elements that frame this study of propaganda and its uses during the late seventeenth century. Firstly, propaganda is public in nature, and secondly, it is a purposeful creation and distribution of ideas and information for the ends of influencing the opinions of others.

Several earlier studies have been carried out on the uses of propaganda during the Revolution of 1688-9. In 1977, Lois Schwoerer opened up this area of study with her essay, 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-9.' She argued that by expanding our view beyond High politics to include more popular forms of media, such as pamphlets, tracts, sermons, ballads, and processions, "[We] can enlarge and vivify our comprehension of the Revolution of 1688-9."[4] Schwoerer has also completed work on the Williamite regime's use of imagery in depictions of William's wife, Queen Mary, and the role of processions within royal propaganda campaigns.[5] Recently, Tony Claydon published his book, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, as the first extensive collection of the propaganda campaigns executed by the Williamite regime. In particular, Claydon focuses on the use of providential rhetoric and language of a 'courtly reformation' to legitimatize William as the defender of Protestantism and protector of English virtue. However, a vast majority of these studies focus primarily on the propaganda created by the pro-William camp. Considerably less attention has been

---

[3] Schwoerer, Louis. 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89.' *The American Historical Review*. Vol. 82, No. 4 (Oct., 1977), 844.

[4] Schwoerer, 844.

[5] For more work on the symbolism and propaganda within ceremonies and processions, see Schwoerer, Lois. "Glorious Revolution as Spectacle: A New Perspective" in (ed.) Stephen Baxter. *England's Rise to Greatness*. (Berkley, 1983), pp. 109-149. Also see Schwoerer, Lois. "Images of Queen Mary II." *Renaissance Quarterly,* 42 (1984), pp. 717-48.

granted to the propaganda campaigns of the Jacobites. Notably, Steve Pincus' new book has a substantial focus on understanding how James used propaganda in an attempt to institute a Catholic modernity.[6] Yet, a majority of these studies address Jacobite and Williamite propaganda separately. As these two political parties defined themselves in relation to their oppositional other, it is beneficial to study the propaganda of both sides simultaneously in order to better grasp how the parties influenced one another's political messages.

The use of propaganda within the field of historiography is not without criticism. Opponents contend that propaganda tends to represent the views of a minority segment of the population, and it is uncertain how many individuals were directly affected by such propaganda campaigns. Despite their mass production, J.R. Jones contended,

> The voluminous controversial pamphlets of the [Revolution] period, although they aroused immense interest and excitement among contemporaries, have all fallen into oblivion. In terms of their contribution to political theory, this is easily explained, since these pamphlets were as devoted to immediate issues as the equally ephemeral mass of pamphlets published at the time of the Exclusion Crisis. Theoretically, they are defective and not very interesting.[7]

Additionally, in his work on ballad culture in the Restoration period, Steve Newman explains that this debate over the validity of popular media as historical evidence is intimately intertwined with ideas of democratization, effectively explaining why there is such divide among modern historians on the issue of propaganda. He writes, "It enrolls

---

[6] In particular, see chapters five and six in Pincus, Steve. *1668: First Modern Revolution*. (New Haven, 2009), pp. 118-178.

[7] Jones, J.R. *The Revolution of 1688 in England*. (New York: 1972), 317.

ballads in a debate that continues to this today, over who has and has not been included in a supposed progression toward a more democratic society."[8]

Against these criticisms, I argue that propaganda is a valuable tool for understanding how the people of England understood the events of 1688-9 and the development of a proto-national English identity. By its nature, propaganda is a tool to influence and manipulate the opinions of others. By denying propaganda as a means of historical evidence, we are, at worst, denying the dedicated authors of thousands of pamphlets any historical agency. At the very least, we are ignoring that this sizeable portion of public opinion existed, regardless of whether these writings encouraged any direct action or impact. Individuals writing about the monarchical settlement ranged from philosopher John Locke and writer Daniel Defoe to the anonymous writer of a common street ballad. Within 1689 alone, an estimated 2000 political tracts targeting the settlement were published in England.[9] Questions over the monarchical settlement were not limited just to members of the traditional ruling elite but had a sizeable reach across the English population. Furthermore, there is strong evidence to believe that these propaganda campaigns were highly successful. Schwoerer challenged that the effectiveness of Williamite propaganda is best evident through its influences on historiography today. She writes,

> William's propaganda conveyed an interpretation of persons, motives, policies, and events that has, by and large, been accepted and perpetuated. There is no more indisputable testimony to its effectiveness than that the

[8] Newman, Steve. *Ballad Collection, Lyric, and the Canon: The Call of the Popular from the Restoration to the New Criticism.* (New York, 2007), 4.

[9] Israel, Jonathan. *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact.* (London, 2003), 6.

> interpretation it advanced has dominated the scholarship of the Revolution ever since.[10]

Despite attempts of revisionist and Whig historians to depict the Revolution as a matter of widespread consensus for William of Orange, Jonathan Israel further alerts us, "Far from banishing ideology and philosophizing from the scene, the English Revolution of 1688-9 was arguably the most intensely ideological and philosophical of all major episodes in English history."[11] The monarchical settlement was a divisive event in English society, and a study of the propaganda campaigns of both Williamites and Jacobites reveals that the wider English population frequently and bitterly disputed about the Revolution.

Scope of this Study

This thesis challenges our understanding of the events of the late seventeenth century in England primarily through two means. Firstly, I am shifting the main point of focus away from a mere understanding of high politics to include the political ideas and sentiments of the wider population of England, outside of the traditional aristocratic, ruling classes. Within England during the seventeenth century, there was a significant rise in popular involvement and interest in domestic and foreign political questions, signifying the development of a burgeoning politicized public.

Such interest was fostered by several key sociological developments. Literacy rates were swiftly augmenting; estimates suggest that 70% of Londoners were literate by the mid-1680s.[12] Furthermore, any student of the seventeenth century is familiar with the mid-

---

[10] Schwoerer, 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,' 874.

[11] Israel, 6.

[12] Harris, Tim. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis.* (New York, 1990), 27.

century emergence of the coffeehouse, which came to be a historical icon, as a place of gathering and mixing of individuals from a variety of social classes. Despite the revival of the Licensing Act in 1685, printers were willing to illegally circulate political pamphlets, ballads, and other writings, using coffeehouses as primary centers of distribution.[13] Yet, non-written means for political involvement also proliferated during this period, enabling the inclusion of individuals who were illiterate. Ballads, prints, and sermons frequently carried explicitly political messages, thus drawing an increased number of Englishmen into an informal political space.

I am by no means arguing that the ruling elite were not a critical component of this growing political sphere. The aristocrats of English society were in many ways responsible for these developments. Members of the ruling elite, ranging from men of the Church of England to wealthy merchants, were the most common drafters of these written propaganda pieces. These individuals were the ones able to bear the cost of printing and disseminating such pamphlets. But, there existed a crucial relationship between this traditional ruling class and the wider demographic of England. There was a recognition that the political space was expanding to include a wider variety of individuals, and political writers were seeking to exploit this emerging development. This is most evidentially demonstrated by attempts of political propagandists to develop a farther reach of their arguments outside of the traditional areas of power, such as Parliament, royal court, and the wealthiest of households. Therefore, in terms of historiographical approaches, I contend that it is a matter of *extending* our focus in regard to our research

[13] The Licensing Act was first instituted in 1662 and repeatedly renewed up until 1679. The Act was intended to prevent the printing of seditious, treasonable, and unlicensed books, pamphlets, and other printed material. Upon James ascension to the throne, the Licensing Act was renewed in 1685 for a period of seven years. In 1695, the Parliament voted not to re-institute the act.

subjects, rather than *excluding*. While continued studies focused on the 'crowd' or popular opinion can only enrich modern historiography, we should be aware that these concepts do not exist in isolation from our traditional subjects of focus, such as clergymen or MPs. Rather, these two groups subsisted in a mutually informative relationship.

Secondly, this thesis is born out of the recent historiographical trend to locate the Revolution of 1688-9 in its larger international context. For the past thirty-five years, historians have argued that the Revolution needs to be understood as having distinct implications and impacts in England, Scotland, and Ireland, which need to be studied in conjunction with one another. In 1975, J. G. A. Pocock first argued, "No true history of Britain has ever been composed."[14] Pocock was writing in response to an earlier work by J. P. A. Taylor, in which Taylor claimed that the term Britain had lost any historical meaning as Britain became synonymous with England. In his article, "British History: A Plea for a New Subject," Pocock contended that 'British history' needed to be reclaimed as an equal study of the events of England, Scotland, and Ireland. Of contemporary historiography, he wrote,

> Instead of histories of Britain, we have, first of all, histories of England, in which the Welsh, Irish… appear as peripheral persons… second, and read by limited and fragmented publics, histories of Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and so forth, written as separate enterprises, in the effort, sustained to various degrees, to constitute separate historiographies.[15]

Similarly, Jonathan Israel concluded fifteen years later, "There can be no adequate grasp of the English Revolution of 1688-9 without seeing it as part of a wider revolutionary process closely linked to its offshoot revolutions in Ireland, Scotland, and the American colonies."[16]

---

[14] Pocock, J. G. A. "British History: A Plea for a New Subject," *Journal of Modern History* 47. (1975), 604.
[15] Pocock, 604.
[16] Israel, 'Introduction,' *Anglo-Dutch Moment*, 10.

More recently, Tim Harris, in his book, *Revolution: Crisis of the British Monarchy*, continued to urge historians to include the Celtic Fringe of Scotland and Ireland in their studies of the Revolution. Harris contends that each of the three kingdoms developed unique understandings of and reactions to the revolutionary events, and it is necessary to distinguish between these movements at the local level. Otherwise, one faces the risk of minimizing these distinctions by classifying the revolution as a centralized movement.

In a similar manner, this thesis will argue that the central propaganda-makers of England understood these regional differences between the three kingdoms. By examining how propagandists represented Ireland and Scotland in their writings, it is immediately evident that these distinctions were exploited to further different political arguments. Speaking broadly, the revolution in Scotland was presented as a warning about the possible future outcome of the Church settlement in England, namely the dismantlement of the ecclesiastical establishment. In contrast, Ireland dominated propaganda, as it was the site of a bloody Catholic and Jacobite-led movement. How and to what ends propagandists used Ireland and Scotland within their writing will be explored more fully in Chapters 3 and 4, respectively.

As historiography has moved from understanding England's relationship with the Celtic fringe to including the colonies in the Atlantic world, other historians have argued that our scope needs to be broader still by understanding England in the even wider international context of Europe. Jonathan Israel asked,

> If the study of English history has long suffered from the mistaken but deeply entrenched habit of separating English from the rest of British history, what of the equally unwarranted and entrenched practice of viewing English history apart from that of continental Europe, that tradition based on

> the premise that everything of significance which happens in England must be due to English causes?[17]

As Israel warns, focusing solely on English history can obscure the substantial impact of foreign involvement.

Yet, as Steve Pincus reminds us in his work, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, while the Glorious Revolution was initiated by an act of foreign invasion as Israel rightly claims, it was successful only through crucial support by the people of the British Isles. The study of propaganda is particularly fruitful in understanding this claim by Pincus, as it enables us to better conceptualize the relationship between English political agency and influence by foreign actors. By its nature, propaganda focused on international issues is dependent upon foreign influences. However, English propagandists were incredibly willing to exploit the developments and recent events in their neighbouring kingdoms to manipulate the opinions and perceptions of their fellow Englishmen. Furthermore, these English propagandists were proactive in detailing the significance of on-goings within the international community with the ends of influencing domestic policy, particularly in regard to the monarchical settlement, role of the Church, and the future of English foreign policy. Given the regional focuses of this thesis, more in-depth discussions of historiography will take place within the relevant chapters.

Structure of This Study

Chronologically, this thesis is primarily focused on 1688-9, the main years of the Revolution. However, propaganda produced during the decade following James' ascension will also be discussed when relevant to the determination of the monarchical settlement.

---

[17] Israel, 11.

By expanding our focus to include this ten-year period, we develop a more full grasp of the influential writings leading up to the Revolution, such as James' attempts to spread information on Gallicanism across the kingdom and Whig attempts to discredit James' position as king by emphasizing his Catholic faith. By extending this study into the mid-1690's, we also capture the Williamite regime's need for propaganda to encourage the involvement of England in a controversial war with France in the early years of William's reign.

As this thesis is primarily centered on the revolutionary years of 1688-9, I have based my work on a comparison between the propaganda campaigns of the Williamites and Jacobites. While the Whig and Tory parties were equally important during this period, framing my study on the Williamites and Jacobites overtly captures how propagandists were attempting to influence the monarchical settlement. The division between Williamites and Jacobites was explicitly based on political allegiance, and these identities emerged during the summer of 1688 when William declared his intent to invade England. In contrast, the Whig and Tory parties had emerged in 1679. The Whig party believed that the basis of governance rested in the people, and they thus advocated the primacy of Parliament under a constitutional monarchy, which worked to preserve the welfare of the English population. The Whig party profoundly opposed rhetoric of absolute monarchism, and the party was frequently associated with Protestant dissent. The Tory party, in contrast, believed that political power resided within a hereditary monarch, to whom the people of England were obligated to obey. The Tories were often described as the 'Church party' for their interest in preserving the primacy and legal privileges of the Church of England.

By the nature of their political ideologies, the parties of Tory and Whig were primarily divided according to Jacobite and Williamite allegiances, respectively, upon the onset of the Revolution. A majority of the Tories, although they might have disagreed with certain exercises of James' monarchical power, had little intention to overthrow the English king. In contrast, both moderate and radical Whigs believed that the monarchy needed reform, which could only be achieved from dethroning James. Consequently, the format of this thesis assumes a Williamite/Whig and Jacobite/Tory divide. Political affiliations will be noted in cases of variance from this dichotomy or when distinct identification of Whig and Tory ideology is particularly relevant.

The four chapters of this thesis are dedicated to the English propaganda and political thought surrounding four of England's neighbours. Chapter 1 focuses on the United Provinces. In particular, this chapter will explore how the English Jacobites emphasized the Dutch origins of William in order to depict the Prince of Orange as a foreign usurper, who aimed to place England under Dutch control for economic gains and institute religious toleration at the expense of the national Church of England. In opposition, the Williamite propagandists initially attempted to justify the Prince of Orange's invasion by legal arguments, such as the invitation from the 'Immortal Seven' to restore the rights of the English people and his marriage to the next heir to the throne, Mary Stuart. As these arguments were faced with substantial Jacobite opposition, the Williamite propaganda campaigns were refocused on rhetoric of divine ordinance and defense of European liberties. Chapter 2 concentrates on France. Williamite propagandists further developed their rhetoric of defense of European liberties by emphasizing the growing ambitions of Louis XIV to establish a French universal monarchy. This chapter will

also examine the prevalence of Gallican tracts produced under the official regime of James, which were designed to familiarize the English people with the tenets of Catholicism and confirm that their monarch would not subject England to the authority of the pope.

Chapters 3 and 4 deal with the Celtic Fringe of Ireland and Scotland, respectively. In Chapter 3, I will focus on how both Williamite and Jacobite propagandists manipulated the religious make-up of the kingdom, namely its Catholic majority population, and legacy of the civil wars to advance their respective views. Finally, Chapter 4 explores how English propagandists depicted the battle between Scottish Presbyterians and Episcopalians in reaching a religious settlement in Scotland. This study does not attempt to explore propaganda that was produced *within* these foreign neighbouring states.

Chapter 1:

Foreign Invaders or Restorers of English Rights?
The United Provinces in English Propaganda of the 1688-9 Revolution

When the Dutch stadtholder William of Orange declared in September of 1688 that he intended to invade the English nation, the United Provinces became a prominent theme in the writings of English propagandists.[1] Yet, the Jacobite and Williamite regimes had drastically different views on what would become English modernity. The Jacobite propagandists looked to absolutist France for political inspiration, while the Williamites admired the United Provinces. Throughout their campaigns, Jacobite propagandists presented the Prince of Orange's actions as an invasion of the English kingdom by a foreign army. Consequently, these propagandists repeatedly emphasized the 'foreignness' of the invading monarch. Crucially, such writers criticized William's willingness to model England's future off of recent Dutch developments, arguing that the United Provinces was a nation in which religion was subverted to civil government and mercantile success was the central concern of its people.

Williamite propagandists understood that the Dutch origin of William of Orange would act as a political block to his way to the throne. Consequently, the official Williamite regime initially crafted a propaganda campaign that relied upon legal arguments to legitimize William's quest for the throne. However, as Jacobite propagandists dismantled these initial legal arguments, the Williamites turned to a different means of justifying William's claim to the throne: divine ordinance and defense of European liberties. This rhetoric of divine ordinance had a two-fold purpose; it aimed to widen William's base of

[1] A stadtholder was a chief magistrate within the United Provinces. This title was used between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries.

support by appealing primarily to moderate clergymen of the Church of England, and it represented an alternative to James' conception of Gallican absolutism. Furthermore, William was represented as a defender of European liberties against Louis XIV's absolutist visions, providing the means necessary to radically reposition England's foreign policy and encourage English involvement in a war against France. In this manner, other Williamite propagandists chose to emphasize the Dutch origins of the Prince of Orange, contending that Dutch military aid was crucial in protecting the English kingdom from Louis' attempt to institute a universal monarchy.

Crucially, the question of William's Dutch origins continued to remain a pertinent concern in the English political sphere into the early years of William's reign. Within a month of his coronation on 11 April 1689, William declared that the English kingdom would enter war with France. For the Williamite propagandists, the war was necessary for halting the dangerous political ambitions of Louis XIV, who threatened to create a pan-European Catholic empire. To gain support for the war effort, these propagandists presented William as the saviour of European, in particular Protestant, liberties against the threat of an absolutist French regime. In this manner, William was challenging the introduction of the absolutist concept of modernity throughout Europe, offering an alternative based on religious pluralism and more open political participation.[2] In opposition, Tory propagandists accused the new monarch of committing England to a costly war, which the English people were primarily funding, despite the mutual benefit for the United Provinces. Other propagandists asserted the theory that the Dutch king had purposely invaded the English kingdom with the sole intent of gaining a necessary ally in

[2] The Williamite arguments for England's involvement in the war with France will also be developed in the following chapter.

the Continental Nine Years' War against Louis XIV. While such arguments did gain some support among Tory MPs, Parliament continued to supply funding and arms for the war effort.

Traditionally, historians have struggled over how to interpret the allegiances and motivations of the king-stadtholder, William III, whose origins lay in the United Provinces but kingship rested in the British Isles. As the disillusioned ex-Williamite Robert Ferguson explained,

> His Circumstances force him upon the Policy to let his Protection hover, with doubtful Wings, betwixt the two Nations (as it does here between the Church of *England* and the Dissenters,) and they who please him most shall partake the greatest Share of it, but he will be intire to neither.[3]

Like the contemporaries of William, historians have struggled to reconcile the two national identities of the monarch. Baxter explains, "William III has also suffered from the historians. It is difficult if not impossible to fit him into the history of any single nation. Dutch historians have held their Prince in high regard, but they have not felt him to be a very good Dutchman. English historians have been content to think of him as a foreigner, as Dutch William."[4]

Furthermore, a robust discussion of Dutch involvement in the Revolution of 1688-9 is conspicuously missing from modern historiography. Jonathan Israel laments, "One of the most important aspects of the Glorious Revolution in Britain--- and hitherto the most consistently neglected—is the part played by the Dutch state, that is the States General, the

---

[3] Ferguson, Robert. "Reflections on the Foregoing Letter." In John Somers *A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts.* (London, 1750), 364.
[4] Baxter, Stephen B. *William III* (London, 1966), x.

States of Holland, and the Prince of Orange in his capacity as Stadtholder."[5] Israel contends that the Dutch invaded England in order to protect their commercial interests and gain an ally against Louis XIV in the on-going continental warfare. He argues the arrival of William of Orange represented a foreign invasion, placing the immediate impetus for the Revolution at the hands of the Dutch.

There have been other attempts to explain the crucially important role the Dutch played in the Revolution. W.A. Speck argued, "The Orangist conspiracy itself was the single most important cause of the king's flight."[6] Jeremy Black contended that James' deposition was "the result of external invasion of England," led by the Dutch, rather than a popular domestic struggle.[7] In their recent work, *Redefining William III: The Impact of the King-Stadtholder in the International Context,* Esther Mijers and David Onnekink place the works of both English and Dutch historians side-by-side in one collection to further re-define the critical role of William in determining the course of events during the Revolution of 1688-9.

Background: United Provinces and England in the 1680's

On 5 November, William of Orange landed at Torbay, England, with a sizeable Dutch naval fleet, marking the beginning of the 1688-9 Revolution. William of Orange was a young stadtholder of the United Provinces, and the official propaganda of the Williamite regime contended that the Prince of Orange was seeking to restore the civil and religious liberties of the English people, which had become perverted under the increasingly absolutist reign of the Catholic monarch of England, King James. Having ascended the throne in 1685, King

---

[5] Israel, "The Dutch Role in the Glorious Revolution." *Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*. (New York, 2003), 104.
[6] Speck, W.A. "The Organist Conspiracy against James II." *Historical Journal*, 30 (1987), 453.
[7] Black, Jeremy. *A System of Ambition? British Foreign Policy 1660-1793.* (London, 1991), 135.

James began granting religious toleration to his Catholic co-religionists through such means as abolishing the Test Act and passing the Declarations of Indulgence. Opponents of King James argued that this granting of legal toleration was threatening the rights and liberties of the English Protestants.

Furthermore, James' opponents also feared that the Catholic faith of the monarch would result in a military and political alliance between the French and English kingdoms. This alliance had caused difficulties for the Dutch nation several years earlier during the Second Anglo-Dutch War (1665-7). In 1672, England and France had joined together to attack the United Provinces. It was therefore deemed militarily necessary for the Dutch to preemptively act against King James in order to ensure that the English would not side in opposition to the Dutch in another war. Jonathan Israel convincingly argues that the landing of William at Torbay was an invasion of a foreign power.[8] More relevant to this study, Steve Pincus argues further that William's actions constituted an invasion, but this invasion drew substantial support from the people of England, Scotland, and to a lesser extent, Ireland, making the events of 1688 also a revolutionary movement from below.[9] In a similar manner, this chapter will explore how English Williamites furthered the invasion initiated by the United Provinces through their political propaganda campaigns in order to garner support for the new claimant to the throne.[10]

The Williamite regime's insistence on modeling the future of England off of the United Provinces was a particular concern for the Jacobites. The United Provinces

---

[8] Israel, Jonathan. 'Introduction.' *Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact*. (New York, 2003).

[9] Pincus, Steve. *1688: The First Modern Revolution.* (New Haven, 2009).

[10] I am in agreement with Israel, among others, that William's arrival in 1688 was an invasion. While William received an invitation from the Immortal Seven, these individuals were a minority among the MPs, hardly representative of the views of Parliament.

represented a tolerant and religiously pluralistic society, and the kingdom was well known for welcoming the religiously persecuted from other nations. The government of the United Provinces was a largely decentralized republic, with each province being responsible for its own internal affairs. Additionally, the United Provinces had emerged in the seventeenth century as the leader in world trade due to the kingdom's expansive merchant networks. The Williamites believed that the United Provinces represented an ideal model for England's future, and they hoped that the English kingdom could establish a monarchy that encouraged wider political representation within a religiously tolerant society. However, this idea of modernity contrasted with the Jacobite idea of creating a highly centralized monarchy, instilled with absolute power, within a religiously uniform kingdom.

After several months of uncertainty over whether the Dutch invasion proved successful in terms of the monarchical settlement, William of Orange was proclaimed the new monarch of England, jointly with his English wife, Mary Stuart, on 13 February 1689. However, questions over William's Dutch origins remained pertinent throughout the early years of his reign. Soon after his coronation, William approached Parliament with the request that England enter war with France on the grounds of reducing the growing power of the French nation, while protecting the English state. On 7 May 1689, Parliament acquiesced, and William formally declared war on France. This alliance with the United Provinces represented a radical repositioning of English foreign policy from that of James, who remained politically removed from the growing conflict on the continent. However, many Tories began to express their anxieties as the cost of the war, in terms of finances and arms, augmented. In this atmosphere of financial concern, Tory accusations targeted the King's nationality to question where his allegiances laid.

Given this historical context, this chapter will explore how English propagandists understood Dutch-born William, either as a threat to English political autonomy and economic resources, or a representative of an increasingly transnational union working to protect Protestant Europe from the political and religious ambitions of Louis XIV. William's Dutch identity was crucial to the formulation of political propaganda, particularly in regard to the revolutionary settlement and the war with France. As in the subsequent chapters, I will first discuss Jacobite propaganda, followed by a section focused on Williamite writings.

Jacobite Propaganda

Once word began to circulate that William of Orange was planning to enter the Kingdom of England, the English royal publishers worked to present the Prince of Orange as a foreigner usurper, attempting to illegally claim the throne. On 23 September 1688, the Prince of Orange announced to the States General of the United Provinces his intention to invade England. Within a week, James and his council began a propaganda campaign aimed at dismantling William's claims to protect the rights and liberties of the English people. In a Proclamation, James announced, "We have received undoubted advice that a great and sudden invasion from Holland, with an armed force of foreigners and strangers, will speedily be made in a hostile manner upon this our kingdom."[11] James argued that the Prince of Orange purposely fabricated "some false pretences relating to liberty, property, and religion, contrived or worded with art and subtlety" in order to gain support among the English people. The royal regime of James advanced the argument that the Prince of Orange was concealing his true reasons for invading England. In his Proclamation, James argued,

[11] James II. *Proclamation of King James II, September 28, 1688*. (London, 1688).

> It is manifest however (considering the great preparations that are making) that no less matter by this invasion is proposed and purposed than an absolute conquest of our kingdoms and the utter subduing and subjecting us and our people to a foreign power.[12]

Representing the actions of William of Orange as a foreign usurpation by the Dutch was politically useful, for such a representation encouraged the unification of the English people under the leadership of King James against a possible foreign invasion. James' Declaration on 28 September urged,

> And therefore we solemnly conjure our subjects to lay aside all manner of animosities, jealousies and prejudices, and heartily and cheerfully to unite together in the defence of us and their native country, which they alone will (under God) defeat and frustrate the principal hope and design of our enemies, who expect to find a people divided.[13]

Consequently, the court of James was able to reorient the invasion of the Prince of Orange as a problem of national autonomy in an increasingly cosmopolitan Europe, and the English people needed to collectively unite against Dutch ambitions. The Jacobite regime thus urged that the Prince of Orange was purposely manipulating the invasion into being about religion, namely the protection of the Protestant faith.

Regardless of the Prince of Orange's justifications for his invasion, Jacobite propagandists insisted that a free practice of the English government was not possible under foreign occupation. In a royal Declaration, James argued, "Nothing is more evident than that a parliament cannot be free, so long as there is an army of foreigners in the heart of our kingdoms."[14] In a similar manner, a pamphleteer responded to the Declaration of the Prince of Orange, "Nor is anything more inconsistent with Government, than the

---

[12] James II. *Proclamation of King James, September 28, 1688*. (London, 1688).
[13] Ibid.
[14] James II. *Proclamation of King James, November 6, 1688.* (London, 1688).

interposition of Foreign Power."[15] Such propagandists contended that the actions of the Prince of Orange were a direct challenge to English political autonomy. By placing England under the control of a foreign ruler, these writers argued that a free practice of governance by the hereditary monarchy and elected members of the Parliament was not possible, regardless of the claims of William to restore a just parliament. These arguments focused on the practice of a free and inclusive government particularly targeted moderate Whigs, who deeply valued the role of Parliament in English society.

