

“CATHOLICITY AND CIVILIZATION”: CATHOLICS AND THE CAPITALIST ETHIC IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY AMERICA

Martin J. Burke

City University of New York

ABSTRACT

This essay examines arguments made by American Catholics that “Catholicity” promoted progress and that Catholic morality was essential to capitalist societies. These arguments developed in two contexts: as responses to charges that “popery” caused poverty; and in debates over relationships between Catholicism and capitalism. Articulate Catholics compared the social and economic conditions of Catholic and Protestant nations, and argued that the former were preferable. Only the Church, they insisted, could provide the morality necessary for the state and marketplace. While dissenting from the faith of the American majority, these intellectuals did not reject the political and economic ideologies of American culture. Rather, they assimilated them, and adapted them to Catholic ends.

Since they first appeared in 1905, Max Weber’s essays on *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* have provided the focus for continued, and often contentious, scholarly debate.¹ Economic historians such as R. H. Tawney, Amintore Fanfani, Gordon Marshall and David Landes have critically examined Weber’s central arguments about the “elective affinity” between Calvinism and capitalism in the early modern world.² Social theorists such as Talcott Parsons and Anthony Giddens have drawn upon Weber’s conception of “rationalization”—the progressive disenchantment of the world—in order to explain the emergence of modernity.³ Sociologists such as Gerhard Lenski and S. N. Eisenstadt have tried to determine the significance in advanced societies of a “religious factor” in patterns of socio-economic mobility and educational achievement.⁴ And while subsequent historical and sociological investigations have challenged many of the essays’ empirical claims, Weber’s text continues to inform research programs in such fields as social psychology, education, and the sociology of religion.⁵

While this essay does not intend to review the vast literature surrounding Weber’s theses, it will consider one of the subjects his analysis raised concerning the relationships between religious beliefs and economic behaviors: differences between Protestant and Catholic attitudes towards work, poverty, and the accumulation of wealth. Though Weber remained chiefly concerned with the unintended economic consequences of the Calvinist doctrine of predestination and the neo-Calvinist emphasis upon work in one’s calling, he did suggest that Protestant and Catholic ethics differed in a number of ways. Most important to his central argument was the distinction between the “other-worldly” asceticism of medieval monks with the “inner-worldly” asceticism of Puritans. Both groups,

as Weber depicted them, subscribed to work ethics of diligence and self-denial, and both groups accumulated treasures, either in this world or the next. But while the Catholic Church presumed that only members of a spiritual elite would submit to the rigors of monastic rule, Calvinist Protestants demanded disciplined lives from all believers. The medieval Church expected that the laity would work—sloth, after all, was a serious sin—but cycles of rest, feasts and holy days would punctuate the routines of daily labor. Weber's Protestants knew no such leisure. Their work ethic was "modern" in contrast to the "traditional" attitudes of the Catholics. Thus, this "inner-worldly" asceticism of Protestants provided the physical and psychological elements that would give rise to the "spirit" of modern capitalism.⁶

Unlike many of the liberal anti-clericals of his day, Weber did not argue that the Catholic Church's veneration of the poverty of monks and clerics necessarily dissuaded the faithful from the pursuit of worldly goods, for few Europeans were more wealthy, and worldly, than the merchants of the Italian city-states. Rather, Weber argued that the cult of holy poverty, along with the medieval Christian prohibition of usury and Biblical injunctions against avarice, had created social and cultural conditions that inhibited the long-term, "rational" accumulation of wealth. No such inhibitions troubled Protestants. For them, economic success in their now-sanctified worldly callings provided an indicator of their membership in the elect. Wealth was now a sign of God's favor, and poverty, especially the voluntary poverty of the mendicant orders, was to be avoided, not admired. Protestants were not to squander that wealth on luxuries, but to save and invest it. This inner-worldly asceticism, as Weber construed it, compelled Protestants to generate the surplus employed in the rapid expansion of commercial activity in the early modern period. Protestantism alone, in Weber's analysis, fostered the cultural and the material conditions necessary for the development of modern capitalism. Individual Catholics might well engage in capitalist activities, but Catholicism was most compatible with forms of "traditional" economic behavior.⁷

Weber suggested that by the eighteenth century secularization was eroding the connections between Calvinist doctrines and modern capitalism; yet he noted the differential effects of religious affiliation in his own time. He began the *Protestant Ethic* essays with a discussion of religious creeds and social conditions in contemporary Europe. The northern nations which had supported the Reformation—the Netherlands, Scotland, and England—were among the wealthiest and most advanced societies, while the Catholic states of the south—Spain and Italy—were not. Within the German Reich and the Austrian Empire, it was Protestants who appeared overrepresented in industrial and scientific pursuits, while Catholics preferred artisanal and other traditional occupations. He offered some detailed evidence to support these characterizations, but he presumed that his comments about the progressive nature of the Protestant nations and the backwardness of Catholic peoples needed little explanation. Though not an anti-Catholic, Weber subscribed to the standard German liberal position that the Roman Church impeded national unity and development. The contrasts that he made between eco-