Yet, Jacobite propagandists contended that the usurpation was not the end of the difficulties for the English people. Foreign occupation was presented as the first step in placing England under full control of the United Provinces. For the Jacobites, such domination would mean an institution of dangerous religious pluralism and a limited monarchy. James warned there would still be "many mischiefs and calamities which an army of foreigners and rebels must unavoidably bring upon our people."[16] In the pamphlet, *England's Crisis,* the author argued, "May we make most to deliver ourselves from the impending Mischief of a Dutch Conquest, or from the greatest of Mischiefs, the *Spirit of Slavery under a* Commonwealth."[17] Jacobites worried that a Dutch victory would mean an introduction of republicanism and widespread religious toleration, which conflicted with their vision for England's development. Consequently, support for William of Orange was depicted as inherently against the wellbeing of the English kingdom.

In addition to targeting the Dutch military in their campaigns, Jacobite propagandists focused on explicitly representing William as a foreign usurper. In his work, *Historical*

---

[15] Anonymous. *Animadversions Upon the Declaration of His Highness Prince of Orange*. (London, 1688), 21.
[16] James II. *Proclamation of King James, November 6, 1688*. (London, 1688).
[17] Anonymous. *Englands crisis, or, The World well mended.* (London, 1689?), 2.

Romance, John Sergeant created a mythical allegory about the usurpation by King William. Eugenius, the ruler of Utopia, acted as the symbolic representative of King James, while his ambitious son-in-law Nasonius represented William of Orange. Upon the urgings of Lucifer, Nasonius successfully plotted to "drive his pious Father out of his three Kingdoms, and get them for himself."[18] Similarly, Arthur Mainwaring represented King William as Tarquin, the patricidal son-in-law, in his poem, *Tarquin and Tullia.* King James, in a royal proclamation, also emphasized the Prince of Orange's unnatural ambition, which led him to depose of his father-in-law. The Declaration read, "We cannot consider this invasion of our kingdoms by the Prince of Orange without horror, for so unchristian and unnatural an undertaking in a person so nearly related to us." [19] The author of *A Balance Adjusted* further warned that the Prince of Orange was unlikely to represent the best interests of his new subjects by basis of his ambitions and foreign origins, "Since he spared not one so near to us as our King was to him, how can we expect he should have Bowels of Compassion for us?"[20]

English xenophobia toward the Dutch significantly influenced Jacobite propaganda, which increasingly emphasized that William of Orange was not a true Englishman. One author wrote, "Neither the air of England, the honour, benefit, and riches the Prince of Orange hath got by it, hath rendered him more English than ever he was, being wholly entirely Dutch in soul and body."[21] Similarly, the Prince of Orange was accused of favouring Dutch officials in government positions, at the expense of English well-being. John Sergeant

---

[18] Sergeant, John. *An historical romance of the wars between the mighty giant Gallieno, and the great knight Nasonius, and his associates*. (Dublin, 1694).

[19] James II. *Proclamation of King James, November 6, 1688*. (London, 1688).

[20] Anonymous. *The ballance adjusted: or, the interest of church and state weighed and considered upon this revolution*. (1688), 10.

21 Anonymous. *A Modest Apology for the loyal Protestant Subjects of King James, who desire his Restoration, without Prejudice to our Religion, Laws or Liberties*. (London, 1692), 418.

accused, "He was willing to sacrifice the Men, Money, and Interest of Utopia to that of his own dear Country-men."[22] This charge took on a particularly poignancy in light of William's decision to enter England into the war against France, a theme which will be explored more thoroughly in the next section.

Jacobite writings that focused on presenting William of Orange as a Dutch usurper intended to challenge the legitimacy of William's quest for the English throne by promoting a xenophobic depiction of the Dutch stadtholder. These arguments were rooted in an early conception of English nationalism. Jacobite writers contended that the Dutch prince represented a challenge to English political autonomy. Both implicitly and explicitly throughout these propaganda messages, there existed an idea that there was a distinct English identity, that defined the practice of English governance, which a ruler of foreign origin would not be able to fully understand nor preserve. In particular, William threatened two distinctly English institutions, namely the constitutional monarchy and the Church of England, by the nature of his foreign origins and Presbyterian faith. However, the strength of these arguments in encouraging the English people to support King James rather than William was deeply damaged by James' decision to depart for France on 23 December 1688, raising questions over whether the king had intentionally abdicated the throne.

Throughout their propaganda, Jacobite writers also drew heavily upon the Dutch tradition of extensive toleration, in order to challenge William's legitimacy as the future ruler of England. The United Provinces were widely recognized throughout Europe as a religiously pluralistic state, and the Republic had developed a reputation as a safe haven for persecuted individuals across Europe. Particularly among non-jurors, opponents of William

[22] Sergeant, 32-33.

questioned the sincerity of the new monarch's religious beliefs. Such propagandists argued that the Dutch people were profoundly atheist. The author of *A Balance Adjusted* complained, "There is a Toleration, or free Liberty of Exercise and Profession to any, even the Rankest and most Blasphemous Hereticks in the World, insomuch that it cannot properly be said that there is any face of Religion among them."[23] The nonjuror Charles Leslie lamented that trade held more value for the Dutch people, "Is it for their *Religion* that we love the *Dutch?* I wish *Religion,* of any sort had so much Power in *England!* But can they be true to *Religion*, who are content… to renounce their *Christianity,* to promote their *Trade?"*[24]

Such Jacobite propagandists were particularly alarmed that this lack of religious belief would affect domestic government policy. One pamphleteer argued of the Dutch State, "All their Acts of State are with an Eye to that, only without any Consideration of Religion, especially of the Reformation."[25] Similarly, Charles Leslie noted, "The present king had the misfortune (to himself and to us) to be educated under the Geneva model, made Erastian in Holland: And it cannot be imagined, that the alteration of his present circumstances have wrought as great a change in his principles."[26] Leslie warned that William was educated as a Presbyterian under the 'Geneva model', which created a further threat that the Prince of Orange would side with the radical Presbyterians in their attempt to dismantle the episcopacy in Scotland.[27] Such writers were alerting their fellow Englishmen about how accepting a foreign Dutchman as the head of the English monarchy

---

[23] *The ballance adjusted*, 2.
[24] Leslie, Charles. *Delenda Carthago, or, The true interest of England in relation to France and Holland* (London, 1695), 8.
[25] *The Ballance Adjusted*, 8.
[26] Leslie, Charles. *Querala Temporum; or the Danger of the Church of England.* (1694). Quoted in Rose, 34.
[27] Chapter 3 is dedicated to addressing the religious settlement in Scotland and England.

would alter the existing balance between Church and state. High Churchmen were particularly alarmed that the new monarch would subject the interests of the Church of England to the secular state, a course of action that seemed likely for an individual from a nation where the Erastian model was the norm.

This Jacobite argument gained particular traction among High Churchmen, who felt that William was threatening the predominance of the Church of England by encouraging greater toleration of Protestant nonconformity. William was suspected of lacking any sincere religious beliefs, and he tended toward a moderate domestic policy in regard to the religious settlement in England. Consequently, in March of 1689, William's Secretary of State introduced two bills to Parliament in order to encourage increased toleration for the dissenting community. These bills were the Bill of Comprehension, which aimed to bring moderate dissenters back into the Church of England, and a bill of Indulgence, which removed penalties for the practice of dissenting faiths. While the Bill of Comprehension was ultimately halted, King William passed the Act of Indulgence on 24 May 1689. This Toleration Act of 1689 was considered by High Churchmen to be the beginning of rampant religious pluralism at the expense of the Church of England. However, in many ways, the supremacy of the Church of England remained intact. Unlike Scotland, England had avoided the abolition of episcopacy, while sacramental qualifications were still required in order to hold office.

Furthermore, Jacobite propagandists also presented the United Provinces as a nation of ambitious merchants who cared only about advancing their own trade interests. By 1689, the United Provinces had developed the most lucrative trading system in Europe, and the English kingdom was the only European state to rival the economic prominence of

the Dutch. Consequently, Jacobite propagandists asserted that the Dutch considered the English to be a threat to their mercantile dominance. Charles Leslie argued, "The *Interest* and *Life of Holland*, all the World knows is *Trade… England* has been their only mighty *Rival* for the *Trade* of the *World."*[28] *Min Heer T. Van C's Answer to Min Heer H Van L's Letter, Representing the True Interests of Holland*, the author states, "'Tis certain *England* had robbed us of our Trade in the two last Kings Reigns… 'Tis certain also, that late King *James* was taking most mischievious measures to continue and augment their Trade, and ruine ours."[29] The author contended that this jealousy would drive the Dutch to plot against English economic success.

In a similar manner, other Jacobite propagandist asserted that the Dutch aimed to gain governmental control over England as a means of eliminating their main economic competitor. Nathaniel Johnston argued "[King James] made the *Dutch* jealous, and envious, and in spite of their Avarice contributed to that fatal Expedition [i.e. William's invasion]."[30] Another pamphleteer claimed that William's decision to invade England was a result of "the sensibleness the Dutch had, that [King James], by his granting liberty of conscience, and providing such naval and military stores, had a design to promote the traffick of his subjects, and oblige the Dutch to a juster and more equitable regulation of trade."[31] The writer argues that this fair exercise of trade did not suit the Dutch, and so William was

---

[28] Lesilie, *Delenda Cathago,* 2.

[29] T. Van C. *Min Heer T. Van C's Answer to Min Heer H Van L's Letter, Representing the True Interests of Holland.* (London, 1690), 1.

[30] Johnston, Nathaniel. *The dear bargain. Or, A true representation of the state of the English nation under the Dutch* (London, 1689), 3.

[31] Anonymous. *A Modest Apology for the Loyal Protestant Subjects of King James, Who Desire his Restoration, without Prejudice to our Religion, Laws, or Liberties: In Answer to the Pretences of the French Invasion Examined*. In Walter Scott (ed.) A Collection of Scare and Valuable Tracts on the Most Entertaining Subjects: Reign of King William III. (London, 1818), 402.

encouraged to invade the English kingdom to ensure their economic dominance. Such propagandists warned that supporting the Prince of Orange would place England at risk of subjecting their nation to Dutch mercantile interests. In *Dutch Designs Anatomized*, the author wrote, "The true Motives, and first springs of this design on the part of the *States* must have been the care of preserving their trade."[32] Consequently, such writers argued that economic success motivated the Dutch to invade England in order to subjugate their biggest rivals and advance their own economic interests at the expense of the English.

Accusations of Dutch greed continued following the coronation of William as King of England. As the new monarch entered England into a costly war with France, propagandists argued that the Dutch were hoping the expense of the war would eliminate England as a mercantile threat. Nathaniel Johnston argued that it was in the interest of Dutch trade to enter England into the costly war with France. He wrote, "It is their interest (and they know it and love it too) that the *French* should drain us as they do."[33] Similarly, Charles Leslie argued, "It is their *Mammon*, their interest (and they have ever been true to it) to ruine *England.*"[34] Such economic arguments provided the main bulwark used by the Tory community against William's war with France.

Tories under the new monarchy were distraught that William had suddenly brought the English nation into the Nine Years' War being fought on the continent. Under the leadership of King James, England held a notably neutral stance in regard to foreign policy. However, on 7 May 1689, Parliament agreed that England should enter into war against the

---

[32] Anonymous. *The Dutch design anatomized, or, A discovery of the wickedness and unjustice of the intended invasion and a clear proof that it is the interest of all the King's subjects to defend His Majesty and their country against it / written by a true member of the Church of England, and lover of his country, for the satisfaction of a person of quality*. (London, 1688), 7.

[33] Nathaniel Johnston, *A Dear Bargain,* 4.

[34] Leslie, *Delenda Carthago,* 8.

French nation. Tory propagandists were shocked that the Dutch monarch had refused to delay England's commitment to a new war. Suspicions arose that the Dutch monarch had originally invaded England with the primary goal of forcing England to contribute costly military support against the United Provinces' long time foe, France. The Jacobite nonjuror, Sir John Bramston concluded, "The whole confederate Princes made it their business to disjoyne England from France, which could not be effected whilst Charles II or James II were on the thorne… and the Prince had a good colour to use force to prevent his wifes disinhersion and his owne."[35] Similarly, Samuel Grascombe contended that the revolution was "a flat Cheat of the Dutch, and other Confederates, to gull silly England, at the expence of their Blood and Treasure to maintain *their* War."[36]

Many propagandists argued that the British were paying for the Dutchmen's war, bringing concerns over the comparative economic strength of the United Provinces and England into focus. In a speech to the House of Commons, Wagstaffe argued, "This war, and all the charges, we have been at, was purely for the Dutch."[37] Another writer argued, "We have engaged ourselves in the costly, dangerous, and (in all likelihood) lasting war of the confederates against France, which we were free from before… We have exhausted ourselves, to give him vast sums of money, besides what we have kindly lent him out of our pockets."[38] Another pamphleteer estimated that the war cost a hefty 3 million pounds per annum, primarily in taxes on the English people.[39] A Jacobite writer argued that such high

---

[35] Bramston, John. *Autobiography of Sir John Bramston, K.B. if Skreens, in the Hundred of Chelmsford*. (ed.) Lord Braybrook (1835), pp. 385. Quoted in Rose, 119.
[36] Gramscombe, Samuel. *New Court-Contrivances, or, More Sham-Plots still, against true-hearted Englishmen* (London, 1693), 2.
[37] Wagstaffe, *His Majesty's Most Gracious Speech*, 604. Quoted in Rose, 119.
[38] Anonymous. *A letter from the King of Great Britain to the Earl of Portland* (London, 1691), 6.
[39] Clayton, 123.

taxation was a new element of the reign under King William: "We cannot but remember that in King *James's* time, and for a great part of King *Charles* the Second's, for almost 15 years, there had neither been Land Tax nor Poll, the whole Country enjoyed the unspeakable benefits of Peace and Plenty."[40]

Other propagandists took a more severe argument, claiming that there existed a Dutch conspiracy that orchestrated the overthrow of King James. In *Dutch Designs Anatomized,* the author argued that Dutch politicians purposely tried to turn the English people against the old monarch, namely through raising suspicions over James' Declarations of Indulgence and the legitimacy of his newborn son. The author argued that William's projected persona as the Protestant protector was a carefully constructed fabrication to garner the most support. He wrote, "Hence the glorious Title of Protector of the Protestant Religion, and Defender of the English Liberties was pitched upon, as the most likely to bewitch the people here to embrace his knees."[41] The Scottish Whig Sir James Montgomery also advanced a similar conspiracy in his pamphlet, *Great Britain's Just Complaint*. Montgomery argued that the Dutch conspirators knew that James was unwilling to contribute military aid or funds to finance the war against France "but for equivalent returns of glory and profit to the nation," so they conspired to remove the monarch. Montgomery concluded, "We paid them very handsomely for the trick they put upon us."[42]

Both Tories and disaffected Whigs, growing increasingly resentful of the king's preference for Dutch counselors, recognized that the war with France appeared to be

---

[40] Nathaniel Johnston, *A Dear Bargain, 5.*

[41] *The Dutch Design Anatomized*, 8.

[42] Montgomery, James. *Great Britain's just complaint for her late measures, present sufferings, and the future miseries she is exposed to with the best, safest, and most effectual way of securing and establishing her religion, government, liberty, and property upon good and lasting foundations : fully and clearly discovered in answer to two late pamphlets concerning the pretended French invasion.* (London, 1692).

draining the resources of the English nation. Nathaniel Johnston argued that the English people were being forced into poverty as a result of the war. He dismayed over the increasing number of individuals who were "forced to beg, steal, or rob." In his pamphlet, *Dear Bargain*, he wrote,

> I am confounded, I must confess, with Horrour, to look only back upon the Miseries we have hitherto felt; but when I consider that *Pandora's* is but just open'd and view a long Train of War, Famine, Want, Bloud, and Confusion, entailed upon us and our Posterity, as long as this Man, or any descended from him, shall possess the throne… These considerations, I say, chill my Bloud in my veins.[43]

Similarly, a balladeer lamented, "Too well, we understand/what causes all our grief and care/It is the Wars by Sea and Land." He continued, "For while these Wars and Troubles are/Here's none but Sorrows, Grief, and Care. "[44] These arguments created nostalgia for the earlier reign of James II, during which time the people of England were significantly less taxed.

Similarly within Parliament, there emerged concerns over the extreme cost of the war with France. MPs also argued against the growing number of Dutchmen serving as advisors to the new monarch, and the substantial number of land grants going to foreigners. In December of 1692, the Tory MP Thomas Clarges charged, "I cannot but take notice that though we were drawn into this war by the Dutch—they being the principals---yet we must bear a greater share of the burden."[45] Similarly, the Whig MP Paul Foley contended, "England bears almost the charge of the war and others reap the benefit of it."[46]

---

[43] Johnston, *The Dear Bargain,* 23.

[44] Anonymous. *THE Troubles of this World; OR, Nothing Cheap but Poor Mens Labour. Concluding with a Line of Comfortable Consolation, to Chear up our Drooping Hearts, in a time of Trouble.* (1696?)

[45] Luttrell, Narcissus. *Parliamentary Diary of Narcissus Luttrell 1691-1693*. (ed). Henry Horwitz. (Oxford, 1972), 262. Quoted in Rose, 120.

While dissenting voices within Parliament came from both sides of the Whig and Tory divide, Parliament ultimately continued to finance the war effort.

Fundamentally, Jacobite writers worked to create a xenophobic propaganda campaign, which presented William of Orange as a foreign intruder to the English kingdom. As an individual from Dutch origins, William was seen as separate from and incapable of becoming part of the English people. Yet, these propagandists went further to argue that William represented a threat to their conception of Britain across several key areas, including government, religion, and trade. Under his leadership, Jacobites contended Parliament could not freely function freely and the English people would become enslaved to Dutch priorities. Additionally, since William was a stadtholder within a nation where toleration was freely practiced, Jacobite propagandists contended that the interests of the Church of England would be subjected to the civil state if William were to ascend the throne. In regard to finances, Jacobite propagandists accused the Dutch Provinces of attempting to reduce England as their primary mercantile threat, particularly by encouraging English involvement in an expensive war against France.

Crucially, this campaign represented an attempt by the Jacobites to define what it should mean to be English, against which the Dutch background of William of Orange were made to look foreign and incompatible. As William represented a threat to key institutions of English society and the Church of England, the Jacobite propagandists focused their rhetoric on preserving the unique characteristics of England against the occupation of a foreign militia and the leadership of a foreign ruler. This argument based on preservation and protection signifies a growing awareness that England differed in many ways from her

---

[46] Ibid.

neighbouring states in Continental Europe. Moreover, the Jacobite propagandists recognized that there was an active need and desire to protect England's unique differences from foreign influence. In this manner, the propaganda campaigns represented a profound anxiety among the English people in regard to the impact of foreign influences in an increasingly cosmopolitan Europe.

Williamite Propaganda

When William first declared his intention to invade the kingdom of England, the Prince of Orange was immediately faced with a problem of legitimacy. As a Dutch prince, any attempt to enter the English kingdom would be construed by Jacobite propagandists as an attempt of a foreigner ruler to usurp the throne of England. Consequently, Williamite propagandists were left with the sizeable task of making William the most evident and legitimate future ruler of England.

Some Williamite propagandists argued that William of Orange had a right to the throne through his familial connection to King James. While William was of Dutch origin, he had married Mary Stuart, daughter of King James, in 1677. The Prince of Orange appealed to the English people that his marriage invested in him a deep concern for the English nation. In his 30 September 1688 Declaration, William compelled, "And since our dearest and most entirely beloved Consort the Princess, and likewise ourselves, have so great an interest in this matter, and such a right, as all the world knows, to the succession to the Crown."[47]

Other propagandists contended that William had a legal right to the throne because he was acting upon an appeal of several members of Parliament to restore the liberties of

[47] William III. *Declaration of the Prince of Orange, September 30, 1688*. (London, 1688)

the English people. On 30 June 1688, a council of members of the House of Lords, now known as the Immortal Seven, wrote to the Prince of Orange inviting him to lead a Dutch army across the North Sea in order to liberate the English people from the increasingly tyrannical rule of King James. Williamite propagandists widely circulated copies of this letter to act as a legal justification of the Dutch landing in England. Rather than being represented as a foreign invader, this letter helped construct Prince of Orange within the public eye as a concerned protector of English liberties, a man who was responding to a desperate plea from the people of England themselves. The framers of the letter requested,

> If the circumstances stand so with Your Highness that you believe you can get here time enough, in a condition to give assistances this year sufficient for a relief under these circumstances which have been now represented, we who subscribe this will not fail to attend Your Highness upon your landing and to do all that lies in our power to prepare others to be in as much readiness as such an action is capable of.[48]

Consequently, Willamite propagandists attempted to thwart accusations that William was a Dutch usurper by arguing that he was acting upon the request and behalf of the abused English people.

When the Prince of Orange decided to answer the request of these members of the House of Lords, he released his first Declaration on 30 September 1688 announcing his intentions. This Declaration presented his objectives, "We now think fit to declare that this our expedition is intended for no other design but to have a free and lawful parliament assembled as soon as possible."[49] The Declaration argued that the Prince of Orange had received word that the English monarchy, under the influence of evil counselors, had become increasingly absolutist in nature. In order to remedy the situation, the Prince of

---

[48] William III. *Invitation to the Prince of Orange, June 30, 1688*. (London, 1688).

[49] William III. *Declaration of the Prince of Orange, September 30, 1688*. (London, 1688).

Orange was embarking on a mission to England to re-establish a free parliament of the English people. However, the Declaration made no statement on his aspirations to be considered as the future monarch of England.[50] While this Declaration helped William justify his decision to invade, it would later be used by Jacobite propagandists to argue that the Dutchman was being dishonest about his true intentions in entering the English kingdom when William began to make claims for the throne.

By December of 1688, King James and his family had fled to France. In the wake of the King's absence, questions emerged over the future of the monarchical settlement. In particular, Whig and Tory politicians debated whether James had abdicated the throne by fleeing to the Continent and if William held any hereditary right to claim the throne of England. In order to answer these questions, William summoned a Convention of both peers and commoners to meet on 22 January of the following year. While the Commons had concluded that James had in fact abdicated the throne, Tory members of the House of Lords disagreed with the blatant attempt to assist William in claiming the throne. Consequently, the House of Lords rejected the proposal that James had left the throne vacant. A following attempt was made to secure the throne for Mary alone, a clear act of hereditary succession, although this proposal equally ended in an impasse.

Despite many efforts by the English Williamites, their legal arguments to justify the Dutch stadtholder's claim to the throne proved to be of minimal success. The Williamite regime quickly recognized that its reliance upon legal arguments, such as familial ties or the abdication of the throne by King James, to justify the Prince of Orange's claim to the throne opened up ample room for Jacobite criticisms. Tories pointed out that William had

---

[50] For a more thorough discussion of the Prince of Orange's Declaration, see Clayton, 'Courtly Reformation and the Revolution of 1688-1689,' *William III and the Godly Revolution.* (New York, 1996).

no hereditary claim to the throne. James Francis Edward Stuart, the object of the Warming Pan Scandal, was first in line for the succession followed by Mary Stuart, making any legal arguments based on hereditary succession weak at best.[51] Additionally, Tory opponents to William's claim to the throne challenged that although certain members of the House of Lords had invited the Prince to England, he was invited only with the intention of restoring a just Parliament and the full rights of the English people. No request was made for assistance in the deposition of the King, and the Prince of Orange made no mention of his intentions to claim the English throne in his Declaration on 30 September 1688. Consequently, the initial legal arguments, which justified William's claim to the throne against the xenophobic propaganda campaigns by the Jacobites, proved not powerful enough alone to win the monarchical settlement for the Prince of Orange.

As the legal arguments initially put forth by Williamite propagandists weakened under Jacobite scrutiny, William's supporters re-focused their propaganda campaigns to center on representing Prince William as the object of God's divine ordinance and the defender of the Protestant faith both in England and across Europe.[52] In his work on the royal propaganda following William's invasion, Claydon concluded, "Over the winter of 1688, Williamite reformation was gradually to replace English constitutionalism as the defence of William's position."[53] While Williamite propagandists emphasized that William was a friend to the Protestant cause, they did not represent the Prince of Orange as the

---

[51] On 10 June 1688, James Frances Edward Stuart was born, making him the long awaited heir to the English throne. However, there existed an extensive Whig rumour that the baby was a stillborn. The Warming Pan Scandal contended that in order to preserve the Catholic Stuart lineage, a supposititious baby had been smuggled into the birthing room by means of a warming pan.

[52] There is limited existing evidence affirming that the strength of Jacobite counterarguments were responsible for the shift in focus in the Williamite propaganda campaigns of the 1688. However, this is the most plausible explanation for the sudden re-centering of Williamite propaganda around divine ordinance.

[53] Clayton, 52.

leader of an exclusionary pan-European union. Rather, Williamite propagandists also asserted that William was a defender of all European liberties, regardless of religious affiliations.

The Williamite propagandists first worked to present the Prince of Orange as the saviour of the English people, protecting them from the horrors of Catholic absolutism under King James. As will be discussed further in the France chapter, James' personal faith was increasingly associated with the tyrannical leadership of Louis XIV. As James' actions continued to resemble those of the French king, Williamite propagandists warned that James' allegiances lay with the French monarchy, rather than the English state, meaning James was a foreigner by *ideology*, if not from birth. Consequently, William argued that he planned to invade the Kingdom of England in order to protect the Protestant faith of the English people against the attempts of James to institute greater toleration for Catholics in violation of existing English law. In his 30 June 1688 Declaration, William argued that he was venturing to England in order to "procure a settlement of the religion and of the liberties" for the English people.[54] English supporters of William generated similar themes within their propaganda. A balladeer wrote, "Then let us defend the brave Orange's Cause/He came to restore our Religion and Laws/We neither for Pope nor Papists will care/And as for the French, let them come if they dare."[55] In celebration of the arrival of the Prince of Orange, another balladeer wrote, "Then let West-country Protestants all/Drink

---

[54] James II. *Declaration of King James II, June 30, 1688*. (London, 1688).

[55] Anonymous. *The Protestant's Jubile: OR, A Farewel to Popery. Being an Excellent Cordial to Chear a Protestant's Heart: Made of the Juice of an Orange.* (1689).

round a sound touch/To this brave Prince & Dutch/Who redeem'd us from slavery and thrall."[56]

William's supporters also worked to direct attention away from the Prince of Orange's foreign origins by focusing on another international political threat: Louis XIV. In addition to Louis' despotic imposition of religious uniformity within France, the French monarch was also believed to be desirous of establishing a universal French empire across Europe. Therefore, supporters of the Dutch prince argued that the European community needed to stop the political and religious ambitions of Louis XIV, and William of Orange was the ideal individual to lead the cause. Preacher William King described the Prince of Orange as the "Patron and Defender of the Liberty of *Europe."*[57] Archbishop Tillotson argued further that the Prince of Orange was selflessly dedicating himself not only to the defense of England, but the entirety of Europe. Tillotson argued, "This great Deliverance from the design'd *Invasion*, and this glorious *Victory,* God vouch'saf'd to us *at Home*, whist His Sacred Majesty was so freely hazarding his Royal Person *abroad*, in the Publick Cause of the Rights and Liberties of almost all *Europe*."[58] Similarly, a balladeer wrote, **"**Proud Lewis of France they will make him to fear/When our gracious King William he then shall come there/…. Then Boys let us fight with our Courage so free/To pull down the French and the pride of popery."[59]

---

[56] Anonymous. *A NEW SONG Made in the Praise of the West of England.* (1690).

[57] King, William. *Europe's deliverance from France and slavery a sermon, preached at St. Patrick's Church, Dublin, on the 16th of November 1690 : being the day of thanksgiving for the preservation of His Majesties person, his good success in our deliverance, and his safe and happy return into England*. (London, 1691), 2.

[58] Tillotson, John. *A sermon preached before the King and Queen at White-Hall, the 27th of October being the day appointed for a publick thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the signal victory at sea, for the preservation of His Majesty's Sacred Person, and for his safe return to his people*. (London, 1692), 25.

[59] Anonymous. *The Souldiers Prayers for King VVILLIAMS Good Success in Ireland Over His Enemies.* (London, 1690).

Interpreting the Revolution as an act of divine ordinance was a key component of Williamite propaganda.[60] Such writers insisted that William's success in crossing the North Sea was ordained by God. In his 30 June 1688 Declaration, the Prince of Orange announced that he intended to enter the English Kingdom, and it would be a matter of the will of God whether he was to be successful. He declared, "We have thought fit to go over to England and to carry with us a force sufficient, by the blessing of God, to defend us from the violence of those evil counselors."[61] When William was announced the ruler of the English kingdom, Williamite propagandists interpreted the event as an act of God, just as William had predicted in his earlier Declaration. In 1690, a preacher proclaimed that William's coronation was "conducted by a special Providence, which loudly proclaim'd all along, that it was God who had raised him up, to restore our Israel, to deliver our Bodies from the Tyranny of Men, and our Souls from the Doctrines of Devils."[62] Similarly, the preacher William King stated, "It has been carried on by such a miraculous chain of Providences, that we must acknowledge, that it is by the *Grace of God,* that *William* and *Mary* are now our King and Queen."[63]

However, not all Williamite propagandists tried to distract attention away from the Prince of Orange's Dutch origins. Certain Williamite propagandists used the king's Dutch background to argue that there existed a sense of goodwill and friendly obligation between

---

[60] It must be noted that Tony Claydon further defined this rhetoric of divine ordinance in his book, *William III and the Godly Revolution.* Claydon argued that William's propagandists redefined Englishness away from the material conceptualization of England as a body of kinsmen, susceptible to foreign invasion, as advanced by Jacobite opponents. In exchange, Williamites conceived Englishness as representing "a national covenant with a deity." In other words, England was a nation with a special divine relationship with God.

[61] William III. *Declaration of the Prince of Orange, June 30, 1688.* (London, 1688).

[62] Anonymous. *A Sermon Preached upon The Fast-Day, June the 18th, 1690. By the Presbyter of the Church of England, that Swore in the Sincerity of his Heart, with a full satisfied Conscience, to King William and Queen Mary.* (1690). Quoted in Rose, 20.

[63] King, William. 21.

the nations of England and the United Provinces. Such propagandists urged the English people to remember the sacrifices the Dutch were willing to make in order to ensure the liberties and freedoms of the English nation. Preacher William King argued that the Dutch were sacrificing the wellbeing of their nation in order to assist the English people. He orated,

> We all know that the *United Netherlands* are a free People, most Jealous of their Liberty… And so they are jealous of their Liberty, so they are close and wary and not apt to venture too much at one state. Now that such a People should commit the absolute disposal of their *Navy, their Armies, and their Money, the very Sinews of their State*…. Was an *unbounded Trust and Kindness.*[64]

Similarly, William's supporters argued that the Prince of Orange willfully journeyed across the sea in order to protect the interests of the English Nation. In his song, 'The Protestants Triumph,' the balladeer stated of William of Orange:

> He is in the prospect of Englands Great Crown,
> And fully resolved to keep Popery down,
> And therefore he ventur'd o're Tempestuous Seas
> When he might have tarry'd at home at his case:
> But 'twas for our good, as it well does appear,
> That he was so Graciously pleas'd to come here.[65]

William's supporters emphasized that the prince was not obligated to assist the English people. Rather, they argued, he graciously responded to the request of a few Englishmen to assist in the battle for the protection of English law. For these individuals, William represented a true Englishman, for although he was not born on English soil, he was acting in the best interests of the nation and her people. Unlike the native born James II, William

---

[64] Ibid., 16.

[65] Anonymous. *The PROTESTANTS TRIUMPH: OR, King WILLIAM Proclaim'd, to the Subjects Joy and Gladness.* (1689)

proved his allegiance to the kingdom of England by fighting for the rights of its people, rather than fleeing to France.

Such propagandists argued that without the Dutch, the English would have been left vulnerable to the territorial ambitions of Louis XIV. By the beginning of the 1680's, France had emerged as the most powerful state within Europe, and it was speculated that Louis XIV was desirous of forming a universal trans-European empire. Consequently, Williamite propagandists contended that the United Provinces provided the necessary assistance to limit the power of the French military. A balladeer wrote of the Dutch,

> Dutch-men of War they will us meet,
> For to compleat our Royal Fleet;
> Which being done they will [advance],
> For to pull down the pride of France.[66]

In a similar manner, John Hampden reminded his readers, "The Dutch resolved upon lending us their best troops, and actually sent them under the conduct of the Prince of Orange."[67] These Williamite propagandists urged their fellow countrymen to recognize and be grateful for the United Provinces for their allegiance against the French king's attempts at an expansionist foreign policy.

Other balladeers attempted to counter Jacobite arguments that occupation by Dutch soldiers would mean the ransacking and bankruptcy of the nation. In his ballad, "The Protestants Triumph," a balladeer wrote,

> The most of his Army we see are inclin'd
> Unto a most Noble and Generous Mind;
> Behaving themselves here most gallant and brave,
> Both Silver and Gold in their Pockets they have,
> They come not to burthen this Nation at all,

---

[66] Anonymous. *THE Devonshire Boys Courage AND Loyalty to Their Majesties King WILLIAM and Queen MARY; in defending their Country from the Invasion of the French.* (1692).
[67] Hampden, John. *Some Considerations on the Most Proper Way of Raising Money* (London, 1691), 2.

> But freely they pay for what ever they call;
> By which they have purchas'd the Nations Good-will
> Our Gracious King *William* may Heaven Bless still.[68]

The balladeer argued that the Dutch soldiers, despite being of foreign descent, have bravely and willingly entered England for the wellbeing of the English people. This moral and economic argument that the Dutchmen were bringing new wealth to the nation was a compelling retort to accusations that the foreign soldiers were entering England to overcome and impoverish its people. Another ballad similarly described the soldiers, "They pay all their Quarters most honest and brave/ They charge not the Country for ought that they have."[69] Such ballads clarified that foreign occupation by William's soldiers would not negatively impact English citizens.

While Williamite propagandists frequently used legally based arguments early within William's campaign for the throne, these arguments were phased out of usage. Additionally, greater emphasis was placed on rhetoric of divine ordinance and defense of European liberties, which became central features of the Williamite propaganda campaigns. These propagandists insisted that William of Orange was a representative of a transnational community, which was seeking to limit the aspirations of Louis XIV to institute absolutism and religious uniformity across Europe. Other propagandists refused to shy away from hiding William of Orange's Dutch origin, which was used to argue that the Dutch were leading the cause against the French kingdom out of goodwill toward their neighbouring states, including England. In this manner, the Williamite propagandists

---

[68] Anonymous. *The PROTESTANTS TRIUMPH: OR, King WILLIAM Proclaim'd, to the Subjects Joy and Gladness.* (1689).
[69] Anonymous. A Full Description of these Times; Or The Prince of ORANGE's March from EXETER to LONDON. (1689).

demonstrated a greater willingness to enter and support transnational alliances than the Jacobite community. By the end of the seventeenth century, the balance of powers was shifting throughout Europe, with France emerging as the most powerful kingdom. The Williamite regime recognized that although the Prince of Orange was a foreigner, accepting him as the king of England, in addition to forging alliances with other kingdoms of Europe, would best ensure English political autonomy in an increasingly interconnected Europe.

Conclusion

William of Orange's Dutch origins brought the United Provinces into the center of debate for English propagandists during the Revolution of 1688-9. However, Jacobite and Williamite propagandists adopted oppositional strategies for exploiting these origins for the benefit of their political goals. Jacobite writers in England consistently presented William in a xenophobic light. These writers contended that the Prince of Orange, as a foreigner, would never truly assimilate with the English people nor would he be able to represent their best interests. William was deemed a threat to particularly English institutions, such as the hereditary monarchy and the Church of England. Jacobite propagandists further insisted that William's leadership of England would place the kingdom at risk of losing its comparative superiority to the other European nations, particularly in regard to economic and military strength, as a result of engaging in a costly war with France. Consequently, Jacobite writers fostered a strong proto-nationalist sentiment to counter what they considered to be a threat to their political autonomy from a neighbouring state.

In opposition, the Williamite propagandists adopted a drastically different strategy. Initially, Williamite propagandists understood that Jacobite writers would use the Prince's

foreign origins as a block to William's path to the English crown. In order to justify William's claim to the throne, Williamite writers initially attempted to use several legal arguments. Yet, as the Jacobite opposition challenged these arguments, the Williamite propagandists shifted their primary rhetorical focus to Wlliam's divine ordinance and his role as the Protector of the Protestant faith in England and across Europe. These arguments challenged the xenophobic isolationist rhetoric of the Jacobites by emphasizing the need to embrace Dutch allegiance in order to combat the growing power of Louis XIV and preserve English and European liberties. Throughout the Williamite propaganda campaigns, there was a persistent emphasis on defining Englishness as distinctively *not* Catholic. Consequently, these Williamite propagandists were conceiving of an alternative national identity of the English people based on the Protestant faith.

Consequently, examining the role of the United Provinces in the political propaganda of the late 1680's is useful in determining popular attitudes and understanding the distinct visions for a common English identity that were emerging during this period. Such writings reveal a struggle to understand what defined the English nation as unique and what was the relationship between England and the other states in an increasingly interconnected Europe. The attention both political groups paid to understanding how a Dutch monarch would affect their nation and the frequency with which they attempted to situate England in comparison to Europe demonstrates a deep-rooted anxiety between both parties to understand what this European internationalism meant.

Chapter 2:

Model State or Foreign Threat?
France in the Propaganda of the 1688-9 Revolution

As the Williamite revolutionaries of 1688-9 looked eastward to the United Provinces for inspiration for their conception of a new path of development for England's future, the official regime under James II was busy looking southward at France. Since his ascension to the English throne in 1685, James had a distinct vision for the future of the English nation. He conceptualized modernity as similar to that being achieved by King Louis XIV within France. Namely, James aimed to create a central, bureaucratic state based on absolute obedience to his leadership as monarch. Additionally, James sought to produce a professional army and extend toleration to Catholics. Promoting this vision necessitated the official regime of James to develop a propaganda campaign to garner support and acceptance among the people of England for the king's aims. Consequently, the Jacobite regime encouraged the production of explicitly Gallican treatises and pamphlets to support the push for establishing a relationship between the English government and Catholic religion that was similar to that in France. Yet, this emphasis on emulating France provided ample fodder for the Williamite propagandists, who criticized James for contracting the liberties of his subjects, particularly those of the Protestant faith, in violation of English law. Additionally, the Williamite regime developed an opposing propaganda campaign based on the defense of the rights of the people of England and Europe against the threat of a universal monarchy established under Louis XIV.

This chapter explores how James' conception of modernity was promoted through the propaganda campaigns of the Jacobite regime, which depended heavily upon intellectual inheritances from the French kingdom. In opposition, the Williamite regime

developed their system of propaganda based on representing the Dutch stadtholder as a defender of English and European liberties against the growing ambitions of both James II and Louis XIV.[1] France represented a point of ideological conflict between the Jacobites and Williamites, a theme that is repeatedly explored throughout the propaganda produced by both parties. While France was a source of political inspiration for Jacobites, the Williamites saw the French kingdom's aims, namely the continued development of Gallicanism, as a threat to their own ideas of how the future of England should unfold. Consequently, there existed a fervent and immediate need for the Williamites to limit the further progression of these intentions by garnering support for William as the best contender for the throne of England. These concerns persisted into the early reign of William, who furthered these propagandistic arguments in order to garner support for engaging England in war with France.

In terms of existing historiography, this chapter borrows considerably from, and further affirms Steve Pincus' work, *1688: The First Modern Revolution.* Pincus contends that the English revolutionaries forged the world's first modern revolution for, he writes, "The revolutionaries created a new kind of English state after 1689. They rejected the modern, bureaucratic absolutist state model developed by Louis XIV in France. But they did not reject the state."[2] Instead, these Williamite revolutionaries visualized a modern nation based on a constitutional monarchy that facilitated political participation, a society that was broad in its toleration of other religions, and a free economy that exploited the growing internationalism within Europe.

---

[1] This theme is also explored in Chapter 1.

[2] Pincus, Steve. *1688: First Modern Revolution*. (New Haven, 2009), 8. Also see Pincus, Steve. 'The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy and the Transformation of English Political Culture." *The European Legacy*, Vol 5, 4. (2000).

Interpreting the events of 1688-9 as 'modern' challenged earlier claims that the Revolution was "restorative and conservationist."[3] Historians have long argued that the English revolutionaries aimed to preserve English government and laws, rather than usher in radical change of English institutions. As a result, John Morrill dubbed the events as "the Sensible Revolution of 1688-89."[4] Other historians have contended that the Revolution was distinctively un-modern as only a select few political elites determined the revolutionary proceedings. Mark Goldie wrote, "Talk of popular revolution was minimal."[5] Similarly, W.A. Speck argued in his book, *Reluctant Revolutionaries,* that the wider English populace did not initiate the happenings of 1688-9.[6]

Background: France in the 1680-90's

Late seventeenth century France is undoubtedly best understood as the dominion of Louis XIV. Louis inherited the French crown in 1643 at the early age of five, during which time Cardinal Mazarin acted as chief minister of state. Upon the Cardinal's death in 1662, Louis began his personal rule of the kingdom of France, a reign that would be characterized by his persistent attempts to establish his position as an absolute monarch at the head of an increasingly centralized and bureaucratic state. His first concern was quelling the growing political ambitions of the nobles and *parlementaires*, who had rebelled against the monarchy during the earlier *Fronde,* a series of civil wars lasting from 1648-53. In order to assert and maintain his supreme authority, Louis developed a complex system of

---

[3] Jones, J.R. "The Revolution in Context." In Jones' *Liberty Secured? Britain Before and After 1688*. (New York, 1992), 12.
[4] Morrill, John. "The Sensible Revolution." In Israel's *Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact*. (New York, 2003), 73-104.
[5] Goldie, Mark. "Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution," *The Revolutions of 1688*. (Oxford, 1991), 104.
[6] See W.A. Speck. *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*. (Oxford, 1988).

patronage, in which titles and pensions were exchanged for obedience to the crown. The construction of Versailles further ensured that the French nobles remained under constant surveillance of King Louis and his network of spies. Furthermore, the financial reforms of Colbert enabled France to develop the financial power necessary to pursue Louis' modernist projects, such as creating a professional army, centralizing the state, and instituting religious uniformity. Louis XIV was also skilled in the modern art of political propaganda through which he created an ideology of power predicated on his identity as the 'Sun King.' [7] Through this propaganda, the officials of Louis XIV made an active attempt to project the king as the divine, sole ruler of France through various forms of physical and psychological representations of his authority, such as images on coins, paintings, royal processions, and poems.

Throughout his reign, Louis XIV gradually restricted the rights provisioned to Protestants, culminating in the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. For King Louis, the Huguenot community represented a threat to the cohesive unity of France, and this Protestant 'state within a state' undermined his supreme authority. Consequently, Louis worked to systematically limit the rights granted to Huguenots, beginning with a prohibition of the meeting of national and provincial synods in 1669. By 1681, Louis instituted the *dragonnades*, a government policy that required Protestant families to billet French soldiers. This anti-Protestant fervour reached a peak with the Edict of Fontainebleau four years later, which declared the Edict of Nantes void, revoking the right of freedom of conscience for Protestants. In response, hundreds of thousands of French

[7] This topic has been widely studied by many historians. In particular, see Burke, Peter. *Fabrications of Louis XIV.* (London, 1992). Also see, Klaits, Joseph. *Printed Propaganda Under Louis XIV: Absolute Monarchy and Public Opinion.* (Princeton, 1976).

Protestants fled to the surrounding nations, most notably England and the United Provinces, bringing along tales of the persecutions faced at the hands of the French monarchy. [8]

Yet, there existed many parallels between the leadership of Louis XIV and the reigns of Charles II and James II. King Louis was the cousin of both Charles and James, and the French monarchy had proven to be a powerful ally of the Stuart family throughout the second half of the seventeenth century. In 1649, during the English Civil Wars, Charles I was assassinated, and his sons, Charles and James, fled to France. During this near decade long exile in France, it is likely that James developed his pro-Catholic sympathies and a lasting gratitude for the French monarchy. Further linking the two nations, in 1670, Louis and Charles secretly agreed to the Treaty of Dover, which ensured English assistance in the French war against the United Provinces in 1672, while the French agreed to aid in the promotion of Roman Catholicism in England.[9] Charles, and later James, had even instituted policies of religious persecution of Protestants similar to those legislated in France, although several years before Louis revoked the Edict of Nantes. In late 1679, Charles ordered the dragooning of soldiers in Scotland in an attempt to enforce uniformity to Episcopalianism, sparking a period referred to as the 'Killing Times.'

When Louis initiated his attempts to modernize the French state, it is clear that James wanted to emulate Louis' key accomplishments, such as the augmentation of a standing army and a bureaucratic state. Additionally, James admired Louis' institution of Gallicanism across the kingdom of France through the Declaration of 1682, which ensured

---

[8] The exact number of individuals involved in this Protestant exodus from France is unknown. Historians have placed the estimates between 200,000-900,000.

[9] The treaty did not become publically known until 1830.

the dominancy of the monarch's authority over both temporal and spiritual affairs. Seeking to institute a similar relationship between the state and religion in England, the court of James ordered the mass production and circulation of Gallican treatises by both French and English writers.

While James considered himself an ally of King Louis XIV, the majority of the other kingdoms of Europe viewed the French monarch with profound distrust, for they believed he was aiming to establish a French empire that would stretch across continental Europe. Additionally, Williamites contended that James would be willing to sacrifice English interests in order to please his French cousin. This distrust was not unwarranted, as Louis had acted with considerable and consistent aggression against the neighbouring kingdoms of France throughout his reign. During the seventy-two years of Louis' kingship, France was involved in military conflict for nearly fifty of those years.[10] The kingdoms of Europe were particularly concerned that the French king would attempt to institute a universal monarchy by seeking greater hold over the territories of continental Europe and thereby disrupting the existing balance of powers. Furthermore, the ambitions of Louis to spread French-style Catholicism and absolutism stood in violation of the 1648 Peace of Westphalia, which recognized the right of each prince to determine the religion of his kingdom without outside influence.

These suspicions were seemingly confirmed in 1689, when Louis ordered his troops to solidify and expand France's territorial claims into the Rhineland, which sparked the beginning of the Nine Years War between France and the League of Augsburg, led by William of Orange of the United Provinces, Leopold II of the Holy Roman Empire, and

---

[10] Sturdy, David. *Louis XIV* (London, 1998), pp. 126.

Charles II of Spain. In order to be successful against the powerful French kingdom, it was paramount that England align with the League of Augsburg. In this context of shifting dynamics of power within continental Europe, it was crucial that William emerge as the successful contender for the English crown against James, in order to bring England in line with the League of Augsburg against France. Consequently, Williamite propaganda was exceedingly important in ensuring that the League of Augsburg earned the necessary English support to quell the ambitions of Louis XIV.

The other chapters of this thesis are focused primarily on the years of 1688-9, in order to better understand the propaganda produced *during* the monarchical settlement. However, Whig propagandists began questioning the legitimacy of James' authority, as the official court of James published pro-Gallican tracts to gain support for his political ideology, even before William stated his intent to enter the English kingdom in June of 1688. Such arguments were influential in determining the course of the monarchical settlement. Consequently, this particular chapter partially deviates from the timeline of other chapters in order to explore the propaganda contributions from these earlier years in the 1680's.

Jacobite Propaganda

The personal faith of King James brought France into the center of English public awareness during the mid-1680's. When James ascended the throne in 1685, he was devoutly Catholic. However, legal toleration for Catholics was limited during Restoration England, and James was forced to hide his earlier conversion to Roman Catholicism in 1669. Yet, his faith became publicly known four years later following the passing of the Test Act. Having been in command of the English navy since 1660, James was required to

pronounce an oath against the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church in order to retain his position. However, James refused to take the oath, effectively relinquishing his title as Lord High Admiral, thus revealing that his religious sympathies did not lay with the Church of England.

Despite his openly Catholic faith, James was warmly received upon his ascension to the throne as the ruler of the three kingdoms. Yet, soon after his coronation, James' personal ideology began to impact court life, as James surrounded himself with fellow Catholics, who served as the king's most intimate advisors. Particularly, James created the Roman Catholic Council, which gradually replaced the Privy Council as the central advisory group aiding the king in affairs of state. Consequently, opponents of the new monarch began to remark that the king was solely preoccupied with the opinions of a Jesuit faction of the English court. This claim that James was under the influence of a group of evil counselors, seeking to ensure the Catholicization of the English nation, centered in William's justification for his invasion of the English kingdom.[11]

However, this formation of a Catholic court ensured that James always had an audience willing to receive and finance Catholic writings, while the royal press worked to make sure such literature was more widely available within England. Despite being pro-Catholic in content, these pamphlets were not primarily designed to inspire greater numbers of converts to Catholicism. Rather, a majority of the pamphlets had an explicitly

[11] The 10 October 1688 Declaration read: "Upon these grounds it is that we cannot any longer forbear to declare that, to our great regret, we see that those counsellors, who have now the chief credit with the King, have overturned the religion, laws, and liberties of these Realms, and subjected them in all things relating to their consciences, liberties, and properties to arbitrary government, and that not only by secret and indirect ways, but in an open and undisguised manner."

political end- that is, to support and 'normalize' the King's personal faith within the English public eye, which had a long history of distrust for Catholic individuals.

Crucially, many of these writings borrowed directly from the tradition of French Gallicanism. The English political sphere had been familiar with the origins of French Gallicanism prior to the crowning of James, primarily though the 1682 text, *Declaration of the Clergy of France*. In the same year, this Declaration, which resolved that the power of the Pope and the Church were confined to spiritual matters, was translated into English and published by the royal press. By publishing the Declaration, Charles was explicitly supporting this policy of the French monarch, while attempting to alleviate fears that England would be subjected to Papal authority from Rome. The Declaration announced, "Therefore Kings and Princes are not, by the Command of God, subject in things Temporal, to any Ecclesiastical Power, neither can they directly, or indirectly, be Deposed by the power of the Keys of the Church."[12] Crucially, the document challenged the dominancy of the Pope, while instilling the French monarchy with the power to legislate ecclesiastical matters. The Declaration of the French Clergy sparked a fissure between French Gallicanism and Continental Catholicism, as represented by the Papacy in Rome. However, Charles' politico-religious sympathies, as those of his brother James, lay with the French-style of Catholicism, which influenced his actions as monarch.

The writings of Jacques-Begnine Bossuet, the primary minister of Louis XIV and a key drafter of the Declaration by the Assembly of the French Bishops, were also translated

---

[12] Louis XIV. *The French King's edict upon the declaration made by the clergy of France, of their opinion concerning the ecclesiastical power wherein is set forth, that the King is independent in things temporal, that general councils are above the Pope, that the Popes power is to be limited by the antient canons, that the Popes decisions are not infallible without the consent of the Church : together with the said declaration of the clergy as they were registered in the Parliament of Paris, the 23 of March 1682.* (London, 1682).

into English from French, and they were widely circulated around the royal palace. James personally recommended Bossuet's work, and many of the French author's pamphlets were published by means of the royal printers.[13] Bossuet first became well known within the English political community in 1671 following the publishing of his work, *Exposition de la doctrine de l'église catholique sur les matières de controverse (An Exposition on the Doctrine of the Catholic Church on Matters of Controversy).* As described in the preface, the tract was designed for those of the Reformed religion, "who know nothing of our Doctrine, but as represented to them but their Ministers under the most hideous Ideas, know it not again when shewn in its natural dress."[14] Republished again in 1687, Bossuet's *Exposition* intended to correct the existing misconceptions about Catholicism, particularly among the Protestant community. Through his work, Bossuet hoped to "propose [Catholic] Tenets plainly, and simply, and to distinguish them right from those which have been falsely imputed to her [the Catholic Church]."[15] The republishing of this document occurred during James' Declaration of Indulgences controversy, signifying an attempt by the Jacobite regime to generate a more accurate understanding of the tenets of Catholicism and how they did not represent a threat to the political autonomy of the nation.

During the reign of James, the royal press published writings from other French authors, which explicitly advocated James' views on Gallicanism. In particular, the works of Louis Maimbourg were widely circulated around the court during the early years of James' reign. Maimbourg was a former French Jesuit, expelled by the Pope Innocent XI for his open

---

[13] Pincus, 129.

[14] Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne. 'Preface.' *An exposition of the doctrine of the Catholic Church in matters of controversie by James Bénigne Bossuet ; done into English with all the former approbations, and others newly published in the ninth and last edition of the French.* (London, 1686), A2.

[15] Bossuet, 69.

support for French Gallicanism. In late October of 1684, Maimbourg published his *Traité Historique de l'Établissement et des Prérogatives de l'Eglise de Rome et de ses Evesques* (A Historical Treatise of the Establishment and the Prerogatives of the Church of Rome and its Bishops), which provided a clear argument for the power of the monarch over the Pope in temporal affairs. Maimbourg wrote, "The Ancients have always believed, that neither the Pope, nay nor the Church, have received any Power from *Jesus Christ*, but only things merely Spiritual, and wholly distinct from Temporals."[16] He resolved that monarchs were not restrained by ecclesiastical power, namely that of the Papacy. He wrote, "Therefore, Kings and Sovereign Princes, according to the appointment of God, are not subject, as to Temporals, either directly or indirectly to any Ecclesiastical Power."[17] Such propaganda pieces countered the arguments advanced by James' opponents, who argued that the personal faith of the new monarch would place the nation at risk of being subjected to the will and authority of the foreign Pope. By adopting and promoting a distinctly Gallican ideology toward the relationship between James' faith and the exercise of temporal power, Jacobite propaganda contended that the Catholic Church had no right to exhibit authority over an English monarch in temporal affairs.