CATHOLICS AND THE CAPITALIST ETHIC

nomically and socially forward-looking Protestants and traditionally-minded Catholics were typical in the early years of the twentieth century, as they were since the eighteenth. This essay will explore a chapter in the conceptual history of these commonplace themes on the contrasting nature of Catholic and Protestant societies.⁸

In particular, this article will focus on the claims made by American Catholics during the nineteenth century that "Catholicity" promoted, not hindered, the progress of "civilization" and that Catholic morality was essential, not inimical, to a capitalist society. Catholic intellectuals developed these positions in two interrelated contexts. The first context was the response made to charges by evangelicals and nativists that "popery" caused poverty, and that immigrants from "popish" nations were particularly unsuited for American society. The second was the European debate over the compatibility of Catholicism, liberalism, and capitalism. Although many of the continental Catholic disputants in this larger controversy voiced hostility toward democratic politics and suspicions about non-hierarchical societies, their American co-religionists adopted these European defenses of "Catholicity" and adapted them to new circumstances. Preachers, editors, and educators compared the economic and the moral conditions of Catholic and Protestant nations, and found the former superior. Protestantism, they suggested, led to religious indifference and moral decay, especially among the commercial and industrial classes. Catholicism, however, provided the stable morality and the sound virtues necessary for the state and the marketplace. The Church produced good citizens and provided the answers to the problems created by economic development. When translated into Weberian terms, these clerics and laymen argued that there was an affinity between the blessings of Catholicity and the benefits of liberal democracy and commercial capitalism.

The equation of Protestantism with liberty and prosperity, and Catholicism with poverty and tyranny, existed as a central tenet in the public culture of eighteenth-century British North America; and it would continue as a prominent feature in nineteenth-century American public discourse.⁹ Though civil penalties against the tiny Catholic minority disappeared in the wake of the American Revolution, the suitability of Romanists as citizens of a commercial republic remained open to question. When addressing this concern, articulate Catholics such as John England, the bishop of Charleston, and Mathew Carey, the Philadelphia publisher and political economist, argued that their faith was fully compatible with the political, social, and economic conditions of the United States. The Church obliged all Catholics, England contended, to obey legitimate authorities, and surely would do so in a republic where they participated in choosing their governors. The bishop dismissed allegations of treachery and divided loyalties by emphasizing Catholic participation in the Revolution, and by explaining that while all Catholics acknowledged the spiritual authority of the Pope, they owed him no allegiance as a temporal ruler.¹⁰ Mathew Carey, in evaluating the economic and social conditions of his co-religionists, pointed to his own achievements as the proprietor of the largest publishing house in North America and to the success of Catholic artisans, merchants, profession-

als, and planters. Where Catholics did number among the poor, in particular in the seaports along the east coast, he ascribed their distress to low wages and limited domestic markets, rather than to devotional or doctrinal particularities. Given the political liberties and the economic opportunities of the United States, there were, he submitted, no reasons why Catholics should not be as prosperous or prominent as their neighbors.¹¹

Like the majority of his fellow Catholics in nineteenth-century America, Carey was an immigrant, and in such publications as *Letters on Irish Immigrants and Irishmen Generally* he counseled prospective settlers to prepare themselves for lives of hard labor and substantial, if gradually earned, rewards. Carey had come to Philadelphia from Ireland thanks to the sponsorship of Benjamin Franklin; and he championed the virtues of self-discipline and disinterested benevolence recommended by his patron. In Franklin, Weber found the embodiment of the capitalist spirit of inner-worldly asceticism and rational acquisition, and Carey's example proves that public adherence to that ethic was not limited to Protestants. The deist Franklin and the Catholic Carey might politely disagree over matters of faith, but each advocated the same bourgeois ethic of diligence, thrift, honest, and sobriety. While Carey's rise to riches was far from typical of Irish immigrants, he was among the first in a long succession of advocates who endorsed the political and economic order, and who urged their fellow Catholics to adapt themselves to American institutions.

Carey and England's American Catholic apologetic of patriotism and prosperity would prove a durable one, and would be regularly employed against political and confessional critics of their faith. The volume and the pertinence of such criticisms increased during the nineteenth century, however, as the Catholic minority grew larger in numbers but poorer in material terms. With the arrival of hundreds of thousands of Irish, German, Slavic, and Italian migrants from the 1820s onward, the church of Maryland planters and Philadelphia merchants became a church of the urban poor.¹² Evangelical ministers, social reformers, and political nativists insisted that popery was the root cause of the immigrants' poverty. The Roman church, they maintained, by promoting the holy poverty of monks and mendicants, and by requiring the laity to pay for the upkeep of a corrupt, indolent clergy, degraded honest, remunerative work and defrauded its adherents.¹³ When making these accusations, the advocates of learned and popular anti-popery presumed that there *was* a causal link between religious beliefs and economic behavior: once Catholic converted, or migration from Catholic nations ceased, Protestant diligence would replace popish indigence. Thus, the political economy of the evangelicals and nativists intertwined doctrinal and material modes of analysis.