Within months of the publishing of Maimbourg's *Treatise* in France in late 1684, the English royal press had swiftly translated the work into English. The translation of Maimbourg's *Treatise* into English coincided with the ascension of James in April of 1685, and it is highly probable that the royal publishers considered Maimbourg's writing to be useful in dispelling concerns about the relationship between the newly crowned monarch's

---

[16] Maimbourg, Louis. *A discourse concerning the foundation and prerogative of the Church of Rome wherein are handled many important queries concerning the infallibility and power of the Pope, the nature and authority of general councils, &c. By a late writer of the Church of Rome.* (London, 1688), 344.
[17] Maimbourg, 344.

faith and the Catholic Church in Rome. Maimbourg's work explicitly argued that James' faith would not mean that England would be subjected to the will of the Papacy. Furthermore, in translating Maimbourg's works from French, the translator purposely provided political tracts regarding the extent of monarchical power in religious affairs in order to garner support for Gallicanism among the English people. In an introductory note, the translator explicitly explained, "Perceiving that this is an age wherein People either open their own Eyes, or desire they should be opened, I was very willing… to reach to others the Eye salve that hath been handed to me."[18]

Additionally, Maimbourg's works were useful to the royal publishers of King James because they provided a clear condemnation of any form of resistance to monarchical authority. In addition to instilling the monarchy with supreme authority over all non-ecclesiastical affairs, Maimbourg argued that the deposition of a king was never justified. He wrote on monarchs, "They cannot be Deposed, upon any Pretext whatsoever, by the Authority of the Church."[19]

From the translated works of Bossuet, Maimbourg, and the Council of French clergy, it is clear that supporters of King James relied heavily upon the works of French writers to advance the ideology of his faith. However, many English writers also served as pro-Catholic propagandists. Their works carry the themes seen in common French writings of the period, demonstrating the strong influence of French political thought during the mid-1680's. In particular, the English propagandists used Gallican arguments similar to those of their French counterparts to clarify the relationship between the Pope and the English

---

[18] Anonymous, 'Translator's Note,' in Maimburg, Louis. *A Discourse Concerning the Foundation and Prerogative of the Church of Rome.*
[19] Mainbourg, Discourse, 345.

monarchy and allay concerns that James would subject England to overt papal influence in temporal affairs. Their writings represent an attempt to make the King's religion more palatable for individuals not of the Catholic faith. In *Some Reflections on the Bulls of Paul the Third and Pius the Fifth*, the author denied that it was "Lawful for Popes upon the Heads of Heresies, Schism, or scandalous iniquity to Excommunicate Kings and absolute Princes, and thereupon to absolve their natural Subjects from this necessary allegiance." [20] He further argued that the French monarchy under Louis XIV had a Catholic majority population but was able to successfully adopt an ideology in which monarchical authority reigned over that of the Pope, therefore proving that such a balance of power was also possible in England, which had a significantly smaller Catholic portion of the population. He asked, "Who more eagerly and vigourously vindicates his Royal prerogative in Temporal concerns against all pretensions of the Popes than the *French King?*"[21] Godden similarly argued, "The utmost Authority of the Pope can Extend no farther than to things purely Spiritual, that is to say, *matters of Faith* and let us suppose *Discipline in the Church."*[22] He continued to argue, *"*It is plain then, that *Catholicks* may remain good *Catholicks*, and own the Supremacy of the *Pope,* as the *Head of the Catholick Church,* without any Obligation to believe the Deposing Doctrine: and if the *French,* why not the *English Catholicks?*"[23]

Such authors confirmed that the absence of a higher authority, such as the Pope, meant that the English monarch held absolute authority. In an earlier argument attempting

---

[20] Philotheus, *Reflections upon bulls of the Popes Paul the Third, and Pius the Fifth emitted against King Henry the 8 and Queen Elizabeth of England.* (London, 1686), 2.
[21] Philotheus, 2.
[22] Godden, Thomas. *A letter in answer to two main questions of the first letter to a dissenter I. Whether Protestant dissenters ought to refuse the proposed legal toleration, including Catholic dissenters, II. Whether Protestant dissenters ought to expect the said toleration, until the next succession, upon the suggested hopes of excluding Catholicks.* (London, 1687), 8.
[23] Godden, 11.

to appeal to Tories, Godden argued that Catholicism supported the institution of the English monarchy rather than posed a threat. Godden argued, "I think they are so far from being *enemies to Monarchy* in general that the crime which hath been commonly imputed to them, in that of enlarging the bounds of Monarchy, and fixing the Soverain in a greater circle of Power and Prerogative."[24]

Similar arguments were continued after William made his intentions for the English throne clear. In 1688, John Wilson argued that both Charles and James were acting within their right as monarchs to revoke the existing penal laws against Catholics by nature of their absolute authority. Therefore, it was unjust and unlawful for the English people to attempt to depose of James on the grounds of excessive use of power. Wilson contended in his pamphlet *Jus Regium Coronae*,

> In any Select part of the People [authority] cannot lie, because no part can be greater, or have more Power than the whole… It remains then, that it lie in the Prince, i.e. a Sovereign Prince, or Absolute Monarch, who if he offend against those Laws, is unaccountable to them, as having no superior in his Dominions but God.[25]

He concluded, "The Kings of England are Absolute Monarchs."[26] Wilson asserted that by the divine right of kings, the monarch of England held absolute power that was second only to God, regardless of the monarch's personal faith. Consequently, absolute authority was a feature of the throne, and the Williamite supporters had no grounds to advocate the dethroning of James based on 'unjust' exercise of power.

---

[24] Godden, 6.

[25] Wilson, John. *Jus regium coronae, or, The King's supream power in dispensing with penal statutes more particularly as it relates to the the two test-acts of the twenty fifth, and thirtieth of His late Majesty, King Charles the Second, argu'd by reason, and confirm'd by the common, and statute laws of this kingdom : in two parts*, (London, 1688), 6.

[26] Wilson, 7.

Upon the invasion of William in November of 1688, James swiftly departed for France, and the Williamites contended that the King had abandoned English interests, thus abdicating his right to the throne. Against such claims, Jacobite propagandists urged that James was forced to flee to France to ensure his own safety against William's troops. One pamphleteer argued, "His Majesty, before his withdrawing, had sufficient Grounds to make him apprehensive of Danger, and therefore it cannot be called *an Abdication."*[27] He continued to insist that James had entered France with the intention of soon returning to the English nation once the violent revolutionaries were subdued. However, the pamphleteer wrote, "His Majesty was scarcely Landed in *France* before the Administration was conferred upon the Prince of Orange."[28] Similarly, another propagandist later argued that James had 'retired into *France* to be *within call.'*[29] There writers asserted that rather than abandoning the England polity by fleeing to France, James was buying himself time to safely restore his position as the rightful leader of England with help from Louis XIV.

King James issued several official Declarations declaring his gratitude for the French monarch for his aid against William and his troops. After fleeing England, Louis offered James and his family safe dwellings in addition to supplying soldiers and weapons to assist James re-conquering England. James later explained that France was "the only part of Europe to which we could retire with safety."[30] In a speech to the Irish Parliament in May of 1689, James urged the attendees to remember the assistance offered by the French. He stated,

---

[27] Collier, Jeremy. *The Desertion Discuss'd* (London, 1689), 2.
[28] Collier, 8.
[29] *The Late King James' Manifesto answer'd Paragraph by Paragraph* (London, 1697), 1.
[30] James II. *Declaration of King James II, April 20, 1692.* (1692).

> You know with how great generosity and kindness the most Christian King gave a secure retreat to the Queen, my son and myself, when we were forced out of England, and came to look for protection and safety in his dominions, how he embraced my interest and gave me such supplies of all sorts… This he did at a time when he had so many and so considerable enemies to deal with.[31]

Louis continued to supply troops for James' fight against William in Ireland into late 1691. The Jacobite court in exile asserted that France offered King James valuable protection after the desertion by the English army. James contended, "Finding a total defection against me there [in the English military], I returned and went to France, where I was kindly received by that King, and had all the assurances imaginable from him to re-establish me on my throne."[32]

This theme of French assistance, in terms of finances and manpower, was also common throughout more informal Jacobite propaganda. The author of the *Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland* contended that Irish soldiers were encouraged by the news that "France will send arms, will send money, will send experienced officers and trained soldiers to their assistance."[33] In a later warning about England becoming involved in the United Province's war against France, Charles Leslie argued that the French had always been supportive and friendly to the English nation. He compelled, "We find that *France* has always endeavoured to live well with *England;* and indeed they have courted us, and always shewed a more particular Kindness to the *English Gentry*, than to other nations."[34]

Following the establishment of William on the English throne in April of 1689, James issued two Declarations from his exiled court in France in an attempt to gain support for

---

[31] James II. *King James II's Speech from the Throne, May 7, 1689.* (1689).
[32] James II. *Speech of King James to his Council, July 1, 1690.* (1690).
[33] Anonymous. *Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland*, 37.
[34] Leslie, Charles. *Delenda Carthago, or, The true interest of England in relation to France and Holland*. (London, 1695), 1.

his re-establishment. James' Declarations made clear that the French were crucial in his plans of restoration. On 20 April 1692, James announced,

> Whereas the Most Christian King, in pursuance of the many obliging promises he had made us of giving us his effectual assistance for the recovering of our kingdoms as soon as the condition of his affairs would permit, has put us in a way of endeavouring it at this time, and in order to it has lent us so many troops as may be abundantly sufficient to untie the hands of our subjects and make it safe for them to return to their duty and repair to our standard.

By re-establishing an alliance between the English and French kingdoms, James urged there would be a fortunate turning point in the future of Europe as a whole. He continued, "There is another consideration which ought to be of weight with all Christians, and that is the calamitous condition of Europe… at a time when there was the greatest hopes of success against a common enemy, and the fairest prospect of enlarging the bounds of the Christian Empire that ever was in any age since the declining of the Roman."[35] If England assisted the French rather than the United Provinces in the Nine Years' War, James openly contended that the French monarchy would have the strength to establish a Catholic empire across Europe. However, the defeat of the French fleet under the leadership of English Admiral Edward Russell in the following year influenced James to adopt a drastically different strategy in his Declaration on 17 April 1693. Notably, this proclamation agreed to accept all new legislation instituted following the Revolution.

Throughout their propaganda campaigns of the 1680's, the Jacobite regime focused on advancing their ideas for the future of the English polity, namely one modeled off the French state. In order to gain support for their endeavours, the Tory propagandists first sought to normalize the religious faith of King James within the eyes of the English public.

---

[35] James II. *Declaration of King James II, April 20, 1692*. (London, 1692).

These propagandists published tracts that explicitly clarified the central tenets of Catholicism. Additionally, the Jacobite propagandists and the official court of James focused on circulating Gallican documents, written by both French and English writers, which clarified that the religious sympathies of James would not result in the English nation being subjected to the authority of the Catholic pope. Rather, these tracts contended that only God held a power higher than James within the kingdom of England, and the English people were expected to practice absolute obedience to their monarch. France continued to remain a central focus in Jacobite propaganda throughout the monarchical settlement 1688-9 and the early years of William's reign. These propagandists argued that by fleeing to France, James did not abdicate his claim to the throne. Alternatively, they contended that James was seeking his own safety under the goodwill of Louis XIV, who also graciously provided troops for the attempted restoration of James as the rightful king of England.

Williamite Propaganda

Since the early years of James' reign, Whig propagandists argued that the English monarchy was growing increasingly authoritarian in nature, and they raised concerns that James was attempting to model England off of France by copying recent developments instituted by Louis XIV, such as the establishment of absolute control over a bureaucratic state, the creation of a professional army, and Catholicization of the nation. These Whig propagandists were concerned that the royal court under James and his supporters were encouraging the spread of pro-Gallican tracts and treatises, further suggesting that James intended to copy Louis' example. As a result, the Williamite propagandists exploited this perceived need for a leader to protect the English nation from French-style despotism.

Upon the uprising of the Duke of Monmouth in 1685, James made it clear that he was going to establish a standing professional army, similar to Louis' in France, causing much anxiety among the Whigs, who complained that such a militia served as a means of enforcing royal prerogative. In 1687, Gilbert Burnet wrote, "A standing army, in time of peace, [is] looked upon by this nation as an attempt upon the whole property of the nation in gross."[36] Additionally, James was willing to force his subjects to quarter his augmenting army. By November of 1688, the army had grown to include forty thousand troops signifying a four-fold increase in size since James' ascension in 1685.[37] As the creation of garrisons did not keep up with the swiftly growing size of the army, English families were forced to billet soldiers within their homes, although an anti-quartering act was passed in 1679. In doing so, Daniel Defoe urged his readers to recall, "The unspeakable oppressions of the soldiery, by virtue of whose quartering at pleasure, neither men's families or persons were secure from the greatest violence…[This soldiery was] permitted in all their Extravagant Mischiefs, to injure the Nation by degrees of Slavery and Oppression."[38] Williamites believed that this standing army was a key means for a monarch to ensure his absolute authority at the expense of the rights and wellbeing of the English people.

Furthermore, a standing army seemed to represent a tool to enforce religious uniformity. The 1680's in Scotland came to be known as the 'Killing Times' as James ordered the dragooning of soldiers to enforce conformity to the Episocopal Church. In 1688, Thomas Comber wondered how James could pass a charter for religious toleration

---

[36] Gilbert, Burnet. *A Letter Concerning Some Reflections on His Majesty's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience Dated the Fourth of April 1687.* (London, 1687).
[37] Pincus, 144.
[38] Defoe, Daniel. *The advantages of the present settlement, and the great danger of a relapse*. (London, 1689), 13.

when such dragooning was taking place. He asked, "Above all consider what Security or Validity this *New Charter* can be of, *when there is a standing Army kept on foot*? Do *Guns* hear *Reason* or regard *Laws?* Will *Dragoons* mind *Charter*s… Tell us whether they have do or do now so in *France?*"[39] Consequently, when William ascended the throne in 1689, he was obligated to accept the Claim of Right, which explicitly prohibited the quartering of troops and maintaining an army during peacetime without permission from Parliament, representing a deep distrust of singular royal control over a full military force.

Additionally, James' attempts to Catholicize the nation were seen as proof of the monarch's willingness to use force in order to advance his political and religious ideology. In July of 1686, James created his Commission for Ecclesiastical Causes, and the Commission soon after expelled the Anglican fellows of Magdalen College at Oxford University. This attempt horrified the High Churchmen of the Tory party, and a wave of pamphlets were produced condemning James' illegal seize of property and forcible creation of a Catholic educational program within one of the nation's leading Anglican institutions. In his pamphlet, Charles Caesar wrote, "The ejection of the President and Fellows of *Magdalen* College in *Oxford*… open'd the eyes of all sorts and quickly taught the Dissenters what they were to expect (whose Toleration was Temporary and precarious) which such open invasions were made on that Church that was firmly establish'd be Law."[40] Daniel Defoe argued, "Popery could never be introduced into this Kingdom, unless Slavery ushered it in." He continued, "The Master and Fellows of *Magdalen* College are a sufficient

---

[39] Comber, Thomas. *Three considerations proposed to Mr. William Pen concerning the validity and security of his new magna charta for liberty of conscience by a Baptist ; which may be worthy the consideration of all the Quakers and of all my dissenting brethren also that have votes in the choice of Parliament-men.* (London, 1688), 3.

[40] Caesar, Charles. *Numerus infaustus a short view of the unfortunate reigns of William the Second, Henry the Second, Edward the Second, Richard the Second, Charles the Second, James the Second.* (London, 1689), 115.

proof of this, who were deprived of their Freeholds by a most arbitrary Sentence of Court, that in the whole constitution of it was utterly illegal."[41] Even though James was English born, the Williamite propagandists ensured that his actions seemed no better for the English people than a foreigner's.

Consequently, on 30 June 1688, the Prince of Orange declared that he would embark on a military expedition to the English kingdom. As justification for this invasion, Williamite propagandists first argued that James was forcibly spreading Catholicism throughout the English nation, against English law. Notably, the official Williamite regime was not anti-Catholic, for William believed such individuals should be included under religious toleration. However, the Williamite regime disagreed with the forcible and absolutist means that James was using to spread his faith. In his 10 October 1688 Proclamation declaring his intention to travel to England, King William contended that in England, "A religion, which is contrary to law, is endeavoured to be introduced."[42] Prior to his landing at Torbay, the Prince of Orange issued three Declarations, in which he argued that James had abolished the Test Act and granted Catholics upper level positions within the military and civil government, proof that the monarch was pushing to catholicize the nation. Additionally, Catholic individuals dominated the advisory positions offering counsel to the king through such means as the newly established Catholic Cabinet Council. Of these Catholic individuals, William concluded,

> By that means having rendered themselves masters both of the affairs of the Church, of the government of the nation, and of the course of justice, and subjected them all to a despotic and arbitrary power, they might be in a

---

[41] Defoe, Daniel. *The advantages of the present settlement, and the great danger of a relapse*, (London, 1689), 11.
[42] William III. *A Declaration by the Prince of Orange, 10 October 1688.* (London, 1688).

> capacity to maintain and execute their wicked designs by the assistance of the Army, and thereby to enslave the nation.[43]

The Williamites argued that enabling papists to serve in government office threatened the well being of English Protestants. Official propagandists of the Williamite regime contended that these counselors purposefully worked their way into the king's confidence in order to exert their influence over the spread of Catholicism.

In addition to the perceived threat that James and his counselors were seeking to catholicize the nation, the Williamite court in The Hague maintained that the Prince of Orange needed to enter England in order to prevent the continued practice of an absolutist regime. The official propagandists for William sought to convey that James, under the influence of a group of evil counselors, was seeking to establish a more absolute hold on his authority. In his first Declaration of 30 June 1688, the Prince of Orange wrote, "We see that those counsellors who have now the chief credit with the King have overturned the religion, laws, and liberties of those realms and subjected them in all things relating to their consciences, liberties and properties to arbitrary government."[44] Similarly, the pamphleteer, John Phillips, argued that James was also seeking to disrupt the practice of just government by packing Parliament. Phillips wrote,

> He resolves the utter subversion of *English* Parliaments…. by compleating the Disfranchising of all the Cities and Corporations throughout the Nation, so fairly in his Brother's Reign, to make way for the Introduction of a *French* Parliament, That should at once have surrender'd all the Ancient Liberty of the Kingdom, and the whole Power of Government into his Hands.[45]

Consequently, the Williamite regime adopted a campaign based on rhetoric of defense against this tyranny and spreading Catholicism to justify their invasion of England. William

---

[43] Ibid.

[44] William III. *Declaration of the Prince of Orange, 30 June 1688.* (London, 1688).

[45] Phillips, Jonathan. *The secret history of the reigns of K. Charles II and K. James II*. (London, 1690), 193.

of Orange argued, "We may prevent all those miseries which must needs follow upon the nation's being kept under arbitrary government and slavery."[46] Such arguments fostered hope among the English people that William would stop this spread of French Catholicism and absolutism. A balladeer wrote of the Prince of Orange's journey to England, "Let Pope and the Jesuits stay all at Rome/[He] will not allow them in England to come."[47] Such pro-William media expressed confidence that William could successfully keep popery from entering England.

These dangers of augmenting Catholicism and tyranny were made more ominous due to the growing political ambitions of Louis XIV. By the 1680's, Louis' absolutist tendencies, best symbolized by his lavish and recently built court held at Versailles, had drawn substantial international attention, and the Williamite regime argued that the French king and English monarch shared similar political goals. Preacher William King orated that James endeavoured to make his authority absolute through "Toleration of *Popery*, a war with *Holland*, and a League with *France*."[48] There existed a greater fear that Louis XIV would make England into a territory of the French kingdom. William King insisted that there existed a French design against the English people: "It was, in short, to destroy you and your Religion, and enslave all *Europe* under the Tyranny of the *French King."*[49] Similarly, the Whig writer John Hampden warned, "We see the French king has made king James' cause his own… and no body doubts, or can doubt, but if he should ever

---

[46] William III. *Declaration of the Prince of Orange, 10 October 1688*. (London, 1688).
[47] Anonymous. *A Full Description of these Times, Or The Prince of ORANGE's March f[r]om EXETER to LONDON.* (Unknown, 1689).
[48] King, William. *Europe's deliverance from France and slavery a sermon, preached at St. Patrick's Church, Dublin, on the 16th of November 1690 : being the day of thanksgiving for the preservation of His Majesties person, his good success in our deliverance, and his safe and happy return into England*. (London, 1689), 3.
[49] King, 2.

recover the possession of these kingdoms, it would be only to hold them in quality of the French king's lieutenant, to whose ambition and bigotry we must all be sacrificed."[50]

As explored in the previous chapter, Louis XIV and his political ambitions did not only represent a threat to the kingdom of England but the entirety of continental Europe. Consequently, the Williamite propagandists depicted William as the leader of a trans-European, primarily Protestant, community standing in opposition to King Louis. In the ballad, 'Protestant's Prayer,' the author writes,

> LET Protestants now with true Courage advance,
> In time we shall blast all the Glory of France,
> And that the proud Tyrant Lewis shall see
> A common Disturber of Europe is he,
> But if the kind Heavens will Fight on our side,
> In time we shall pull down his insolent Pride:
> Then pray that the Lord by a powerfull Hand
> Will preserve the Great Fleet and the Army by Land.[51]

The balladeer argues that the ascent of William to the throne of England gave Protestants faith that King Louis' desires to expand French control throughout Europe could be stopped by their new monarch. With the blessing of God, Protestants believed William was capable of challenging the political position of France. Another poet writes of Europe,

> Put her not off, till You redress Her Fears.
> Rescue her from the Toyls of *Babel*'s Whore;
> Insulting *Rome* being prostrate on the Floor.
> Nip France's Pride, Pull Hell's Great *Lewis* down;
> Confound his Glory, and Debase his Crown:
> Enquire into the Time; for it is Now.[52]

---

[50] Hampden, John. *Some Considerations about the Most Proper Way of Raising Money in the Present Conjuncture*. Originally printed in 1692. Reprinted in Hansard. *The Parliamentary History of England from the Earliest Period to the Year 1803, Volume 5.* (London, 1809), xlix-lxvi.

[51] Anonymous. *The Protestants Prayer: BEING Their hearty Wishes for the Prosperity of Their Majesties Fleet at Sea, and likewise Their Land-Forces, that our Foes may be put to Flighs, and these Three Kingdoms flourish again in Peace.* (London, 1690).

[52] Anonymous. *To the most illustrious and serene prince, his royal Highness….* (London, 1688)

By insisting that the appropriate time for challenging the reign of King Louis is now, the poet is implicitly indicating that the settlement of William upon the throne should be quickly resolved so he could direct his attention abroad in order to mitigate foreign threats.

Even after the coronation of William and Mary as joint monarchs of England, this rhetoric of William as the Protector of the European continent against the political ambitions of Louis XIV proved necessary for the Williamite regime because King James had fled to France following his deposition. As a stadtholder of the United Provinces, William stood at the head of the League of Augsburg facing against Louis XIV in the Nine Years' War. Now that William had been proclaimed head of the English state, it was necessary to garner the support of Parliament to enter England into the war effort against France. As France was harbouring James, a war with the French kingdom challenged the ability of Jacobites to restore the displaced English monarch. However, gaining parliamentary support was going to require a radical repositioning of England's foreign policy, which had remained largely non-interventionist throughout the reigns of Charles II and James II. The Williamite regime knew that their rhetoric of William as the protector of Protestant Europe had gained traction during the monarchical settlement, and they continued to apply this propaganda campaign to gain support for the war effort.

As a result, the Williamite regime continued to portray the war with France as necessary for halting Louis XIV's ambitions. In his declaration of war, William argued, "We can do no less than join with Our allies in opposing the designs of the *French* King as the disturber of the peace and the common enemy of the Christian world."[53] As William of Orange's Declaration outlines, Williamite propagandists presented Louis XIV as both a

[53] William III. *The Majesties Declaration of War Against the French King.* (London, 1689).

threat to the Protestant faith and the general safety of the European continent. A balladeer similar described," And that the proud Tyrant Lewis shall see/A common Disturber of Europe is he."[54]

Williamite propagadists further represented Louis XIV as being overly ambitious, interested in constructing a universal Catholic monarchy. While Louis XIV had thus far focused his persecutions on Huguenots, he was a threat to the entire European community, regardless of their faith. In 1692, John Hampden argued,

> The Enemy with whom we have to deal is the French King, who is not only our Enemy, but, in some sort, may be said to be the Enemy of Mankind… It has been the Design of his whole Life to establish in Europe what they call a Universal monarchy; which may more properly be call'd the enslaving of all Europe.[55]

In another pamphlet, Hampden contended, "The true and great design was to satisfy the ambition of the King of *France* by advancing him to the universal Monarchy of the *West*."[56] William King similarly argued of the French king's ambitions, "The Design was universal, and aimed at the destruction and enslaving all the Kingdoms and State of *Europe*: No distinctions of *Protestants* or *Papist*, Enemy or Ally."[57] In 1694, John Petter delivered a sermon to the English army at Ghent. In his oration, he argued that Protestants and Catholics had a shared interest to "adventure their distinct Power and Interest in one bottom, and to hinder the obstinate pursuit of his project of Universal Monarchy."[58] Other propagandists emphasized the French king's ideological commitment to establishing

---

[54] Anonymous, *Protestant's Prayer.*

[55] Hampden, John. *Some short Considerations Concerning the State of the Nation*. Originally printed in 1692. Reprinted in Hansard. *The Parliamentary History of England from the Earliest Period to the Year 1803, Volume 5.* (London, 1809), lxvi-lxxxii.

[56] King, 8.

[57] King, 9.

[58] Petter, John. *A Sermon Preached before their Majesties, K. William and Q. Mary's Forces, At Gant in Flanders, The Sunday Before they marched into the Camp.* (1694). Quoted in Rose, 113.

absolutism across European. A balladeer called the French monarch, "Lewis the Great, their most ambitious Tyrant Master."[59] Similarly, William King orated, "We see that the Design was to make the King Absolute*."[60]*

Consequently, William was able to justify the war as a necessary self-defense move against Louis' popish tyranny. The French king's ambitions and willingness to use religious-based tyranny meant that he was a threat to the reformed Protestant religion, not just throughout England, but also throughout continental Europe. Crucially, William's concept of Pan-European Protestantism diverged from that conceived during the Wars of Religion in the late sixteenth century. William's conception was distinctively modern in that it was not exclusively based on religious principles but primarily driven by a desire to preserve political autonomy across Europe.

Such arguments gained traction particularly in the aftermath of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, and Williamite propagandists emphasized the brutality of the French king's regime against the persecuted Huguenots. One balladeer wrote,

> The French-men no manner of pity afford,
> Both Women and Children they put to the Sword,
> And Cities with Fires they often do Burn,
> And the poor Inhabitants naked they turn,
> Starving abroad, while with hunger they dye,
> Whose Blood to this day doth for loud vengeance cry:
> This Tyrant much longer I hope will not stand.[61]

Propaganda of William's supporters depicted the French as inhumane individuals with no qualms about using violence against the vulnerable, such as women and children. By describing the inhumanities committed at the hands of the French, Williamites advocated

---

[59] Anonymous. *The Glorious Victory; OR, The Triumphant Conquest Obtained o'er the French Fleet, by the brave Heroick English and Dutch Navy's; to the Joy and Comfort of all Loyal Subjects.* (London, 1692).
[60] King, 3.
[61] Anonymous, *Protestant's Prayer*.

the nation's need for protection from its southern neighbor. In a sermon, William King warned against the possible actions of a religiously zealous king: "The example of *France* has taught… that Dragooning was a much more effectual way to *Reconcile* men than Sermons or Arguments."[62] Samuel Barton warned that the English needed to protect themselves from experiencing a fate similar to that of the Protestant Church in France. Barton write, "Not we only but even all the Christians of the Reformation had in a little time, in all probability, bin reduc'd to as deplorable a Condition, as those of France or Savoy have bin."[63] John Hampden urged his readers, "Consider how the French king has treated his fellow-protestants, contrary to the faith of all promises, oaths, and edicts made by himself and his ancestors, surpassing the barbarity both of its ancient and latter persecutors."[64]

The Catholic faith of Louis XIV was central to Williamite criticisms of the French monarchy. Williamite propagandists argued that Louis XIV was blinded by an absolute adherence to his Catholic faith, and he had plans to wipe out Protestantism in England and continental Europe. In a 1692 sermon in Dublin, William King warned that the French king intended for the "Expiration of the Pestilent Northern Heresie," namely the Reformation.[65] Similarly, in a sermon at Whitehall in 1692, Archbishop Tillotson argued that the French king was a modern leader of Babylon threatening: "I will destroy the Reformation, I will

---

[62] King, 10.
[63] Barton, Samuel. *A Sermon Preached at St Mary le Bow before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and the Court of Alderman on Wednesday the 16th of July, beinging the Fast Day* (1690). Quoted in Rose, 107.
[64] Hampden, *Some Considerations about the Most Proper Way of Raising Money.*
[65] King, 10.

extirpate the Northern Heresie."[66] Consequently, the war with France was presented as necessary for protecting Protestant faith in England and internationally. In his Declaration of War, William of Orange argued that the English had an obligation to defend Protestants in France from the miseries committed by King Louis. He contended, "We think Ourselves Obliged to endeavour to the uttermost to promote the welfare of Our people, which can never be effectually secured but by preventing the miseries that threaten them from abroad."[67]

Consequently, throughout the monarchical settlement of 1688-9 and William's war with France, Williamite propaganda depicted the Prince of Orange as an advocate of a different conception of England's future development than that promoted by King James II. Throughout their propaganda campaigns, Williamite writers argued that William of Orange was a defender of the English people against James' increasingly catholicizing and absolutist control. In opposition, William campaigned for an alternative future for England, namely a government that celebrated the monarchy and Parliament as complementary government institutions and a religiously tolerant society. Additionally, these propagandists contended that William represented a larger trans-European community, which the English were obligated to help in the Europe-wide fight against the military advancement of Louis XIV and his French troops.

Conclusion

Throughout the monarchical settlement of 1688-9, France played a central role in the political propaganda of both Jacobites and Williamites. While France represented a key

---

[66] Tillotson, John. *A sermon preached before the King and Queen at White-Hall, the 27th of October being the day appointed for a publick thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the signal victory at sea, for the preservation of His Majesty's Sacred Person, and for his safe return to his people*. (London, 1692), 30.
[67] William III, *The Majesties Declaration of War Against the French King.*

source of inspiration for Charles' and James' conception on how the future of England should unfold, William of Orange and his allies within the Augsburg League were deeply suspicious about the political and territorial aspirations of Louis XIV. Consequently, the two parties developed opposing propaganda campaigns that represented their radically different visions for the prospects of England.

For James, France under Louis XIV represented the ideal model off which England should base her political governance. In order to encourage greater toleration of Catholicism within England, the royal press under James printed tracts written by both French and English writers that clearly laid out the tenets of Catholicism so that the Protestant community could fully understand that the Catholic faith posed little threat to their own religious beliefs. Additionally, Jacobite propagandists produced and circulated a substantial number of treatises promoting Gallicanism. Such documents had a dual purpose of combating fears that James would subject the English state to the authority of the Pope, while advertising the need for supreme obedience to the monarchy. Through these means, the Jacobite propagandists were seeking to lay the groundwork for a modern English state, in which the monarch held strong political power and Catholicism was freely practiced.

In contrast, the Williamite regime had a drastically different vision for the future of England, which lay at odds with the propaganda campaigns forwarded by the Jacobites. For the Williamites, Louis XIV represented a threat to the liberties of the people across continental Europe, especially those of the Protestant faith. Consequently, the Williamite regime developed a propaganda campaign predicated on halting the political ambitions of Louis XIV and maintaining both English and European political and religious freedoms. By projecting William as the saviour of the English people, the Williamite regime was hoping

that the Prince of Orange would emerge as the victorious contender for the English throne. Such a victory would ensure that England would side in with the League of Augsburg in the war against France.

Chapter 3:

'The Irish Question'
Ireland in Propaganda of the Revolution of 1688-9

In the political propaganda wars of England during the Revolution of 1688-9, both Williamites and Jacobites highlighted Ireland as a vital, reoccurring theme. In the opening days of the 1688-9 Revolution, English attention shifted west when James II landed at Kinsale, Ireland, after a brief residence in France, in an attempt to reclaim his throne. Over the next year, Ireland served as the primary battleground of the Revolution. The Catholic majority of the population largely supported James, while the Protestants aligned themselves with William of Orange to quell this Jacobite counterrevolution. Throughout their writings, English propagandists repeatedly emphasized the connection between religious affiliation and the political governance. Propagandists on both sides wondered: Were the Whigs, who now largely supported William, proponents of violent and radical republicanism, as seen in the earlier Civil War period? Or did they represent a commitment to a new political identity for England based on greater equality and liberty of the individual? Were the Jacobites devout royalists or advocates of French-style absolutism?

In the case of Ireland, the use of recent history, particularly the legacy of the Civil Wars and Cromwell's rule, was a primary feature of the depictions of the revolutionary struggle in the political propaganda of both Williamites and Jacobites. The Williamite propagandists attempted to gain further support from the Protestant communities in England by presenting the Irish Catholics of 1689 as the descendents of the dangerous rebels of the Uprising of 1641. In contrast, the Jacobite supporters emphasized that Protestants shared the religion of Puritan Oliver Cromwell, the individual responsible for

brutally suppressing the Irish Rebellion in the 1650's. Cromwell's legacy, still sharp in the minds of the Irish Catholic people, acted as a reminder of the harsh persecutions they suffered under a Protestant republican state. Both groups used the Civil Wars in Ireland as proof of the horrors of confessionalism. This propaganda was used not only to place blame for past events but also warned about the dangers of repeating history. Furthermore, this partition between Jacobite and Williamite ideology was not entirely dissimilar to the political divisions of England. However, the Civil Wars were of a more violent nature in Ireland, and this was frequently referenced in the propaganda of both emerging parties. Additionally, draconian legislation instituted during the Civil war years, yet left unaltered during the Restoration, kept the harsh feelings between the Catholics and Protestants of Ireland strong.

The close relationship between King James and Louis XIV also raised concerns about the outcome of the war in Ireland. To assist in his quest to re-claim the throne, James received substantial French aid, raising questions as to the French king's true intentions. James' admiration for the French king also increased anxieties that the invasion of Ireland would mean the establishment of tyranny as a new form of government. Furthermore, Williamite propagandists worried that Louis was placing troops in Ireland in order to later subjugate the island to French control. These propagandists stressed that capturing Ireland was part of the feared plot that the French were seeking to establish a Catholic absolutist monarchy across the European Continent.

Traditional Whig historiography depicts the English Revolution of 1688-9 as the 'bloodless' triumph of Protestantism over absolutism and spreading Catholicism, an interpretation that becomes problematic when the course of the Revolution in Ireland is

simultaneously considered. This Whig interpretation loses validity when one examines the extensive denial of political rights and discriminatory legislation targeted against Irish Catholics that resulted from the Williamite victory. Consequently, recent historians have interpreted the Revolution in Ireland as a result of the struggle between England and Irish interests predicated on the growing authority of the English state.[1] Michael Hector argues that William's victory meant an increased English influence over the Celtic fringe.[2] The revisionists have similarly described the revolution as an example of the expanding power of the English state, an early colonization attempt. D.W. Hayton explained, "The history of early modern Ireland is most easily comprehended as a pattern of English conquest and colonization."[3]

Yet, R.F. Foster urges us to also consider that the Revolution had profound consequences beyond political control over Ireland. He writes:

> Irish history has understandably tended to see the struggle between James and William as a battle over possession of Ireland (and, tangentially, England); but it should be remembered that William invaded England for reasons that were European, not English, and part of the 'revolution' he brought was a revolution in English foreign policy.[4]

The war that was fought in Ireland was a result of the wider Nine Years' War being waged across continental Europe, and it consequently held substantial importance for the future of English foreign policy. Namely, the outcome of the war in Ireland would help determine whether England would align with France or the United Provinces.

---

[1] For such an example, see John Miller, *The Glorious Revolution* (London, 1983). Also see John Carswell, *The Descent on England* (London, 1969).
[2] Claydon, Tony and Ian McBridge. *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-1850.* (New York, 1998), 22.
[3] Hayton, D.W. "The Williamite Revolution in Ireland, 1688-91." In Israel. *Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact* (New York, 2003), 188.
[4] Foster, R.F. *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972*. (London, 1988), 141.

Historians have also explored the profoundly religious dynamic of the Revolution. The Reformation added an element of anglicanization to these early attempts at colonization. In particular, Tony Claydon and Ian McBridge have completed an informative work on how a fundamental sense of Protestantism permeated the Three Kingdoms, which helped define a common political identity between England and Ireland.[5] In Ireland, James' supporters envisioned a triumph of Catholicism, which the Protestant settlers saw as a direct challenge to their religious interests. Such religious concerns were deeply intertwined in the political and economic legacy of Ireland, including the Cromwellian land settlements, which favored the Protestant settlers, and the exclusion of Catholics from Parliament.

Background: Ireland in the 1680's

Ireland of the 1680's had a primarily Catholic population. However, since the Cromwellian Conquest in 1649, the Catholic majority had been subjected to rule by the Irish Protestant minority. Consequently, upon James' ascension to the throne, Ireland was a kingdom deeply divided by economic and political tensions predicated upon religious identities. This history of conflict between Protestantism and Catholicism played a crucial role in determining allegiances during the Revolution.

The legacy of the Civil Wars in England and Ireland particularly shaped Irish opinions on the revolutionary events of 1688-89. Following the defeated uprising of Irish chieftains against English landowners during the 1590's, thousands of English Protestants immigrated to Ireland, and the Old Irish were systematically subjected to the rule of the

[5] See Claydon and McBride, *Protestantism and National Identity.*

new immigrants. Primarily, the newly arrived settlers soon established an English-style Parliament from which the native, primarily Catholic, population was excluded. This long established persecution created a legacy of distrust of the English Protestant immigrants, and eventually led to the countrywide movement by the Irish Confederates against these settlers in the Uprising of 1641. From 1642-49, these rebels successfully achieved Catholic self-rule through the Irish Catholic Confederation.

However, 1649 marked the beginning of the Cromwellian Conquest. Through the actions of Oliver Cromwell, republicanism had intimate ties with radical Protestantism. In 1649, the Rump Parliament feared that an alliance was forming between the Irish Confederate Army and the English Royalists. Such an alliance was deemed an explicit threat to the stability of the Commonwealth, and Cromwell was nominated to re-establish English dominance in Ireland. Cromwell's violent military expedition reached an apex in September of that year during the Siege of Drogheda. The siege, effectively a massacre, resulted in the deaths of 3,500 townspeople. While Cromwell insisted the siege was necessary for the safety of the English people, the events of Drogheda raised questions about the religious intolerance of the future Protector. Under the republican regime of Cromwell, the Irish Catholics were repeatedly subjected to harsh circumstances, including violent massacres and vast confiscations of land.

Additionally, Cromwell was responsible for instituting draconian land settlements targeted at limiting the rights of the Catholic majority. In 1652, the Rump Parliament under Cromwell passed the Act of Settlement, which ordered that all participants in the rebellions of 1642 "be excepted from pardon of life and estate." Additionally, the Act sought to confiscate Irish lands in order to make repayments on the loans taken to finance the

military effort to calm the rebellion. Consequently, two-thirds of the estates held by leaders of the Irish Confederate army, in addition to one-third of the estates held by Catholics, were seized and re-distributed among Protestants in Ireland. Upon the Restoration, little was done to reverse the land settlement. This legacy of Catholic subjugation would have a substantial impact on the Revolution in Ireland.

In March of 1689, James landed in Ireland with a force of 6,000 men in order to militarily re-establish his position as the rightful ruler of England, Ireland, and Scotland. As Ireland had a Catholic majority population, there was widespread allegiance for James, and the displaced monarch believed Ireland would be the most strategic place to begin his quest to re-claim his right to the throne. Crucially, the sheer proximity of Ireland to England raised the stakes on the war's outcome. For whichever political group became victorious in Ireland, there was easy access to the kingdom of England itself. For James, success in Ireland was necessary to re-claim his kingship, while William needed to defeat the Irish soldiers in order to maintain his hold on the English throne against both Jacobite and French opposition. Until October of 1691, Ireland served as the violent fighting ground between the Jacobite counterrevolutionaries and the Williamite troops. Eventually, the Jacobite troops surrendered in the Siege at Limerick on 23 September 1691.

The Irish Question in Jacobite Propaganda

On March 22, 1689, James II arrived in Ireland under the protection of a French fleet, where he was greeted with elaborate displays of loyalty. In Ireland, where an estimated three-quarters of the population were Catholic, there was substantial support for the old monarch. The Irish were aware that the disposed monarch shared their faith, and he was also a campaigner for greater toleration under which Catholics had the most to gain.

Consequently, the Irish people were willing to actively participate in restoring James to the throne, and Jacobite propagandists emphasized that this prevalent loyalism existed throughout the kingdom. A representative of the people of Kilkenny stated, "[We] wish your sacred Majesty a thousand times welcome to this your natural kingdom, to offer you with all sincerity of our souls, all our lives, and fortunes towards your rethroning."[6] On the march from Cork to Dublin, the King was further met with loyal subjects. A contemporary recounted,

> All along on the road, the country came to meet his majesty with staunch loyalty, profound respect, and tender love, as if he had been an angel from heaven. All degrees of people, and of both sexes, were of the number, old and young; orations of welcome being made unto him at the entrance of each considerable town, and the young rural maids weaving dances before him as he travelled.[7]

Upon arriving in Dublin, James was received by the major and principals of the city, "while the bells rang, the cannons roared, and the music on stages erected in the streets harmoniously played."[8]

Jacobite propagandists urged the Irish Catholics to support James for they believed he would reverse the history of Catholic subjugation to the English Protestant settlers. One pamphleteer insisted all Protestants were "intruders and newcomers," whose religious depravity led them to exploit the Catholic majority. However, Jacobite propagandists asserted that James, due to his religious sympathies, would reverse the existing limitations on Catholic rights. Poet Ó Bruadair described James: "Light of Our Church/The Stately Majestic Prince… The first King of England who gave rank and dignity to Irishmen after the risk they encountered/Conduct that freed them from liberty…/[James] hath changed our

---

[6] Representative of Kilkenny. *Address to King James II at Kilkenny, March 22, 1689.* (London, 1689).
[7] Anonymous. *A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland.* (ed.) John Gilbert. (London, 1692), 46.
[8] Ibid, 47.

despondent hope."[9] From their pulpits, Catholic priests assured their parishes that together James and his Lord Deputy of Ireland, Lord Tyrconnell, would "free them from the Slavery of their Conquerors."[10] These Jacobite propagandists argued that the Catholics of Ireland needed to support James in his cause, for it was unlikely that William would offer such favourable terms in exchange for their allegiance.

This loyalty of the Irish Catholics toward James proved a useful example in the official proclamations of the Jacobite regime. James was struck by the loyalty of the Irish people, who differed substantially from the rebellious individuals in England who planned his usurpation. In a speech to the Irish Parliament in May 1689, James stated, "The exemplary loyalty which this nation expressed to me at a time when others of my subjects so undutifully misbehaved themselves to me… made me resolve to come to you, and to venture my life with you in defence of your liberties and my own right."[11] In this Declaration, James was primarily addressing the Catholic majority of the population, who suffered from the Cromwellian land and religious settlement. In exchange for their loyalty and assistance in re-claiming his position as monarch, James was willing to restore the Catholics to their pre-Civil War condition.

James further argued that he was an ally of the Catholic people, and he was working to ensure freedom from the existing religious persecution. In his Declaration in May of 1689, the King reminded the Irish that he had made two previous attempts to establish

---

[9] Ó Bruadair. "Triumph of James II." Quoted from Boyce, Eccleshall, Geoghegan. *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 2005), 28.

[10] Anonymous. *An Account of a late, horrid and bloody massacre in Ireland of several thousands of Protestants, procur'd and carry'd on by the by the L[ord Deputy] Tyrconnel and his adherents which occasioned the English ... to seize and secure the said Tyrconnel in the Castle of Dublin, in order to be sent for England.* (Dublin?, 1689), 1-2.

[11] James II. *King James II's Speech from the Throne, May 7, 1689.* (London, 1689).

religious toleration in England through the Declaration of Indulgence of 1687 and 1688. He stated, "I have also really been for liberty of conscience and against invading any man's property, having still in my mind that saying in Holy Writ, "*do as you would be done to"* for it is the law and the prophets."[12] By attempting to maintain and restore the rights of the Irish, James was seeking their allegiance and commitment to replace him on his recently lost throne.

While toleration for Catholics was a component of Jacobite propaganda, James recognized that it was one of the central complaints of the Protestant Williamites against him. To the Irish Parliament of 1688, he explained, "It was this liberty of conscience I gave which my enemies both abroad and at home dread, especially when they saw I was resolved to have it established by law in all my dominions."[13] More specifically, toleration for *Catholics* lay at the heart of the controversy between Whigs and Tories. Many Whigs in support of William had developed a strong militant Protestantism, which rejected allegiance to a monarch with Catholic sympathies. Consequently, the Whigs, normally promoters of religious toleration, were able to avoid contradictions in ideology by depicting James' conception of toleration as a threat to the reformed religion. To the Whigs, James' advocacy for toleration was considered an attempt to open the kingdom to Catholicism. In opposition to the criticisms of the Williamite Whigs, James argued that individuals should 'have no other test or distinction but that of loyalty.' James claimed loyalty to the monarchy was of higher importance than individual religious belief.

Furthermore, the history of the injustices of the Civil Wars still remained sharp in the minds of Irish Catholic politicians, who integrated such historical allusions into official

---

[12] James II. *King James II's Speech from the Throne, May 7, 1689.* (London, 1689).
[13] Ibid.

propaganda of the Irish Parliament. Upon arriving in Ireland, James called the assembly of a primarily Roman Catholic Parliament. Since 1652, Catholics had been prohibited from sitting in the Parliament recognized by the English state, and James understood that recognizing these Catholic individuals as representatives of Ireland would help him garner more supporters. While seated, this assembled Parliament passed the Act of Recognition, which announced the importance of Irish allegiance to James. Of the supporters of King William, the Act declared,

> They took upon them to declare your royal throne vacant, and… offered your Imperial Crown to the said Prince of Orange, in such horrid manner and odious circumstances as is but too well known to the world, which execrable fact nothing can equal but the barbarous murder of your father of ever blessed and glorious memory.[14]

Even in the legislation of the state, Jacobite supporters were willing to freely express their feelings toward the new usurper. In this document, the recent usurpation of the throne was depicted as a heinous and unnatural a crime as the regicide committed against Charles I.

Emphasis on the horrors of usurpations and regicides was also evident in less official forms of Jacobite propaganda.[15] The anonymous writer of *A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland* argued,

> It is an experience above controlment, that the pretended reformed people of England are prone to rebellion; that de facto they have dethroned three kings one after another, of late years; that of the three nations, the *Catholic* people of Ireland have showed themselves most loyal.[16]

This Jacobite account criticizes members of the Whig faction for rejecting the sanctity of the royal person. Such Protestant Whigs were accused of lacking the inherent loyalty that the

---

[14] *Act of Declaration*, 1689.

[15] Such references to the past usurpations and regicides are a defining feature of Anglo-Irish relations until the twenty-first century.

[16] *A Jacobite Narrative*, 39.

Catholic Tories held for their monarch. English history had shown that Protestant Whigs were responsible for dethroning three previous monarchs: Mary, Queen of Scots, Charles I, and James II. Tory propagandists accused these Whigs of disrupting the stability of the English nation with their radical republican notions, thus attempting to delegitimize the Whigs as a viable political party and republicanism as an effective mode of governance.

Furthermore, Jacobite propagandists could not ignore the similarities between William of Orange and Oliver Cromwell. Both individuals were devout Protestants, whose religious policies centered on establishing the superiority of Presbyterianism in England. Additionally, both men gained positions of leadership in England, Oliver as the Lord Protector, and William as the new monarch. Nathanial Johnston, in his *Dear Bargain*, argued that William's invasion of the English kingdom resembled the moves of an arbitrary government. He wrote, "A Government which drives furiously on arbitrary Principles, and cannot long subsist without breaking into the Tyranny we suffered under the Rump and *Cromwell."*[17] Of the similarities between the two men, William Sherlock mused, "So let O.P. [Oliver Protector] or P.O [Prince of Orange] be King/Or anyone else, it is the same thing."[18] In his Declaration of November 1688, James accused the Prince of Orange of attempting "nothing less than an absolute usurping of our crown and royal authority" by disposing of his father-in-law.[19] Yet, William went even further by actually seizing the English crown, which Cromwell had declined. Ralph Grey wrote in his *Coronation Ballad,*

> O.P. did but smell at the crown in the Rump
> But though four were before, P.O., with a jump

---

[17] Johnston, Nathaniel. *The dear bargain. Or, A true representation of the state of the English nation under the Dutch. In a letter to a friend*. (London, 1689), 23.
[18] Sherlock, William. *Poems on the Affairs of State.* (ed.) George deForest Lord et. al. Vol. V. (New Haven, 1963-75), 250.
[19] James II. *Declaration of King James II, November 6, 1688.* (London, 1688).

Did venture his neck to saddle his bump.[20]

Consequently, William was depicted as being even more ambitious than the dangerous Oliver Cromwell. Due to the legacy of Oliver Cromwell, Irish apprehensions about renewed parliamentary rule, held even by members of the assembled Parliament, were not unjustified. Under the republican regime of Cromwell, the Irish Catholics were subjected to harsh circumstances, including violent massacres and vast confiscations of land. Through the actions of Oliver Cromwell, republicanism had intimate ties with radical Protestantism, including disadvantageous economic legislation for Catholics under the Act of Settlement.

Throughout the revolutionary period, references to this Act of Settlement established under Cromwell re-appeared in Jacobite propaganda, fueling anti-Protestant and anti-republican sentiments. The Irish poet, O Bruadair wrote of the disappointment of the Irish Catholics upon the passing of the Act, "When home they returned they got naught of their old demesnes/But to gaze at their lands like a dog at a lump of beef."[21] In 1691, William Petty hypothesized that Catholics now held only 2,280,000 acres, roughly one-third of the "good land of Ireland."[22] This land policy was a continuously used example of the injustices experienced under Protestant rule, reappearing in pro-Irish Catholic propaganda for the next three hundred years.[23] In 1668, Nicholas French wrote, *A narrative of the settlement and sale of Ireland,* which criticized the Restoration land settlement. He wrote, "Since his Majestys happy Restauration… that the *Irish* alone shou'd be forced to mourn, but condemned to a perpetual Sufferance, far surrassing those they formerly

---

[20] Grey, Ralph. 'Coronation Ballad.' *Poems on the Affairs of State*. (ed.) George deForest Lord et. al. Vol V. (New Haven, (1963-75), 43.

[21] *The Poems of David Ó Bruadair.* (ed. and trans.) J.C. MacErlean. (London, 1910-17), vol 3, pp. 23.

[22] Anonymous. *The Political Anatomy of Ireland* (Ireland, 1691), pp. 15.

[23] For a discussion on the legacy of land settlement and its continued presence in historical thought, see Perceval-Maxwell. 'The Irish Restoration Land Settlement and its Historians.' *Restoration Ireland*.

endured under the Government of *Cromwel* is a Calamity rather to be deplored."[24] Jacobite propagandists ordered the reprinting of this pamphlet in 1685, reviving Catholic interest in seeking royal assistance in repealing the Act.

Early in his reign, King James was wary about reversing the Act of Settlement for fear that it would alienate his Protestant supporters. However, in the aftermath of his displacement from the throne, James recognized that the intense hatred of this legislation among the Catholics could be used to garner crucial support in order to re-claim his throne. Consequently, James explicitly declared in his speeches to the Irish Parliament his intentions to amend the past injustices by eliminating these Acts. Upon his arrival in Ireland in March 1689, King James stated, "I shall also most readily consent to the making such good and wholesome laws as may be for your and the general good of the nation, and the improvement of trade, and relieving such as have been injured by the late Acts of Settlement."[25] In his speech, James explicitly was emphasizing the legacy of economic discrimination under which the Irish Catholics suffered, and he compelled that he would effectively restore these individuals' land rights, which had been damaged under Cromwell and ignored under Charles. A Jacobite supporter celebrated James' decision as an attempt to "render at last that great justice to the nation which had been wanting for forty years."[26]

However, supporters of James were aware that the Irish Protestants had ample reason to rebel against the displaced monarch, as he publicly stated his intentions to

---

[24] French, Nicholas. *A narrative of the settlement and sale of Ireland whereby the just English adventurer is much prejudiced, the antient proprietor destroyed, and publick faith violated : to the great discredit of the English church, and government, (if not re-called and made void) as being against the principles of Christianity, and true Protestancy / written in a letter by a gentleman in the country to a noble-man at court* (London, 1668), 1.

[25] James II. *King James II's Speech from the Throne, May 7, 1689*. (London, 1689).

[26] *A Jacobite Narrative*. 54-5.

counter the Act of Settlement. The writer of *A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland,* wrote of Protestants,

> They have been in fear, of a long time, that his majesty would, upon the first opportunity, compel them by new and just laws to restore unto the *Catholic* owners those estates which the said Protestants possessed by the grant of Cromwell, and by the confirmation of that unrighteous parliament which sat at Dublin a little after King Charles the second had been restored.[27]

The conflict between Protestants and Catholics had a strong economic basis, rooted in the actions of Cromwell. Under Cromwell and Charles II, Protestants had privileged economic status, primarily through the acquisition of land following the Acts of Settlement. If James were to re-capture the throne, he argued that he reward the loyalty of the Irish Catholics with a complete reversal of the land settlements, thus resulting in a mass transfer of estates in Protestant possession.

In their propaganda, Jacobites were also quick to emphasize that a Williamite victory would place the Three Kingdoms of Ireland, Scotland, and England under foreign control. Upon hearing the plans of William's invasion, James released a declaration stating his dismay that a personal relative would attempt to usurp his kingship with a foreign army. The proclamation stated,

> We cannot consider this invasion of our kingdoms by the Prince of Orange without horror, for so unchristian and unnatural an undertaking in a person so nearly related to us; so it is a matter of the greater trouble and concern to us to reflect upon the many mischiefs and calamities which an army of foreigners and rebels much unavoidably bring upon.[28]

Supporters of James in Ireland took up similar arguments. A representative from the town of Kilkenny urged of James, "Order us to attack the faithless excellent, your fanatic Bristol, your deserting Chester, your rebellious London… Give us the signal to invest the source of

---

[27] *A Jacobite Narrative*, 40.

[28] James II. *Declaration of King James II, November 6, 1688.* (London, 1688).

treacherous Amsterdam, to surround the factious Hague, and seize the sinews of ungrateful Holland."[29] In addition to William's foreign origins, his army was also comprised largely of soldiers from the Netherlands. Of the Irish soldiers, one pamphleteer wrote, "They are to fight veteran forces of *several* nations, which the prince of Orange will send, or bring himself."[30] Consequently, Jacobite propagandists urged these Irish Catholic soldiers to protect the Three Kingdoms from a Dutch invasion.

Furthermore, Jacobite propagandists stressed the brutality of the Protestants against the Catholics. One pamphleteer wrote, "The people of England, since their fall into heresey is a nation prone to rebellion through the depravedness of religion."[31] Charles Leslie argued that such depravedness based on religion led the Protestants to commit gruesome acts against their Catholic neighbours. Of Catholics in Protestant majority areas, Leslie wrote, "All the *Irish there* were in mortal Fear of the *Protestants*, and they commonly durst not sleep in their Houses by lay abreast in the Fields lest they should fall upon them."[32] He continued to lament the brutality exercised against the Catholic civilians, "But the vast Number of poor harmless *Natives*, who were daily Kill'd up and down the Fields, as they were following their Labour, or taken our of their Beds and Hanged, or shot immediately for *Rapparees is a most Terrible Scandal."* [33] Jacobite propagandists emphasized that this brutality was proof that the persecutions that Catholics had long felt under Protestant role would only continue if the Jacobites lost their counterrevolution.

---

[29] Representative of Kilkenny. *Address to King James II at Kilkenny, March 22, 1689.*
[30] *Jacobite Narrative,* 37.
[31] Ibid., 187.
[32] Leslie, Charles. *An answer to a book, intituled, The state of the Protestants in Ireland under the late King James government in which, their carriage towards him is justified, and the absolute necessity of their endeavouring to be free'd from his government, and of submitting to their present Majesties, is demonstrated*. (London, 1692), 84.
[33] Ibid., 164.

Consequently, Ireland was a useful rhetorical tool for Jacobite propagandists in England to express the dangers of confessionalism and radical republicanism under Protestant leadership. When James arrived in Ireland in 1688, he centered his official propaganda on restoring the rights of the Catholics, who comprised the majority of the individuals in Ireland. By using frequent appeals to history, Jacobites associated Protestants with anti-monarchical tendencies and the usurpations of three former monarchs. By referencing the recent history of the Civil War years, propagandists outlined similarities between Oliver Cromwell and William of Orange. Such references served as powerful rhetorical tools as the Catholics of Ireland, who had been subjected to long lasting socio-economic and political persecution, harshly remembered Cromwell's legacy. Jacobites further warned that William might bring a similar fate again to the Irish people if he won the monarchical succession, a concern strengthened due to the Prince of Orange's Dutch origins.

In addition to stoking fear and anxieties by emphasizing the likelihood of Protestant-led confessionalism and republicanism if the Williamite regime were to emerge victorious, James and his supporters were able to garner further support by offering protection from these two threats. When James arrived in Ireland, he offered to restore and protect the rights of the Catholic majority against the horrors of Protestant rule. James, a long supporter of toleration and liberty of conscience, especially for Catholics, offered to reject the Act of Settlements and acknowledge a Catholic-majority Parliament, an institution not yet recognized by the English state. In fostering the fear of the Protestant 'other,' Jacobites built a propaganda campaign around the offer of freedom from

persecution to the Catholics of Ireland. In this manner, James was seeking support to re-establish a government in Ireland based on Catholic principles and leadership.

The Irish Question in Williamite Propaganda

Throughout Williamite propaganda, there permeated a fear of the relationship developing between Catholic Ireland under James and France under Louis XIV. Upon the arrival of William in England, James fled to France, where he resided under the hospitality of King Louis. This brief sojourn, indicative of the close relationship between the French monarch and the newly disposed English king, would later have a substantial influence on propaganda targeting the dangerous Anglo-Franco alliance.[34] Upon the declaration of William and Mary as the new monarchs of England, James resolved to invade the English kingdom with the assistance of Louis XIV by re-entering through Ireland. By using widespread Irish Catholic support, James hoped to regain control over England.

In their attempt to discredit James as a valid ruler of Ireland, Williamite writers worked to associate Irish Catholic leadership with the brutal and tyrannical commands of King Louis. By making these associations, such propagandists foretold of the misfortunes that would befall Ireland, and possibly spread into England, if the Irish Catholics were to be victorious over the army of William. The ballad, 'LONDONS TRIUMPH,' described a public display erected on 5 November 1690 in honor of King William's birthday. The spectacle included four figures, one depicting King Louis XIV. The balladeer describes the figure,

> The third Figure shews you how Lewis le Grand,
> That desperate Tyrant and Torment to man,
> What vast Floods of Protestant Blood he has spilt,
> With Swords in their Bodies sheath'd up to the Hilt;
> His booted Apostles some thousands did kill,

[34] For a discussion on the threat of a possible Anglo-French Alliance, see chapters 1 and 2.

The bloody Commands of their King to fulfill.[35]

Williamite propagandists accused King Louis of being responsible for commanding his supporters to slaughter Protestants within Ireland. By calling Louis' foot soldiers 'booted Apostles,' the propagandist effectively transformed the struggle of succession into a religious conflict between the English Protestants with their allegiance to William of Orange and the Irish Catholics with their allegiance to the French king and King James.

Consequently, when fighting broke out between Irish Jacobites and Williamites in March of 1689, there was a widespread fear that the Irish Catholic Jacobites would massacre all Protestant civilians within Ireland and England. Williamite propagandists accused Catholics in Ireland of brutally raping and murdering Protestant individuals. A balladeer described the horrendous acts committed at the hands of Catholic fanatics,

> They Ravish Maids and Wives also,
> Then murder'd them before they go…
> By hundreds without Remorse,
> Into Houses they did drive by force;
> Then burn'd th[e]i[r] Houses o're their head,
> There they lay frying till they were dead. [36]

Another ballad questioned, "How many poor Souls has in Ireland been lost/And all by the Papists they have been crost."[37] To the Williamites, Ireland was a 'Kingdom of Rebels.'[38] A writer accounted that the army of William were horrified by the brutality of the Irish. He writes, "With horrour dey fill us, both shoot, cut and kill us… we was ne'er so pepper'd

---

[35] Anonymous. *LONDONS TRIUMPH: OR, The Magnificent Glory at the head of Cheapside, on the Kings Birth-Day, and the Fifth of November…* (London, 1692).

[36] Anonymous. *The PROTESTANTS Great Misery in IRELAND, Relating the Inhumane Cruelties that are daily committed there by the French and Irish Papists.* (London, 1689).

[37] Anonymous. The Souldiers Prayers for King VVILLIAMS Good Success in Ireland Over His Enemies. (London, 1689).

[38] Anonymous. *The Warlike Monarch OR, King William's Princely Courage, and Resolution, for Reducing the Kingdom of Ireland in his own Person by his Care and Conduct.*

before."[39] Such descriptions drove individuals toward stronger Protestant sentiments. By describing their enemies as sub-human 'others,' Williamite propagandists asserted that widespread religious violence was inevitable under Catholic leadership.

In addition to representing a threat of widespread violence, Louis XIV was also depicted as seeking to gain political control over Ireland within Williamite propaganda. These writers contended that the French king did not intend to restore James to throne but claim it for himself. One ballad argues that Louis was attempting to also take control over the Celtic and North Seas surrounding England, thus controlling England's trade routes. The balladeer argued that the English army needed to prevent this from occurring,

> Let Monsieur now, doe what he can,
> We'll still Reign Master o'er the Main;
> Old England's Right upon the Sea,
> In spight of France maintain'd shall be.[40]

Another balladeer argued that the French king had an elaborate plot to capture Ireland. In this plot, Louis XIV had encouraged James to abdicate the throne, and the subsequent war in Ireland was a mere design to gain political control over England under the guise of restoring James to his monarchy. The ballad continued, "But would you have thought it, this French King design'd to make little Ireland a Province of France."[41] Others similarly argued that the French monarch manipulated James into taking to arms against the Irish and English Williamites. Rather than supporting the Irish Catholics to help James regain the throne, King Louis was using James as a political tool to gain control of the kingdom

---

[39] Anonymous. *DUBLIN'S Deliverance: OR, The Surrender of DROGHEDA. Shewing, King William's Conquest over his Catholick Enemies in his Warlike Progress in IRELAND.* (1690).
[40] Anonymous. *THE Nations Joy for a War With MONSIEUR, OR, ENGLAND's Resolution to pluck down France.* (London, 1690).
[41] Anonymous. The PROCLAMATION For a General FAST in the Nation. (1690).

himself. In a fake dialogue between Tyrconnel, the Duke of Berwick, and James, the displaced monarch bemoaned,

> I am not but a Souldier, that once was a King.
> What hard fortune have I for to have such bad luck,
> Proud Lewis hath brought me for to carry his Cloak.[42]

The satirical account suggests that James was merely an actor in Louis' ambitions for Ireland.

Therefore, Williamite propagandists asserted that it was the job of the English army to disturb Louis' plan to lay claim to England. One ballad stated, "The haughty Monsieur we'll pluck down/And make him bow to England's Crown."[43] By emphasizing Irish violence and the proximity of French tyranny, individuals were encouraged to join the army of William against the Catholic threat. Another balladeer wrote,

> Come all you brave Souldiers with courage let's go,
> To fight for the King, and to bring down his foe…
> The Boys let us fight with our Courage so free,
> To pull down the French and the pride of popery.[44]

As this balladeer chose to fight in order "to maintain the Laws of Old Englands right," he urged his fellow Englishmen to preserve the Protestant faith against their Catholic neighbors. Throughout Whig propaganda, such as this ballad, writers created a dichotomy between the virtuous courage of the Protestant English and the proud vices of the French and Irish Catholics.

---

[42] Anonymous. *A Dialogue Between the Late King James The Duke of Berwick, and Tyrconnel; A while after the Fight, that happen'd about Nine Miles from Dublin: Together with their full Resolution to quit Ireland, and to take Shipping and so Sail to France, to tell Proud Lewis their great Misfortune.* (London, 1690).

[43] Anonymous. *THE Nations Joy for a War With MONSIEUR, OR, ENGLAND's Resolution to pluck down France.* (London, 1690).

[44] Anonymous. *The Souldier's Prayers*.

Consequently, the official propagandists of the Williamite regime developed a media campaign, which highlighted the virtuous nature of the court of King Willaim in dramatic contrast with the vices of the Irish Catholics.[45] Catholicism was closely associated with vice in the minds of Protestants, frequently evidenced in the descriptions of court proceedings during the reign of Charles II. In order to display the religiosity of the court, Williamite propagandists published forty-nine royal sermons between 1689 to 1691, as compared to the average three per year during Charles' reign.[46] In particular, the royal propagandists commonly used Queen Mary as evidence of the new virtue of the court. Mary was described as, "A Protestant that's good and true, and hates the Name of Popery."[47] She was frequently attributed with the new rise in religious observance. Preacher Thomas Manningham argued, "Tis to the *Queen* that we owe any of those *Pious Treatises* which have been Publish'd among us… It's judiciously concluded by many, that there was not such *Preaching* in the whole World besides, as at *Whitehall* and never such in England before."[48]

Williamite propagandists also encouraged William's supporters to fast and pray for their new monarch as he ventured to Ireland. While God had ordained William's victory over King James for the crown of England, it was not yet certain whether the Lord would also grant William control over Ireland. By royal proclamation, a fast was to be held on the

---

[45] For the most complete work exploring the propaganda of the 'virtuous court,' see Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*. (New York, 1996).

[46] Claydon, 96.

[47] Anonymous. *THE Boast of Great Britain; OR, A SONG in praise of MARY present Queen of England, Scotland, France and Ireland*. (London, 1689).

[48] Manningham, Thomas. *A sermon preach'd at the parish church of St. Andrew's, Holburn, 30 December 1694. On the most lamented death of our most gracious soveraign Queen Mary*. (1694). Quoted in Claydon, 98.

third Wednesday of every month to encourage the King's success in Ireland.[49] One balladeer urged participation in this national fast,

> That all Kingdoms be
> The Gift of God only, and no Prince's Fee:
> And learn, by true Fasting, Devoutly to Pray
> Usurpers and Rebels may ne'r get the Day.[50]

National prayer and fast campaigns were common features of the official propaganda of the Williamite state, primarily led by Bishop Gilbert Burnet.[51] Protestants asserted that victory in Ireland was not a right of any monarch but a gift determined by God. William could only defeat the Jacobites in Ireland if he and the English nation had the favor of the Lord. In order to gain such divine ordinance, religious Whigs stressed the importance of maintaining devout Protestantism and morality within England. By establishing national fasts and praying, such individuals were optimistic that the Lord would be pleased by the religiosity of the English nation under William.

Other propagandists stressed that the English people needed to further distance themselves from the immorality that flourished under James and his Catholic court. The above balladeer further accused James of purposefully encouraging the rebellion in Ireland. He wrote, "By Irish, too Wild/But Parent, more Vil'd/That would keep that Kingdom, even from his own Child."[52] The balladeer criticized King James for his greed in attempting to maintain hold on the English and Irish kingdoms, even at the expense of his daughter and son-in-law. Since the Restoration period, Protestants had worked to prevent the spread of

---

[49] *By the King and Queen, a proclamation for a general fast... given 20 February 1689.* (1689)
[50] Anonymous. The PROCLAMATION For a General FAST in the Nation. (?, 1690).

[51] For additional uses of fasts and thanksgivings, see Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution,* pp. 100-110.
[52] Anonymous, *The PROCLAMATION For a General FAST in the Nation.*

Catholicism in order to limit the expansion of immorality.[53] Catholicism did not just represent the personal faith of an individual. It represented a national level fear about increased sexuality, excessive drinking, and gambling. Such improprieties threatened the Protestant view of divine ordinance, which could only be granted through moral observance of God's teachings.

Williamite propagandists, like their Jacobite counterparts, also used the legacy of past events in Ireland to garner support for their cause. By associating the new support for King James with the Uprising of 1641, the Williamites could place blame on the Irish for creating the impetus for the Civil Wars. Furthermore, by recounting these past events, Williamite propagandists were warning against plunging England back into a similar situation. Of the new outbreak of violence, one balladeer relates, "What wicked Murders has been done/As bad as was in Forty-One."[54] In a sermon, John Vesey accused the Irish rebels of "ripping up Women big with Child , and giving the Infant to the Dogs; compelling the Wife to kill the Husband, and the Son the Mother, and then murder the Son."[55] Such allusions added greater urgency to helping William achieve victory over James on the battlefields in Ireland, so that such violence toward Protestants would not be repeated.

In opposition to this Catholic threat, Williamite propagandists presented the Prince of Orange as the defender of political liberties and the Protestant faith in England and Ireland. One writer called the Prince of Orange, "Mighty William, great William Three

---

[53] See Claydon, *William III.* Also see, Harris, Tim. *Revolution. The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720.* (London, 2007).

[54] Anonymous. *The PROTESTANTS Great Misery in IRELAND, Relating the Inhumane Cruelties that are daily committed there by the French and Irish Papists.* (London, 1690).

[55] Vesey, John. *A sermon preach'd to the Protestants of Ireland, in and about the city of London, at St. Mary le Bow in Cheapside, Octob. 23. 1689 being the day appointed by act of Parliament in Ireland, for an anniversary thanksgiving for the deliverance of the Protestants of that kingdom, from the bloudy massacre and rebellion begun by the Irish papists, on the 23rd of October, 1641.* (London, 1689), 29.

Kingdoms defender."[56] Another propagandist emphasized the bravery of King William. Of the rebels, he wrote, "They strait did Surrender to our Faith's Defender/no King ever conquer'd like him before."[57] Furthermore, in defending Ireland from falling to French Catholicism, William was presented as a barrier to the advancement of Catholicism throughout Europe. Across the continent, there existed common anxieties about the future of Protestantism and Catholicism, particularly as Louis' ambitions and power grew. In this context, William was depicted as the sole individual of the Protestant kingdoms able to counter the French monarch.[58] One balladeer called him the 'Pride of Christendom,' The balladeer continued,

> No sooner we the Coast had clear'd,
> But we our Hearts with Liquor chear'd,
> In drinking Healths to that great King,
> Whose fame shall thorough Europe Ring.[59]

Consequently, Williamite propagandists constructed an image of the king in their writings as a devout Protestant, who contrasted substantially with the Catholic James.

As this section explores, Williamite propaganda stressed that the proximity of Ireland to England meant a threat to the autonomy and security of the English nation in the event that the Irish Catholics or the French planned an invasion. Some writers argued that the French were planning to invade Ireland, in order to have easy entry into England. Other propagandists suggested that Louis was attempting to take over Ireland itself, through

---

[56] Anonymous. *The Triumph of IRELAND: OR, The Surrender of Limbrick To Their MAJESTIES FORCES under the Command of the Duke Of Wirtemburg, and Lieutenant General Scravenmore, on Sunday the 27th. of September 1693. to the unspeakable joy of the Protestant Army.* (?, 1693).

[57] Anonymous. *DUBLIN'S Deliverance: OR, The Surrender of DROGHEDA.* (?, 1690).

[58] For a more thorough discussion of concerns over French absolutism, see chapter 2.

[59] Anonymous. *THE Irish Rebels Routed: OR, A brief Relation of the Victorious Conquest by the Protestants over the French & Irish at CAVAN: To the great Encouragement of the Protestant Party, as it was sent in a Letter from a Soldier in Ireland to his Love in London.* (1690).

placing James on the throne as a puppet king. Additionally, Williamite propagandists depicted the Irish as ethnically different, a barbaric race capable of committing horrible acts of violence. Furthermore, appeals to past history emphasized that Irish Catholics had been responsible for the Uprising of 1641, arguably the impetus for the Civil Wars. Consequently, the Williamites accused the Irish as threatening the future political stability of the Three Kingdoms in their propaganda.

In response, Williamite propagandists developed a complementary argument based on William as the defender of the Protestant faith. As Protestants were the minority in Ireland, it was argued that William of Orange could protect them against the violent Catholic majority. Additionally, William was presented as the only individual capable of stopping the spread of Catholicism and French influence from Ireland into England. In order to ensure William's success in the war being fought in Ireland, the royal propagandists developed national fast and prayer campaigns. Consequently, the Williamite propagandists effectively used the war in Ireland to further advance William as the saviour of the Protestant people from the threat of Catholicism.

Conclusion

Ireland greatly differed from England during the Revolution of 1688-9 in that the majority of its civilians were Catholic. While ties between religion and forms of governance were a common feature of the propaganda campaigns during the Revolution in England, the Catholic majority in Ireland altered how such campaigns were presented. Specifically, Jacobites lamented that Ireland had a legacy since the Civil War period in which the majority of its people were subjected to injustices at the benefit of a few Protestant leaders. Such injustices included land confiscations, exclusion from representation in Parliament,

and qualifications for office. In his propaganda campaigns, James attempted to develop a common trans-Ireland desire among the Irish Catholics to reverse the prejudicial post-Restoration settlements and regain self-rule, turning Ireland into a Catholic kingdom.

For the Williamites, there was substantial anxiety that the Jacobites would be successful in their bid for the Irish kingdom, as the Jacobite counterrevolution posed a direct challenge to their hold on government and conception that Ireland should be a Protestant state. Throughout their propaganda, Williamite writers repeatedly warned about the horrors that would befall the Protestants if the Jacobites proved successful. The Williamite propagandists consequently featured Tyrconnel and his purging of Protestants from the Irish army as a symbol of the violent possibilities under Catholic tyranny. Throughout the war in Ireland, Williamite propagandists in England used Ireland as an example of the horrors of confessionalism, foretelling what would befall England if such conflict entered the kingdom.

Both Jacobites and Williamites argued further that their opponents were dependent upon an untrustworthy foreign 'other,' particularly for assistance on the battlefields in Ireland. For the Jacobites, William of Orange was a Dutch usurper, who had no true connection to the English or Irish kingdoms. Thousands of Dutch soldiers were brought to fight in Ireland for William, causing concern that the Dutch Republic was seeking to place England under its dominion. Similarly, the Jacobites relied heavily upon French soldiers and aid. While Jacobite writers argued that this aid would tip the scales of victory in favor of James and his army, Williamite writers argued that it was really the French seeking a way to subject England to their authority. Particularly, these foreign 'others' represented threats to both parties' conceptions of the future of the Three Kingdoms.

Chapter 4:

The Battle over the Religious Settlement
Scotland in the Political Propaganda of the 1688-9 Revolution

Upon ascending the throne in 1685, the Duke of York was crowned King James II of England and King James VII of Scotland. Almost immediately into his reign, James decided that Scotland was the ideal testing ground for new policies regarding religious toleration for his Catholic co-religionists. There was a close geographical proximity between the two kingdoms, and the people of these two regions were united as subjects under the same monarch. These similarities sparked substantial speculation and fear among the English people that James hoped such toleration could later be transferred south to the English kingdom. While James hoped to primarily benefit Catholics through the Declaration of Indulgence in 1687, the Declaration also ensured that toleration was extended to Presbyterian dissenters. High churchmen within England and Scotland alike considered the granting of increased rights to dissenters a threat to the dominancy of the national Episcopal churches in both kingdoms.

Consequently, during the period between 1688-90, there existed substantial contention in Scotland over the future of the established Episcopal Church, which was repeatedly emphasized in both the Williamite and Jacobite propaganda produced within England. The radical Presbyterians of Southwest Scotland wanted to demolish episcopacy, effectively seeking to dismantle the Church of Scotland through whatever physical and legal mechanisms were deemed necessary. In opposition, the Episcopal Church of Scotland struggled to justify its position as the national Church. As questions over the religious settlement unfolded, propagandists in England frequently retold the violent overthrow of

the Episcopacy in 1688-9 as a warning for what the future of their own kingdom and national church might entail.[1]

Modern historiography has been unable to reach a consensus regarding the level and direction of the interconnectedness that existed between Scotland and England during the Revolution of 1688. One camp argues that Scotland represented a periphery state to the war being fought physically in Ireland and politically in England. Historian Gordon Donaldson claimed, "The Revolution was made in England and imported to Scotland."[2] Furthermore, the Scots have often been described as 'uncommitted' and 'passive' within the workings of the Revolution, characteristics attributed to the relative weakness of the Scottish economy and military force.[3] In his essay, 'Sensible Revolutionaries,' John Morrill laments that recent revisits to Scottish seventeenth century history have been noticeably silent on the 1688 revolution and the resulting impact, focusing rather on the earlier events of the 1640's.[4]

However, this section seeks to challenge the existing notion that the events in Scotland were separate and peripheral to the revolutionary proceedings in England during the late 1688's. This chapter (and the proceeding chapter on Ireland) is particularly aligned with Tim Harris' revisionist work, in which he argues, "The Glorious Revolution was, by

---

[1] This chapter focuses primarily on the religious settlements in both England and Scotland during the Revolution. In order to address this issue fully, this section will have a more narrow temporal scope than the other chapters in this thesis, focusing on the years 1688-90.

[2] Donaldson, Gordon. *Scotland: James V to James VII*. (Edinburgh, 1965), 383.

[3] See Barnes, Robert Paul. 'Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688.' *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* , Vol. 3, No. 3 (Autumn, 1971), 117. Also, Ian Cowan, 'The Reluctant Revolutionaries: Scotland in 1688' in Evelie Cruickshanks (ed.), *By Force or By Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689*. (Edinburgh, 1989)

[4] Morrill, John. 'The Sensible Revolution,' in Jonathan Israel (ed.), *Anglo-Dutch Moment.* (New York, 2003).

definition, a three-kingdoms event, and needs to be studied as such."[5] Similarly, Jonathan Israel contends that it is crucial to study the English-speaking kingdoms together as a collective whole. He writes,

> Setting the English Revolution in its wider British context is not just a matter of placing developments in Ireland, Scotland, and English-speaking America alongside those in England but of learning to view developments in the whole group of English-speaking nations as belonging together, closely connected parts of a single complex.[6]

More narrowly, this chapter contends that the English people had a profound interest in the religious events unfolding in Scotland, as there existed a robust effort by both Whig and Tory propagandists to seek and distribute accounts of the Scottish revolutionary proceedings within England. This active retelling of Scottish events in England reveals that to focus exclusively on England or Scotland within historiography would obscure the attempts of propagandists to influence domestic events by means of referencing the international context.

London served as a hotbed for the publication and circulation of writings on the revolutionary happenings of Scotland. Such accounts included those written by Scottish writers who chose to publish in London rather than Edinburgh, and English propagandists, who wanted to use the Scottish example to influence domestic opinions on religious toleration and rights of the monarch. Jacobite propagandists focused on presenting the radicalism of the Presbyterian Whigs as a threat to the stability of the Church of Scotland, and by association, the Church of England. In contrast, the Williamite propagandists targeted James' personal faith and his commitment to an ideology based on French-style

---

[5] Harris, Tim. *Revolution: Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720*. (London, 2006), 15.

[6] Israel, Jonathan. *Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact*. (New York, 2003),12.

absolutism as a danger to the security of the Scottish and English people. Such writers frequently relied upon the association between Catholicism and absolutism, effectively disseminating an argument that would provide the justification for challenging James' right to the throne. Consequently, by citing James' actions and intentions in Scotland, English Whig propagandists created a political demand for a new leader, a role that would ultimately be filled by the Prince of Orange.

Background: Scotland in the Late 1680's

When James ascended the throne in 1685, his coronation was initially met with widespread support in both Scotland and England.[7] However, James soon began pursuing religious toleration in Scotland for his Catholic co-religionists, which raised concerns among the Episcopalian and Presbyterian communities alike. Within a year of his coronation, James began placing men of Catholic faith in both local and high positions of the Scottish government, in violation of pre-existing Scottish law. Following the uprising led by the Earl of Argyll, James named the Earl of Dumbarton the Commander of Forces in Scotland in May of 1685. Later that year, the Lord Chancellor of Perth converted to Catholicism, along with his brother, the Earl of Melfort, the acting Secretary of State of Scotland. James also sought to increase the number of Catholics holding local office. In November of 1685, he exempted 26 individuals, who sought positions as tax collectors

[7] The failed uprising of the Earl of Argyll in May of 1685 attests to this high level of popular support for the monarch during the early years of his reign. Argyll's rebellion gained little traction among the people of Scotland, and the Earl was soon captured in June. In England, the Duke of Monmouth led a similar small, and only slightly more successful, uprising in England. It is likely that neither rebellion gained much popular support due to the prevalent skepticism of radicalism in the aftermath of the earlier Exclusion Crisis from 1679-81 and the Rye House Plot of 1683. However, these two uprisings had a profound effect on King James' willingness to use strong royal authority. Despite the minimal level of the support of these two movements, King James adopted an increasingly heavy-handed approach toward domestic security, which started to raise suspicions about the monarch's political intentions.

from taking the Test Act oath. Furthermore, in 1686, the new monarch attempted to convince the Scottish Parliament to repeal the Test Act, which would legally enable Catholics to take public office without receiving a monarchical exemption. Such actions were considered by the Whig faction to be proof of the king's growing attempts to institute Gallican absolutism within the three kingdoms. As a result of the king's initiatives, anti-Catholic propaganda produced by the Whig community proliferated throughout Scotland in the forms of sermons, pamphlets, and ballads, despite government attempts to limit the publication of such material in Edinburgh. Between 1685-7, James' attempts to ensure religious toleration for Catholics were primarily limited to Scotland. However, this prolific anti-Catholic propaganda filtered down to London, where the English waited in speculation over whether the king would pursue similar toleration for Catholics in their kingdom.

When the Scottish Parliament of 1686 failed to pass the requested legislation, James decided to implement his Scottish Declaration of Indulgence on 12 February 1687 by means of royal prerogative.[8] As this section will explore further, Whig propagandists emphasized that the Declaration was couched in the offensive terms of 'absolute authority.' Consequently, these propagandists were seeking to generate fear throughout the kingdoms of Scotland and England on the grounds that James was attempting to implement a French-style form of absolute rule, seemingly confirmed by the king's commitment to spreading Catholicism in violation of the law. Thus, the Declaration fueled a new wave of anti-Catholic propaganda, and Whig propagandists effectively created a demand for an alternative political leader: the Prince of Orange.

---

[8] A separate Declaration of Indulgence was passed in England in April of the same year. Note that these two Declarations had significantly different content.

When William landed in England in November of 1688, Whig propagandists both in England and Scotland argued that the Prince of Orange was to be the savior of the Scottish people from the spread of popery. In his official Declarations, William presented himself as politically moderate in order to appeal to both High Churchmen and the moderate Presbyterians. Writing to the Scottish Convention in March of 1689 in order to convince the MPs that he was the most suitable leader of the two kingdoms, William argued that his goal was to protect the Protestant religion from the political horrors of Catholicism through uniting the Scottish and English kingdoms. However, the Presbyterian-majority Scottish Convention argued that unifying the two kingdoms would result in their subjugation under the Anglican Church. In response to the king's attempt at moderation, the Convention pushed to limit royal prerogative, and William was required to sign the Claim of Right, which legally dismantled the Episcopal Church of Scotland as the national church.

Consequently, what emerges is an attempt by Scottish Whigs to define Scottish and English identity as fundamentally Presbyterian. As the Scottish Whigs vehemently rejected the Episcopal Church model, the revolutionary settlement in Scotland ultimately took on a substantially more radical nature than that in England. Crucially, the spread of Jacobite propaganda detailing the events in Scotland cautioned Tories and moderate Whigs about the dangers of tolerating radical dissenting views when seeking a religious settlement. Beginning with the rabblings, the forcible removal of Episcopal ministers from their manses by Presbyterian laymen in 1688, Tory propagandists circulated in England and Scotland extensive accounts of the radical and violent nature of Presbyterian dissenters. Such accounts served as warnings to Anglican clergy about the danger of accepting the English dissenting voice within the revolutionary settlement. Furthermore, in February of

1687, the Declaration of Indulgence had been passed only in Scotland, enabling the English to witness the mounting tensions, culminating in the violent rabblings and forceful Presbyterian domination of the Scottish Convention of 1689, which resulted from toleration being granted to the Presbyterian community.

Following the rabblings of 1688-9, William maintained his moderate political stance in urging the radical Presbyterians to cease their violent activities. However, this moderate stance served to alienate the Scottish High Churchmen, who believed William had abandoned their interests in his attempt to gain support from the radicals of the Scottish Convention. While these High Churchmen earlier disagreed with James for implementing the Declaration of Indulgence of 1687, for it served to weaken the dominancy of the Church by legalizing Protestant dissent, many of these clergymen were also skeptical that the alternative leader, William, was capable of protecting the Church of Scotland. Some clergy made appeals to the new king to protect their interests, while many abandoned hope that William would defend the position of the Church. Ultimately, these clergymen proved correct when William signed the Claim of Right, resulting in the disestablishment of the Church of Scotland.

In England, the religious settlement had a more moderate outcome, although the Church of England still emerged from the Revolution significantly altered. In 1689, the Toleration Act was passed by Parliament, legislating freedom of worship to Nonconformist dissenters. However, the act did not apply to Catholics, nor did it allow Nonconformists to hold public office. Crucially, the Toleration Act meant that the Church of England became the established, rather than the exclusive national church, to a state that was increasingly recognizing the rights of other Christian sects.

Tory Propaganda and the Defense of the Episcopal Church

In the aftermath of the arrival of William in November of 1688, the Scottish clergy largely felt King William had abandoned their interests. In the *History of His Own Time,* Bishop Burnet, a man of Scottish origin who served as the personal minister of King William, recounted, "[The Scottish bishops] finding that the Presbyterians were likely to carry all before them, resolved to make what party they could for King James and to stick to his interest."[9] As the conflict over the Church settlement unfolded, a majority of the members of the Church of Scotland felt that King William was doing nothing to mitigate the radical attempts of the Presbyterians to eliminate all traces of episcopacy. Consequently, the Scottish Episcopacy aligned itself with the old monarch, King James. In England, Anglicans anxiously watched the unfolding of events in the North to determine the fate of their own Church of England.

As the debate over the future of the Church of Scotland reached its peak in late 1688, the Whigs of Scotland began tugging at the foundations of the Episcopal Church by physically attacking Scottish High Churchmen. Episcopalian Scottish witnesses, who were appalled at the behavior of the radical Presbyterians, recorded accounts of these attacks, which were soon sent for publication and circulation throughout the streets of London. Christmas Day of 1688 saw the first of these events, later referred to as the rabblings, which primarily look place throughout the southwest of Scotland. The rabblings typically followed a 'ritualistic pattern,' in which the minister was forcibly removed from his home, while his gown was torn, prayer book burnt, and keys to the Church seized.[10] The targets of the rabblings were Episcopalian clergymen and Catholics, who the Presbyterian dissenters

[9] Burnet, Gilbert. (ed.) in H.C. Foxcroft. *Supplement to Burnet's History of His Own Time*. (London, 1902), 305
[10] Harris, *Revolution,* 376.

considered responsible for enforcing anti-Presbyterian legislation. During the disturbances of 1688-9, 160 members of the Church of Scotland were forcibly removed from their manses.

By circulating accounts of these rabblings, Tory propagandists purposefully projected Whiggism and Protestant radicalism as intimately linked. In associating the Whig party with the radical and violent actions of the Presbyterian radicals, the Tories were offering an alternative middle path based on a moderate religious settlement, which avoided the complete dismantlement of the Scottish Episcopacy. In England and Scotland, such Jacobite writers began to use accounts of the rabblings as examples of the injustices exercised by the radical Whig Presbyterians of the Southwest. These descriptions acted as warnings to the Anglican ministers about the dangers Episcopalians faced under Presbyterian leadership. A published account of the forcible removal of Francis Fordyce, minister of Cumnock, from his home stated, "This they did not as statesmen, nor as churchmen, but by violence, and in a military way of reformation."[11] Published in London in 1690, John Sage wrote of the condition of the expelled ministers in *The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland*:

> As for them, I say, to be turned out of their Churches in so great numbers, may justly make strangers think these men guilty of hainous villanies and crimes, which have provoked the Government against them, and obliged it to turn them out of their Livings, and forbid them all exercise of their Ministry, to declare their Churches vacant, and to order themselves and families to remove from their dwelling-houses in the middle of winter.

[11] Gregory, Irwine, and Fordyce. "A Just and True Account how sadly the regular ministers within the presbytery of Ayr have been treated since Christmas last" in Alexander Peterkin (ed.) *The Constitution of the Church of Scotland, as Established at the Revolution.* (Edinburgh, 1841), 68-9.

Sage continued that the Presbyterian radicals threatened to the minister's pregnant wife, "They would cut off her Papish nose and rip up her Prelaticall belly." [12] Similarly, George Mackenzie, chief minister of King James from 1682-88, criticized the fanaticism of the Scottish Presbyterians. He recounted that the rabblers also inquired if the targeted minister was in possession of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. He wrote, "If [the ministers] have it, it is wrapped up in the ministers Gown, and both committed to the flames together, with loud shouts of Joy and Triumph."[13] In targeting the Anglican Book of Common Prayer when executing the rabblings, it is evident that these radical Whigs associated Anglicanism with the Scottish Episcopacy. Similarly, Tory propagandists understood that the current Episcopalian cause was linked with the future of the Anglican Church, as there was a risk that similar violence against the Episcopal High churchmen could also take place in England. The rabblings provided an opportunity for the High churchmen to openly express their distrust of the increasingly radical Presbyterian community, and by association, Whig party.

Notably, William responded to these concerns voiced by the Tory propagandists. Recognizing the growing dissatisfaction among the Episcopalian community, King William emphasized his ideological position as a political moderate, both in Scotland and England, in order to appeal to this disaffected group. His first task in shaping his public image was to discourage the increasingly violent radicalization of Presbyterians. King William attempted to dissuade the continuance of the violent ramblings through royal proclamation, "We do hereby expressly prohibit and discharge all disturbance and violence upon the account of religion, whether it be in the churches or in the public and private meetings of those of a

[12] Sage, John. *The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland*. (London, 1690).
[13] Mackenzie, George. *A Memorial for His Highness Prince of Orange*. (London, 1689), 20.

different persuasion, [As all should] enjoy their several pinions or forms of worship."[14] William released an additional proclamation on 6 August 1689, reaffirming that "such Ministers who gave Obedience should be Secure under the Protection of the Law."[15] Politically, William sought to align himself between both the Whig and Tory divide by advancing a moderate political persona, which became a key component of William's public image making in early 1689.

Despite attempts by William to encourage a more moderate approach to the church settlement, the violent and radical events of late December sparked fear that the new contender for the throne was not protecting Episcopalian interests. Consequently, when the Scottish Assembly was called in March of 1689, a majority of Episcopalian members of the Scottish Assembly were unwilling to return to Edinburgh to take their seats.[16] The significant reduction in the Episcopalian presence resulted in the Scottish Assembly developing an increasingly radical ideology based on furthering Presbyterian dominance. Out of fear, the Episcopalian voice was driven out of the primary means of political representation for the Scottish people. Ultimately, this enabled the Assembly, which had lost its moderate and royalist representatives, to advocate for a radical settlement of the royal succession in Scotland. In order to influence the decision of the Convention of the Estates, each claimant to the throne wrote to the Convention.

In his letter to the Convention, James utilized rhetoric involving a proto-nationalist Scottish identity to argue that the Scots had an obligation to defend the monarchy of England and Scotland. While William's letter reflected the moderate political affiliation he

---

[14] William III. *A Declaration by His Highness for the Keeping of the Peace*. (London, 1689).
[15] Scottish Privy Council. *A Proclamation Anent the Ministers* (Edinburgh, 1689).
[16] Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690's: Revolution, Religion, and War.* (Oxford, 1999).

was trying to project, James' letter provided a harsh condemnation of the Convention for meeting under 'the Usurped Authority of the Prince of Orange.' The displaced king compelled,

> So now again we require of you to support our royal interest, expecting from you what becomes loyal and faithful subjects, generous and honest men, that will neither suffer yourselves to be cajoled nor frighted into any action misbecoming true-hearted Scotch-men.[17]

In his official letter, James drew upon the rhetoric of Scottish identity and loyalty to the three kingdoms of which he still considered himself the rightful monarch. James demanded the men of the Scottish council to be courageous in rejecting the usurpation by William. James argued that only through doing so could these men be brave, true Scotsmen. Such rhetoric attempted to appeal to a developing Scottish identity, which recognized the Scots as a distinct but united entity within the three kingdoms.

In this appeal to Scottish national identity, there was an implicit claim that the Scottish people were obligated to assist their southern neighbours, representing a hierarchy of territorial importance within the three kingdoms, in which England stood on top. In order to defeat the political aspirations of the Dutch-born William of Orange, James insisted to the members of the Scottish Convention that an alliance between the Scottish and English would "enable you to defend yourselves from any foreign attempt, but put you in a condition to assert our right against our enemies, who have depressed the same by the blackest of usurpations."[18] Furthermore, James openly argued that there existed a legacy of protection and unity between the English monarchy and Scotland. He contended,

> You will likewise have the opportunity to secure to yourselves and your posterity, the gracious promises which we have so often made of securing

[17] James II. *Letter of King James VII to the Scottish Convention, March 1, 1689.* (1689).
[18] Ibid.

> your religion, laws, properties, and rights, which we are still resolved to perform as soon as it is possible for us to meet you safely in a Parliament of our Ancient Kingdom.[19]

In his letter, James maintained that the united monarchy of England and Scotland had long protected the rights and liberties of the people, and in exchange, the Scottish people were obligated to support King James in his claim to the throne. James was willing to recognize that the Scots had developed a unique national identity, which was allowed, to a certain degree, to develop its own political ideologies through a separate Parliamentary system.[20] However, James demanded that as a territory within the three kingdoms, Scotland was obliged, under their contract to the royal monarchy, to first support the needs of the English kingdom.

However, James' attempt at garnering support through his letter to the Convention failed. His demands for loyalty, with implicit undertones of Scottish inferiority, did not resonate well with the Scottish Convention. In describing the events for London audiences, the *London Gazette* determined that the letter 'served to make the Convention more unanimous for the settling of the Government' on William.[21] Consequently, the Convention voted in favor of the Dutch prince.

As the Revolution in Scotland took on an increasingly Whiggish hue, Tory propagandists argued that the Presbyterian majority of the Scottish Convention meant that the Episcopal establishment was in immediate danger of being dismantled and replaced with a Presbyterian order. Such propaganda generated substantial resistance to this growing radicalization, primarily led by the clergy of the Scottish Church, the majority of

---

[19] Ibid.
[20] Parliaments were still summoned under royal decree, thus denying the institution full autonomy.
[21] Quoted in Harris, *Revolution*, 389.

whom were Tories. The earlier rabblings had already signified a profound and widespread dissatisfaction against the High Church settlement of the Restoration period, and Tory propagandists argued that the radical Presbyterians were not looking to protect the liberties of the people of Scotland by advancing Presbyterianism. Instead, they were more focused on destroying episcopacy. John Sage contended that those responsible for the turning out of ministers were more content to "destroy the Clergy and the whole Episcopal Order, then to settle the Kingdom upon its just and Ancient basis, or to preserve our Religion, Liberties, and Properties."[22] In April 1689, the Convention confirmed these fears by releasing its new Claim of Right, which openly declared prelacy to be "a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this Nation and contrary to the Inclinationes of the generality of the people… and therfor ought to be abolished."[23]

Tory propagandists were also divided on their trust in William to reach a moderate settlement. In an appeal to William before his ascension to the throne, George Mackenzie urged the Prince of Orange to not sacrifice the established church for his political goals. Mackenzie wrote, "Episcopacy is necessary for the support of the monarchy."[24] Such propagandists sought to garner support for a moderate Church settlement rather than one that favored the Presbytery. However, critics of William distrusted that he would protect the interests of the clergy. John Sage argued, "King William loves Episcopacy as ill in England, as in Scotland, and would be content to have it away."[25] Consequently, many Tories were driven to support James in his claim for the throne.

---

[22] Sage, John. *The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland.* (London, 1690).
[23] Scottish Convention. *Claim of Right Act of 1689*.
[24] Mackenzie, George. *Memoirs of the Affairs of Scotland from the Restoration of Charles II.* (ed.) Thomas Thompson. (Edinburgh, 1821), 6.
[25] Sage, John. *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland* (London, 1690).

After the Scottish Convention voted to dismantle episcopacy, English propagandists cast the religious settlement in a radical light in order to warn their fellow Englishmen about a possible threat to their national Church if similar ideologies moved south. Despite Tory appeals to William to protect the Episcopacy, the Parliament of Scotland voted to abolish prelacy on 22 July 1689. Earlier in May of that year, the English Parliament had passed the Toleration Act, granting freedom of worship to dissenters, making the additional threat of the complete dismantlement of the Episcopacy in England seem a likely concern. Writing from London, Charles Leslie warned his fellow Englishmen, "Let us remember that the covenant (now rampant in Scotland) obliges them to cry on the work of that reformation in England as well as in Scotland."[26] Similarly, Burnet observed that the events in Scotland substantially influenced opinions of members of the Anglican Church. Burnet wrote that the recent occurrences in Scotland "gave a new quickning to the hatred that was generally borne to the Dissenters here, for it was in every mouth, that it was both unreasonable and unsafe for us to shew any favour to a party that acted so severely against all those of our persuasion when they had power."[27] Another English propagandist wrote, "The cruel treatment which their Brethern in Scotland received from that Dissenting Party may justly alarm the English clergy to expect the same usage from the Presbyterians here."[28] English Tory propagandists were actively using the settlement of the Scottish Church to warn their fellow Englishmen against compromising with nonconformists, who may threaten their own Church of England. By the end of the Revolution, the two kingdoms of England and Scotland emerged with drastically different religious settlements. While the

---

[26] Leslie, Charles. *Querala Temporum,* 3.

[27] Burnet, *History of His Own Time.*

[28] Strachan, William. *Some remarks upon a late pamphlet, entituled, An answer to the Scots Presbyterian eloquence wherein the innocency of the Episcopal clergy is vindicated.* (London, 1694), 48.

Anglican Church maintained its identity as the established Church despite facing the Toleration Act of 1689, the Episcopacy was completely dismantled in Scotland.

Whig Propaganda and the Push for a Presbyterian Settlement

While King James held widespread support upon his ascension, his Catholic faith came under immediate scrunity of the Whig party. In response to James' support for the Catholic minority, anti-Catholic propaganda began to proliferate across Scotland and England. In a sermon orated in Edinburgh and later published in London, the Williamite Episcopal minister James Canaries described the Catholic Church, "A Church that has perverted the most noble design in the worst purposes, that has daub'd the most beautifull Religion with the most ugly and preternatural inventions."[29] He also criticized mass as the 'most bombast pieces of Pageantry the world ever saw.' Yet, James Canaries was not the only individual to criticize the growing influence of Catholicism, and the Scottish government under King James made an attempt to limit anti-Popish publications in Scotland in early 1686. Fountainhall describes, "The printers and stationers were by the privy council's order… discharged either to print or sell any books reflecting on Popery… But it was thought obvious that this was meant against Protestant books of controversy, because they stirred by the minds of the people against the king's religion."[30]

In 1687, the passing of the Scottish Declaration of Indulgence sparked a new wave of pamphlets and sermons expressing distrust toward the monarch and his Gallican

---

[29] Canaries, James. *Rome's additions to Christianity shewn to be inconsistent with the true design of so spiritual a religion In a sermon preached at Edinburgh, in the East church of St. Giles. Feb. 14. 1686* (London, 1686), 12. Unlike many of his Episcopalian brethren, Canaries was willing to abandon his legal obligation to King James and warmly welcome William as the new monarch of England. Canaries was later appointed William's chaplain.

[30] (ed.) Thomas Howell et. al. *A Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings* (London, 1816), 1169.

sympathies. The Scottish Episcopalians considered the Declaration of Indulgence to directly challenge the prominence of the established church and Scottish law by offering religious tolerance to Presbyterians and Catholics alike. The Anglicans of England were similarly aware of the consequences of such toleration, for it was likely that the King would implement similar policies in England. Even Princess Anne noted the likelihood that James would pass an English declaration of tolerance. The Princess wrote, "What has been done there, has been but a fore-runner of what in a short time has been done here."[31]

Whig propagandists were also concerned about the King's novel and stern affirmation of his right to use royal prerogative to implement this increased toleration. While the Scottish Declaration of Indulgence opened by claiming to be protecting the kingdom against the 'ruin and decay of trade,' opponents were concerned about the absolutist language of the king's announcement. The Declaration read, "[The monarchy] Therefore thought fit to grant, and by our sovereign authority, prerogative royal, and absolute power, which all our subjects are to obey without reserve, do hereby give and grant our royal toleration."[32] Whig propagandists immediately questioned the king's intent in using the term 'absolute power.' Gilbert Burnet wrote, "The true meaning of this seems to be, that there is an *Inherent Power* in the *King*, which can neither be restrained by *Lawes, Promises* nor *Oaths*; for nothing less than the being *free* from all theses, renders a *Power Absolute.*" He continued, "It asserts a *Power* to be in the *King,* to command what he will, and an Obligation in the *Subjects*, to *obey* whatsoever he shall *command*."[33] In a response to the Earl of Melfort's letter, a Whig pamphleteer criticized, "All former *Secretaries* used the

---

[31] Quoted from Harris, *Revolution*, 145.

[32] King James. *Scottish Declaration of Toleration,* 12 February 1687.

[33] Burnet, Gilbert. *Some reflections on His Majesty's proclamation of the 12th of February 1686/7 for a toleration in Scotland, together with the said proclamation.* (London, 1687), 1.

modest Words of proposing or recommending; but he… told us of his *Majesty's Absolute power, to which all the Subjects are to obey without reserve."*[34] This criticism of the king's inappropriate use of royal prerogative became a rallying point around which both English and Scottish Whigs developed a political identity.

As the Whigs increasingly associated James and the Tory party with 'absolute power,' their propagandists added fervor to their cause by associating James' leadership with French-style tyranny. Their goal was to warn their fellow Englishmen that James was likely to execute similar displays of Gallic absolutism in the southern kingdom as well. In response to the Scottish Declaration of Indulgence, Gilbert Burnet wrote from London, "It is probably this qualification of the duty of *Subjects* was put in here, to prepare us for a terrible *le Roy le veut."*[35] Following a letter published by the Earl of Melfort in favour of the new act of toleration, an anonymous pamphleteer satirically urged that the Earl's letter be translated into French, in order to determine, "Whether the *Secretary Stile* will look better in his *Irish French*, than it does now in the *Scottish English*."[36]

Consequently, Whig propagandists contended that the Declaration of Indulgence appeared to be a product of James' belief in Gallican absolutism. In particular, these opponents of James warned that the monarch's actions in Scotland were beginning to resemble the fanatical persecutions ordered by Louis in France. Whig propagandists were concerned that James' admiration of the French state under Louis XIV would mean that the English monarch would try to institute a similar religious uniformity domestically. Robert Ferguson argued that the king's Proclamation for Toleration was for 'arbitrary and popish

---

[34] Anonymous. *The Earle of Melfort's letter to the Presbyterian-ministers in Scotland writ in His Majesty's name upon their address together with some remarks upon it*. (Edinburgh, 1687), 3.
[35] Gilbert, 1.
[36] Anonymous. *Earle of Melfort's Letter to the Presbyterian-Ministers in Scotland,* 4.

ends.'[37] This new declaration of royal prerogative was also criticized for providing a means for the king to institute religious intolerance in the future if he so chose. Burnet explicitly argued of the Declaration, "This looks so like a Fetch of the *French Prerogative Law,* both in their processes with Relation to the *Edict of Nantes*… that this seems to be a Copy from that famous Original."[38] Other Whig propagandists argued that King Louis was merely using James as a puppet in satisfying French demands. A balladeer wrote,

> When I was in France proud Lewis did own
> He then wanted nothing but Englands Crown,
> Scotland he would have, and Ireland was his own.[39]

Among such propagandists, Scotland was marketed as the French king's next target for conquest. Therefore, it was of the utmost importance to protect Scotland from developing a sizeable Catholic population, who might support a French invasion.

Williamite propagandists made particular use of anti-Catholic public performances in order to garner distrust of King James' faith. Throughout Scotland, Whigs publically condemned the pro-Catholic policies of James through elaborate spectacles, many of which included the burning of effigies of the pope. While executed in Scotland, accounts of the burnings reached a wider audience by being published in London. Such pope burnings represented a common desire to eliminate the Catholic threat, and their public nature attracted bystanders to partake in the cause. In an account published in London, an observer described how the students of Edinburgh University set fire to the Pope's effigy in

---

[37] Ferguson, Robert. *A Representation of the Threatening Dangers Impending over Protestants in Great Britain.* (Edinburgh, 1687).
[38] Gilbert, 2.
[39] Anonymous. A Dialogue Between the Late King James, The Duke of Berwick, and Tyrconnel. (London, 1690).

late November of 1688, "It was done about Ten Days ago, after day-light gone, at the Cross, and blow up with art, that seems to have been beyond their invention, above Four Stories high."[40] Throughout the city, students chanted, "No Pope, No Papist, No Popish Chancellor, No Melfort, No Father Petres." On Christmas Day, another burning of the pope's effigy along the Royal Mile attracted an estimated 16,000 individuals. A spectator describes, "Our Privy Chancellors and Magistrates were Spectators, and no inconveniences followed."[41]

Pope burnings provided an opportunity to raise fears about the violence and disorder that would likely ensue under the leadership of a Catholic ruler. Similar burnings took place in Aberdeen and Glasgow, both featuring effigy burnings for the Archbishops of Aberdeen and Glasgow, respectively. In a published account of the procession at Aberdeen, the fictitious Pope emphasized the brutality of the Catholics in defense of their religion. The pope stated,

> 'Gainst Hereticks our Swords we'll quickly draw,
> And will perform this Your so Sacred Law:
> Hundreds of Thousands we will make to share
> On common Doom nor Sex nor Age we'll spare
> No kneeling beauties tears, no Virgins Cryes,
> No Infants smiles, none spar'd with us all dyes.

Following the Pope's speech, the devil appeared beyond the Pope, to which the audience cried,

> Now *Babylon* falls, come, come let us pull down
> That Scarlet Whore, and break the Triple Crown:
> We'll Countermine her Plots, we will Combine

---

[40] Anonymous. *Five letters from a gentleman in Scotland to his friend in London being a true account of what remarkable passages have happened since the Prince's landing, the manner of the taking of the Chancellor, and his lady in mans apparel, the burning of the Pope, demolishing of the popish chapels, &c. with the total overthrow of the Roman Catholicks*. (Ediburgh, 1688), 1.
[41] Ibid.

And ever pray fo' Religion and our King.[42]

Consequently, such pope burnings were opportunities to spread anti-French Catholic rhetoric and propaganda, while engaging the crowd in the symbolic fight against Catholicism. By condemning Catholicism, Whig propagandists were creating a demand for new political leadership besides James.

By inciting anti-Catholic sentiments, Williamite propagandists attempted to garner support for their new leader, William of Orange. Throughout the publications in both Scotland and England, Whig propagandists were increasingly associating James' push for toleration for Catholics in Scotland with the possibility of Gallic absolutism. In opposition, William represented their Saviour from Popery. From London, a pamphleteer described the sentiments among the Scottish Presbyterian Whigs upon hearing the arrival of William of Orange. Having declared their support for Protestantism and the Prince of Orange, "They lastly resolved on this Opportunity of rooting both popery and Papists out of the city and kingdom."[43] On 10 January 1689, the Scottish Convention thanked William for protecting Protestantism and the rights of the people within Scotland. The Convention declared to William, "[We] do give Your Highness our humble and hearty thanks for your pious and generous undertaking, for preserving of the Protestant Religion, and restoring the laws and liberties of these kingdoms."[44]

---

[42] Reid, Robert. *The Account of the Pope's Procession at Aberdeen.* (1689), 4-5.

[43] L.L., *Scotland against popery being a particular account of the late revolutions in Edenborough, and other parts of that kingdom, the defacing popish chappels, and palace of Holy-Rood-House; the levelling to the ground of the chancellor's chappel and house, &c. and all other popish chapels*. (London, 1688).

[44] Scottish Convention. *Letter of the Scottish Convention to the Prince of Orange, January 10, 1689.* (1689)

In an attempt to appeal to High Episcopal Churchmen and moderate Presbyterians, William constructed an official public image based upon his moderate political ideology. Like James, the Prince of Orange wrote to the Scottish Convention in March of 1689 in support of his claim to the throne. Arguing that he arrived in the Three Kingdoms to "ensure the preservation of religion and liberty which were in such eminent danger," William thanked the Scottish Convention for enabling him to call a meeting of the Estates to secure these liberties.[45] In particular, William sought to achieve a moderate Church settlement, which he believed would be best guaranteed through unifying the Scottish and English kingdoms. In his letter to the Convention, William argued that the idea was popular in London:

> We were glad to find that so many of the nobility and gentry, when here at London, were so much inclined to an union of both kingdoms, and that they did look upon it as one of the best means for procuring the happiness of these nations, and settling of a lasting peace amongst them, which would be advantageous to both.[46]

William argued that the people of England and Scotland shared the same isle, language, and religious principles. Yet, his concern for religion lay behind these arguments. The Prince of Orange contended that the religious sympathies of the ex-king were threatening the well being of the two kingdoms, and unification was the best means for combating the popish threat. He wrote, "The enemies of both [kingdoms] are so restless, endeavouring to make and increase jealousies and divisions, which they will be ready to improve to their own advantage and the ruin of Britain."[47] For the Prince of Orange and his supporters, Scotland and England had to remain united in defense of the 'reformed religion.' Ultimately,

---

[45] William III. *Letter of the Prince of Orange to the Scottish Convention, March 16, 1689*. (London, 1689).
[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.

William's letter, which made no direct demands of the Scottish Convention, unlike the epistle sent by James, helped ensure that William was chosen as the worthy successor to the throne.

King William, however, underestimated the radical Whig ideology of his supporters within the Scottish Convention. Since the violent rabblings of the late 1688, the majority of the Episcopalian members of the Scottish Convention declined to take their seats in the following year. Consequently, the Convention grew increasingly radical in their attempts to dismantle the Church of Scotland. While William attempted to persuade the Convention to unite with England, the Presbyterian majority refused to risk subjugation of their interests to the English Parliament and Anglican Church, which remained the dominant political and religious institutions of England. Additionally, the Scottish Convention made it clear that they were not afraid to place limits on royal prerogative. The Scottish Convention was primarily made up of individuals with Whig sentiments, and they were willing to push for establishing a constitutional monarchy. In comparison, English Whigs were significantly less willing to place limitations on monarchical power out of concern that such constraints would lead the Prince of Orange to court individuals with High Church sympathies instead.[48]

In order to justify their aims of limiting the control of the monarchy, the Scottish Convention published a condemnation of James for his Catholic faith. On 11 April 1689, the Convention accused, "James…being a professed Catholic… acted as King without ever taking the oath required by law, whereby the King, at his access to the government is obliged to

[48] Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690's* (Oxford, 1999), 210.

swear, to maintain the Protestant religion."[49] The declaration of the Scottish Convention stressed that James' Catholic faith was intimately linked with the exercise of arbitrary power. The Declaration created a list of grievances, primarily that the deposed king "asserted an absolute power, to cass, annul, and disable all the laws, particularly arraigning the laws establishing the Protestant religion."[50] The Convention argued that James unlawfully ascended the throne by refusing to recite the necessary oath, but he also perverted the use and extent of royal prerogative. In creating an exhaustive list of the grievances experienced under the past king, the Scottish Convention was able to justify limiting the royal prerogative of William through the Claim of Right and Articles of Grievances.

The Convention of Estates was particularly important for the Whig party in establishing their ideal Church settlement. In order to secure the prominence of Presbyterianism within Scotland, the Convention of Estates first began attacking Catholics as enemies of the state. On 20 March, the Convention publicly proclaimed Catholics to be threats to the peace of Scotland. The Proclamation read,

> The meeting of Estates of this Kingdom -- considering the danger and hazard the religion, peace, and quiet of the Kingdom is in, by the growth and increase of popery and papists of late, occasioned by the employing them in places of greatest trust within the Kingdom, and continuing them in places and offices, civil and military.[51]

Under the leadership of James, it was argued that Catholics had been illegally placed in important administrative and military positions rather than qualified Protestants. This attempt by James to aggressively catholicize the Scottish Kingdom was presented as a

---

[49] *Declaration of the Scottish Convention, April 11, 1689*. (1689).
[50] *Ibid.*
[51] *Scottish Convention's Proclamation against Papists, March 20, 1689*. (1689).

direct threat to the Whig conception of Scottish identity, which was based on an adherence to Protestantism.

The Episcopal Church was the next target of Williamite propaganda in Scotland. The Scottish Convention made it clear that they were enemies of the Church of Scotland. The Scottish Convention declared,

> That prelacy and the superiority of any office in the church above presbyters is, and hath been, a great and insupportable grievance and trouble to this nation, and contrary to the inclinations of the generality of the people ever since the Reformation (they having reformed from popery by presbyters), and therefore ought to be abolished.[52]

In this manner, the Whigs of the Convention were drawing upon rhetoric of a Scottish proto-national identity in arguing that the Scottish were a Presbyterian people. The Proclamation inferred that the Scottish had advanced from the prejudices of Catholicism to Protestantism during the Reformation, and the rise of the Episcopal Church was a digression back to the teachings of the Catholic Church. Consequently, the Whigs of Scotland were attempting to construct a Scottish identity predicated upon radical Presbyterianism. In Scotland, the Church settlement took on a more staunchly Whiggish tone than in England, as the Scottish Presbyterians sought a complete disestablishment of the Episcopal Church. In contrast, the Whigs of England were less radical in their demands, advocating for increased Presbyterian toleration rather than directly attacking the Church of England.

William, however, recognized that the actions of the Presbyterians represented a substantial threat to his support among the Tories and moderate Whigs, particularly in England, and he compelled the Scottish Convention to protect the Scottish bishops.

---

[52] Scottish Convention. *Declaration of the Scottish Convention, April 11, 1689.* (1689).

Following the declarations of the Scottish Convention, the rabblings continued. At the end of 1689, only 400 Episcopalians remained in their posts.[53] In order to shield them, William urged that the Scottish Presbyterians act with moderation, not using overt violence in their attempts to advance their ideal religious settlement. To the Scottish Assembly in October of 1690, William urged,

> We never could be of the mind that violence was suited to the advancing of true religion, nor do we intend that our authority shall ever be a tool to the irregular passions of any party. Moderation is what religion enjoins, neighbouring churches expect from you and we recommend to you.

While this declaration from King William helped tame the frequency of the purges of Scottish clergymen from their manses, members of the High Church remained alienated by the King's previous policies.

Conclusion

English propagandists found the events in Scotland from 1685-90 to be useful in helping advance their political agendas in England. Both Tory and Whig propagandists ensured that the English people were kept aware of the religious and political situation unfolding in Scotland by overseeing the publishing of relevant pamphlets, sermons, ballads, and accounts of public demonstrations in London. For propagandists of both sides, Scotland was used as a warning of what may befall the English kingdom in the near future, as the Church of England was precariously perched to experience the same fate of disestablishment as the Church of Scotland.

Among the English Tories, the Scottish Presbyterians were vilified as radicals, responsible for dismantling the dominancy of the Church of England. While a Declaration of Toleration was passed in England in 1689, it lacked the religious and political backlash

[53] Rose, 212.

from Presbyterian radicals as happened in Scotland. By emphasizing the radicalism of the revolution in Scotland, Tory propagandists helped ensure that the revolution in England remained more moderate over the question of religion. Consequently, while the Church of Scotland no longer remained the official national church by the end of 1689, the Anglican Church was able to largely maintain its dominant position within English society.

Whig propagandists also led successful campaigns in that they were able to advance support for their preferred leader, William. Whig writers emphasized James' attempts to normalize Catholicism in the Northern Kingdom, thus alienating readers from the monarch. Additionally, such Whig propagandists warned that James was willing to use strong displays of royal authority, not different from that exercised by Louis XIV in France. As a result, when King William landed in England in late 1688, he received ample support from both Scots and Englishmen alike.

As English propagandists witnessed and retold the battle over the religious settlement in Scotland, they were forced to carefully consider the role of religion within English society. For Tory and Whig writers, the events of Scotland were not peripheral and foreign but relevant examples of England's possible development in the near future. The Revolution of 1688-9 marked a turning point in the relationship between Church and state in the kingdoms of England and Scotland, and Tory and Whig propagandists worked to define England's future by promoting their ideal for the religious settlement.

Conclusion

During the revolutionary years of 1688-9, there was a prolific production of political propaganda that primarily focused on influencing the monarchical settlement between the sitting monarch, King James II, and the foreign contender, Prince William of Orange. This propaganda was being produced during a time in which England was rapidly expanding politically. Less than a decade earlier, England had witnessed the emergence of the world's first political parties, the Whigs and Tories. The development of the political party meant there was an increased need for distinct political groups to differentiate their platforms of concerns and issues, and propaganda was an influential way of projecting these differences while reaching a wide segment of the population. Consequently, Williamites and Jacobites both developed extensive propaganda campaigns as part of their mission to gain support for their ideal contender for the English throne.

Crucially, the Williamite and Jacobite propagandists were preoccupied with understanding and engaging with contemporary international events. Throughout their writings, propagandists from both parties repeatedly looked outside of England, to places such as the United Provinces or Scotland. These foreign states acted as benchmarks against which the propagandists could compare and contrast their political ideologies.

The Revolution of 1688-9 represented an important crossroads for the future development of Britain. Throughout the 1680's, the people of the British Isles were divided on where to look for a model to follow in England's future. By studying their propaganda of this period, it is evident that Williamite and Jacobite ideology dramatically diverged on this account. Jacobite propagandists urged that England parallel France, where Louis XIV was seeking to establish a centralized and bureaucratic absolutist state and militarily enforce

religious uniformity. In contrast, the Williamites idealized the United Provinces as a religiously pluralistic and tolerant society that valued wide political participation. As the propaganda through the 1680's shows, England was largely divided on this issue for most of the period. However, the Revolution of 1688-9 was a critical moment in which popular support shifted away from a Franco-centric model of political and religious governance towards a Dutch model.

Studying the propaganda at the heart of this shift sheds light on the emergence of an English proto-nationalism. Within their focus on international propaganda, Williamites and Jacobites alike defined their hopes for the development of England by comparing and contrasting the state with the other kingdoms of Europe. Throughout the four chapters of this thesis, there was a consistent effort to define one's political ideology by what it was *not*. English Williamites, for example, knew they were not like the violent and barbarous Catholics in Ireland. Their Jacobite counterparts distinguished themselves from Dutch trading greed and radical religious tolerance. From understanding what it was not, English propagandists of the Revolutionary period began to comprehend what they believed should comprise an English national identity. As Peter Sahlins writes of national identity, "It is defined by the social or territorial boundaries drawn to distinguish the collective self and its implicit negation, the other."[1]

However, English Williamites and Jacobites held deeply divergent views on what this English national identity should look like based on their separate views on whether to adopt a French or Dutch model of political and religious governance. These internal differences would, until several years after the Revolution, block the development of a

---

[1] Sahlins, Peter. *Boundaries: The Making of France and Spain in the Pyrennes* (Berkley, 1989), 271. Quoted in Linda Colley. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. (New Haven, 1992), 6.

unified common identity that could be determined as 'Englishness.' Yet, as popular support turned in favour of a Dutch model of modernity, the Revolution marked a key turning point toward the formation of a collective English identity.

Bibliography

Anonymous. *An Account of a late, horrid and bloody massacre in Ireland of several thousands of Protestants, procur'd and carry'd on by the by the L[ord Deputy] Tyrconnel and his adherents which occasioned the English ... to seize and secure the said Tyrconnel in the Castle of Dublin, in order to be sent for England.* (Dublin?, 1689).

------. *Animadversions Upon the Declaration of His Highness Prince of Orange*. (London, 1688).

------.*The ballance adjusted: or, the interest of church and state weighed and considered upon this revolution*. (1688).

------. *THE Boast of Great Britain; OR, A SONG in praise of MARY present Queen of England, Scotland, France and Ireland*. (London, 1689).

------. *THE Devonshire Boys Courage AND Loyalty to Their Majesties King WILLIAM and Queen MARY; in defending their Country from the Invasion of the French.* (1692).

------. *A Dialogue Between the Late King James The Duke of Berwick, and Tyrconnel; A while after the Fight, that happen'd about Nine Miles from Dublin: Together with their full Resolution to quit Ireland, and to take Shipping and so Sail to France, to tell Proud Lewis their great Misfortune.* (London, 1690).

------. *DUBLIN'S Deliverance: OR, The Surrender of DROGHEDA. Shewing, King William's Conquest over his Catholick Enemies in his Warlike Progress in IRELAND.* (1690).

------. *The Dutch design anatomized, or, A discovery of the wickedness and unjustice of the intended invasion and a clear proof that it is the interest of all the King's subjects to defend His Majesty and their country against it written by a true member of the Church of England, and lover of his country, for the satisfaction of a person of quality*. (London, 1688).

------. *The Earle of Melfort's letter to the Presbyterian-ministers in Scotland writ in His Majesty's name upon their address together with some remarks upon it*. (Edinburgh, 1687).

------. *Englands crisis, or, The World well mended.* (London, 1689?).

------. *Five letters from a gentleman in Scotland to his friend in London being a true account of what remarkable passages have happened since the Prince's landing, the manner of the taking of the Chancellor, and his lady in mans apparel, the burning of the Pope, demolishing of the popish chapels, &c. with the total overthrow of the Roman Catholicks*. (Edinburgh, 1688).

------. A Full Description of these Times; Or The Prince of ORANGE's March from EXETER to LONDON. (1689).

------. *The Glorious Victory; OR, The Triumphant Conquest Obtained o'er the French Fleet, by the brave Heroick English and Dutch Navy's; to the Joy and Comfort of all Loyal Subjects.* (London, 1692).

------. *THE Irish Rebels Routed: OR, A brief Relation of the Victorious Conquest by the Protestants over the French & Irish at CAVAN: To the great Encouragement of the Protestant Party, as it was sent in a Letter from a Soldier in Ireland to his Love in London.* (1690).

------. *A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland.* (ed.) John Gilbert. (London, 1692).

------. *LONDONS TRIUMPH: OR, The Magnificent Glory at the head of Cheapside, on the Kings Birth-Day, and the Fifth of November…* (London, 1692).

------. *A letter from the King of Great Britain to the Earl of Portland* (London, 1691).

------. *A Modest Apology for the loyal Protestant Subjects of King James, who desire his Restoration, without Prejudice to our Religion, Laws or Liberties*. (London, 1692).

------. *THE Nations Joy for a War With MONSIEUR, OR, ENGLAND's Resolution to pluck down France.* (London, 1690).

------. *A NEW SONG Made in the Praise of the West of England.* (1690).

------. *The Political Anatomy of Ireland* (Ireland, 1691).

------. The PROCLAMATION For a General FAST in the Nation. (1690).

------. *The PROTESTANTS Great Misery in IRELAND, Relating the Inhumane Cruelties that are daily committed there by the French and Irish Papists.* (London, 1689).

------. *The Protestant's Jubile: OR, A Farewel to Popery. Being an Excellent Cordial to Chear a Protestant's Heart: Made of the Juice of an Orange.* (1689).

------. *The Protestants Prayer: BEING Their hearty Wishes for the Prosperity of Their Majesties Fleet at Sea, and likewise Their Land-Forces, that our Foes may be put to Flighs, and these Three Kingdoms flourish again in Peace.* (London, 1690).

------. *The PROTESTANTS TRIUMPH: OR, King WILLIAM Proclaim'd, to the Subjects Joy and Gladness.* (1689)

------. *A Sermon Preached upon The Fast-Day, June the 18th, 1690. By the Presbyter of the Church of England, that Swore in the Sincerity of his Heart, with a full satisfied Conscience, to King William and Queen Mary.* (1690).

------. The Souldiers Prayers for King VVILLIAMS Good Success in Ireland Over His Enemies. (London, 1689).

------. *To the most illustrious and serene prince, his royal Highness….* (London, 1688)

------. *The Triumph of IRELAND: OR, The Surrender of Limbrick To Their MAJESTIES FORCES under the Command of the Duke Of Wirtemburg, and Lieutenant General Scravenmore, on Sunday the 27th. of September 1693. to the unspeakable joy of the Protestant Army.* (?, 1693).

------. *THE Troubles of this World; OR, Nothing Cheap but Poor Mens Labour. Concluding with a Line of Comfortable Consolation, to Chear up our Drooping Hearts, in a time of Trouble.* (1696?)

------. *The Warlike Monarch. OR, King William's Princely Courage, and Resolution, for Reducing the Kingdom of Ireland in his own Person by his Care and Conduct.*

Barnes, Robert Paul. 'Scotland and the Glorious Revolution of 1688.' *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* , Vol. 3, No. 3 (Autumn, 1971).

Barton, Samuel. *A Sermon Preached at St Mary le Bow before the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor and the Court of Alderman on Wednesday the 16th of July, beinging the Fast Day* (1690).

Baxter, Stephen B. *William III* (London, 1966).

Black, Jeremy. *A System of Ambition? British Foreign Policy 1660-1793.* (London, 1991).

Burke, Peter. *Fabrications of Louis XIV.* (London, 1992).

Bossuet, Jacques Bénigne. *An exposition of the doctrine of the Catholic Church in matters of controversie by James Bénigne Bossuet ; done into English with all the former approbations, and others newly published in the ninth and last edition of the French.* (London, 1686).

Bramston, John. *Autobiography of Sir John Bramston, K.B. if Skreens, in the Hundred of Chelmsford*. (ed.) Lord Braybrook (1835).

Caesar, Charles. *Numerus infaustus a short view of the unfortunate reigns of William the Second, Henry the Second, Edward the Second, Richard the Second, Charles the Second, James the Second.* (London, 1689).

Canaries, James. *Rome's additions to Christianity shewn to be inconsistent with the true design of so spiritual a religion In a sermon preached at Edinburgh, in the East church of St. Giles. Feb. 14. 1686* (London, 1686).

Claydon, Tony. *William III and the Godly Revolution.* (New York, 1996).

Claydon, Tony and Ian McBridge. *Protestantism and National Identity: Britain and Ireland, c. 1650-1850.* (New York, 1998).

Colley, Linda. *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. (New Haven, 1992).

Collier, Jeremy. *The Desertion Discuss'd* (London, 1689).

Comber, Thomas. *Three considerations proposed to Mr. William Pen concerning the validity and security of his new magna charta for liberty of conscience by a Baptist ; which may be worthy the consideration of all the Quakers and of all my dissenting brethren also that have votes in the choice of Parliament-men.* (London, 1688).

Defoe, Daniel. *The advantages of the present settlement, and the great danger of a relapse*. (London, 1689).

Donaldson, Gordon. *Scotland: James V to James VII*. (Edinburgh, 1965).

Ferguson, Robert. "Reflections on the Foregoing Letter." In John Somers *A Collection of Scarce and Valuable Tracts.* (London, 1750).

------. *A Representation of the Threatening Dangers Impending over Protestants in Great Britain.* (Edinburgh, 1687).

Foster, R.F. *Modern Ireland, 1600-1972*. (London, 1988).

French, Nicholas. *A narrative of the settlement and sale of Ireland whereby the just English adventurer is much prejudiced, the antient proprietor destroyed, and publick faith violated : to the great discredit of the English church, and government, (if not re-called and made void) as being against the principles of Christianity, and true Protestancy written in a letter by a gentleman in the country to a noble-man at court* (London, 1668), 1.

Gilbert, Burnet. *A Letter Concerning Some Reflections on His Majesty's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience Dated the Fourth of April 1687.* (London, 1687).

Godden, Thomas. *A letter in answer to two main questions of the first letter to a dissenter I. Whether Protestant dissenters ought to refuse the proposed legal toleration, including Catholic dissenters, II. Whether Protestant dissenters ought to expect the said toleration, until the next succession, upon the suggested hopes of excluding Catholicks.* (London, 1687).

Goldie, Mark. "Political Thought of the Anglican Revolution," *The Revolutions of 1688*. (Oxford, 1991).

Gramscombe, Samuel. *New Court-Contrivances, or, More Sham-Plots still, against true-hearted Englishmen* (London, 1693).

Gregory, Irwine, and Fordyce. "A Just and True Account how sadly the regular ministers within the presbytery of Ayr have been treated since Christmas last" in Alexander Peterkin (ed.) *The Constitution of the Church of Scotland, as Established at the Revolution.* (Edinburgh, 1841).

Grey, Ralph. 'Coronation Ballad.' *Poems on the Affairs of State*. (ed.) George deForest Lord et. al. Vol V. (New Haven, (1963-75).

Hampden, John. *Some short Considerations Concerning the State of the Nation*. (London, 1692).

------. *Some Considerations on the Most Proper Way of Raising Money* (London, 1691).

Harris, Tim. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration to the Exclusion Crisis.* (New York, 1990).

------. *Revolution. The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720.* (London, 2007).

Hayton, D.W. "The Williamite Revolution in Ireland, 1688-91." In Israel. *Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact* (New York, 2003).

Israel, Jonathan. *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact.* (London, 2003).

James II. *Declaration of King James II, June 30, 1688*. (London, 1688).

------. *Declaration of King James II, April 20, 1692.* (1692).

------. *Letter of King James VII to the Scottish Convention, March 1, 1689.* (1689).

------. *Proclamation of King James II, September 28, 1688*. (London, 1688).

------. *Proclamation of King James, November 6, 1688.* (London, 1688).

------. *King James II' Speech from the Throne, May 7, 1689.* (1689).

Johnston, Nathaniel. *The dear bargain. Or, A true representation of the state of the English nation under the Dutch* (London, 1689).

Jones, J.R. *The Revolution of 1688 in England*. (New York: 1972).

------. "The Revolution in Context." In Jones' *Liberty Secured? Britain Before and After 1688*. (New York, 1992).

King, William. *Europe's deliverance from France and slavery a sermon, preached at St. Patrick's Church, Dublin, on the 16th of November 1690 : being the day of thanksgiving for the preservation of His Majesties person, his good success in our deliverance, and his safe and happy return into England*. (London, 1691).

Klaits, Joseph. *Printed Propaganda Under Louis XIV: Absolute Monarchy and Public Opinion.* (Princeton, 1976).

Leslie, Charles. *An answer to a book, intituled, The state of the Protestants in Ireland under the late King James government in which, their carriage towards him is justified, and the absolute necessity of their endeavouring to be free'd from his government, and of submitting to their present Majesties, is demonstrated*. (London, 1692).

------. *Delenda Carthago, or, The true interest of England in relation to France and Holland* (London, 1695).

------. *Querala Temporum; or the Danger of the Church of England.* (1694).

L.L., *Scotland against popery being a particular account of the late revolutions in Edenborough, and other parts of that kingdom, the defacing popish chappels, and palace of Holy-Rood-House; the levelling to the ground of the chancellor's chappel and house, &c. and all other popish chapels*. (London, 1688).

Louis XIV. *The French King's edict upon the declaration made by the clergy of France, of their opinion concerning the ecclesiastical power wherein is set forth, that the King is independent in things temporal, that general councils are above the Pope, that the Popes power is to be limited by the antient canons, that the Popes decisions are not infallible without the consent of the Church : together with the said declaration of the clergy as they were registered in the Parliament of Paris, the 23 of March 1682.* (London, 1682).

Mackenzie, George. *A Memorial for His Highness Prince of Orange*. (London, 1689).

Maimbourg, Louis. *A discourse concerning the foundation and prerogative of the Church of Rome wherein are handled many important queries concerning the infallibility and power of the Pope, the nature and authority of general councils, &c. By a late writer of the Church of Rome.* (London, 1688).

Manningham, Thomas. *A sermon preach'd at the parish church of St. Andrew's, Holburn, 30 December 1694. On the most lamented death of our most gracious soveraign Queen Mary*. (1694).

Montgomery, James. *Great Britain's just complaint for her late measures, present sufferings, and the future miseries she is exposed to with the best, safest, and most effectual way of securing and establishing her religion, government, liberty, and property upon good and lasting foundations : fully and clearly discovered in answer to two late pamphlets concerning the pretended French invasion.* (London, 1692).

Morrill, John. "The Sensible Revolution." In Israel's *Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and Its World Impact*. (New York, 2003).

Newman, Steve. *Ballad Collection, Lyric, and the Canon: The Call of the Popular from the Restoration to the New Criticism.* (New York, 2007).

Ó Bruadair. "Triumph of James II." Quoted from Boyce, Eccleshall, Geoghegan. *Political Thought in Ireland Since the Seventeenth Century* (New York, 2005).

Petter, John. *A Sermon Preached before their Majesties, K. William and Q. Mary's Forces, At Gant in Flanders, The Sunday Before they marched into the Camp.* (1694).

Pincus, Steve. *1668: First Modern Revolution*. (New Haven, 2009).

------. 'The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy and the Transformation of English Political Culture." *The European Legacy*, Vol 5, 4. (2000).

Phillips, Jonathan. *The secret history of the reigns of K. Charles II and K. James II*. (London, 1690).

Philotheus, *Reflections upon bulls of the Popes Paul the Third, and Pius the Fifth emitted against King Henry the 8 and Queen Elizabeth of England.* (London, 1686).

Pocock, J. G. A. "British History: A Plea for a New Subject," *Journal of Modern History* 47. (1975).

Reid, Robert. *The Account of the Pope's Procession at Aberdeen.* (1689).

Representative of Kilkenny. *Address to King James II at Kilkenny, March 22, 1689.* (London, 1689).

Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690's: Revolution, Religion, and War.* (Oxford, 1999).

Sage, John. *An Account of the Present Persecution of the Church in Scotland* (London, 1690).

------. *The Case of the Present Afflicted Clergy in Scotland*. (London, 1690).

Schwoerer, Louis. 'Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89.' *The American Historical Review*. Vol. 82, No. 4 (Oct., 1977).

Scottish Convention. *Declaration of the Scottish Convention, April 11, 1689.* (1689).

------. *Letter of the Scottish Convention to the Prince of Orange, January 10, 1689.* (1689)

------. *Scottish Convention's Proclamation against Papists, March 20, 1689*. (1689).

Scottish Privy Council. *A Proclamation Anent the Ministers* (Edinburgh, 1689).

Sergeant, John. *An historical romance of the wars between the mighty giant Gallieno, and the great knight Nasonius, and his associates*. (Dublin, 1694).

Speck, W.A. "The Orangist Conspiracy against James II." *Historical Journal*, 30 (1987).

------. *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*. (Oxford, 1988).

Strachan, William. *Some remarks upon a late pamphlet, entituled, An answer to the Scots Presbyterian eloquence wherein the innocency of the Episcopal clergy is vindicated.* (London, 1694),

Sturdy, David. *Louis XIV* (London, 1998),

Tillotson, John. *A sermon preached before the King and Queen at White-Hall, the 27th of October being the day appointed for a publick thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the signal victory at sea, for the preservation of His Majesty's Sacred Person, and for his safe return to his people*. (London, 1692).

T. Van C. *Min Heer T. Van C's Answer to Min Heer H Van L's Letter, Representing the True Interests of Holland.* (London, 1690).

Vesey, John. *A sermon preach'd to the Protestants of Ireland, in and about the city of London, at St. Mary le Bow in Cheapside, Octob. 23. 1689 being the day appointed by act of Parliament in Ireland, for an anniversary thanksgiving for the deliverance of the Protestants of that kingdom, from the bloudy massacre and rebellion begun by the Irish papists, on the 23rd of October, 1641.* (London, 1689).

William III. *Declaration of the Prince of Orange, September 30, 1688*. (London, 1688)

------. *A Declaration by the Prince of Orange, 10 October 1688.* (London, 1688).

------. *Invitation to the Prince of Orange, June 30, 1688*. (London, 1688).

------. *Letter of the Prince of Orange to the Scottish Convention, March 16, 1689*. (London, 1689).

------. *The Majesties Declaration of War Against the French King.* (London, 1689).

King, William. *Europe's deliverance from France and slavery a sermon, preached at St. Patrick's Church, Dublin, on the 16th of November 1690 : being the day of thanksgiving for the preservation of His Majesties person, his good success in our deliverance, and his safe and happy return into England*. (London, 1689).

Wilson, John. *Jus regium coronae, or, The King's supream power in dispensing with penal statutes more particularly as it relates to the the two test-acts of the twenty fifth, and thirtieth of His late Majesty, King Charles the Second, argu'd by reason, and confirm'd by the common, and statute laws of this kingdom : in two parts*, (London, 1688).