These rhetorical assaults prompted Catholic responses. In the pages of such journals as the *United States Catholic Magazine*, the *Catholic World*, and the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, lay and clerical editors and reviewers offered an alternative explanation of their Church's views on work, wealth, and poverty. They granted that Catholics honored the voluntary poverty of those in religious orders: their disciplined self-denial was worthy of emulation. But monastic rules did not offer manuals for the secular world.

CATHOLICS AND THE CAPITALIST ETHIC

The Lord called only a few to the rigors of the religious life. For the rest, the church acknowledged that honest labor in mundane callings pleased God: in the words of Ignatius Loyola, "laborare est orare"—to work is to pray. If riches resulted from one's labor, they were God's blessing. Wealth, per se, was not sinful; avarice and covetousness were. If hard work produced few rewards, that too was God's will. The Church did not enjoin or encourage her members to be poor; rather, she taught the poor to find contentment with their lot and reminded the rich of the obligations of Christian charity.¹⁴

A number of commentators waxed effusively about the economic prospects of the Catholic community. In an essay for the *Catholic World* entitled "Put Money in Thy Purse," M. T. Elder invited his co-religionists to fill the ranks of "bankers, merchant princes, railroad kings ... and factory owners."¹⁵ In a society where poverty was a "disgrace," and proselytizers targeted the poor, Catholics who proved capable had a duty to become rich. The "gift of money-making," as he termed it, should be "held as a high vocation." Elder was not interested in simply producing a new generation of "prominent businessmen and manufacturers," however; he wanted to ensure that the Church had the resources necessary to construct and operate its ever-expanding networks of parishes, schools, hospitals, orphanages, and asylums. The separation of church and state, and the suspicions of the Protestant majority, had denied the Church access to public funds and had placed a heavy burden on the laity.¹⁶ An expanded class of wealthy Catholics could assume those obligations. Elder's exhortations to "make money not only honestly ... but abundantly" are similar in style and substance to those found in such American Protestant way-to-wealth pieces as Russell Conwell's *Acres of Diamonds*.¹⁷ There are few differences between this American Catholic injunction towards work and wealth creation and the one espoused by Conwell, a Baptist. Elder's essay exemplifies efforts to engage the acquisitive economic values of American commercial culture and to translate those values into Catholic terms.¹⁸ Though these translations did not involve celebrations of wealth for wealth's sake, they did acknowledge the Church's dependence upon the voluntary contributions of the laity, and the importance of Catholic philanthropy.¹⁹

While many American Catholics advocated an ethic of hard work, self-denial, and savings, they failed to espouse the secularized bourgeois value of accumulation as the highest goal in life. Nor did they subscribe to the tenets of a socially and culturally dominant Protestantism. The irenic, cooperative spirit expressed by members of Mathew Carey's generation towards their fellow Christians had given way by mid-century to a competitive, aggressive stance. Suspicion of, and hostility towards, Protestantism developed, in part, as a reaction to domestic anti-Popery. But it was also shaped by the wider currents of international Catholicism. Rome saw itself locked in battle with the forces of liberalism, social, and indifferentism—all modern errors deriving from the arch-heresy of Protestantism.²⁰ The Church was engaged in a spiritual and a cultural war which was fought on many fronts, and which involved American Catholics in chronic disputes with, and in rancorous attacks upon, their Protestant opposites.

Among the most contested issues in this prolonged ideological conflict was the rela-

tion of Roman Catholicism to Western, and especially European, civilization. Clergymen and laymen alike addressed this question, and it involved at times historians, politicians, theologians, men of letters, and political economists. In such texts as François Guizot's *General History of Civilization in Europe*, Napoleon Roussel's *Catholic and Protestant Nations Compared in Their Relations to Wealth, Knowledge, and Morality*, and Emile Laveleye's *Protestantism and Catholicism in Their Bearing Upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations*, European liberals argued that the Church had been the enemy of freedom and an impediment to progress.²¹ They drew upon historical sources, travelers' accounts, official reports and statistics for evidence of the comparative social, political, and economic circumstances of Protestant and Catholic states. The British, Dutch, and Germans were stable, moral, prosperous, and progressive nations; the Irish, Italians, and the Spanish were not. In the opening of *The Protestant Ethic*, Weber had cited Laveleye as an authority, and many of Weber's assumptions about Catholicism, freedom, and economic development have their origins in this controversial literature.²²

Catholic controversialists answered Guizot's and Laveleye's texts, in turn, with such works as Jaime Balmes' *Protestantism and Catholicism Compared in their Effects Upon the Civilization of Europe*, the Abbé Martin's *Future of Protestantism and Catholicism*, and Baron de Haulleville's *The Future of the Catholic Peoples*.²³ Though a number of Catholic authors granted that Protestant states were more advanced economically, they rejected the equation of national income with national morality. Great Britain might be rich, but crime, drunkenness, and illegitimacy plagued English society; Spanish peasants might have little; yet they were fed, housed and clothed better than the denizens of London's slums. Civilization, Balmes contended, was a spiritual, not a material phenomenon. European civilization was Christian, but it was in decline since the Reformation. The solutions to the troubles besetting the modern world were to be found in the eternal truths of Catholicity, not in the illusion of progress.²⁴

When American Catholics joined in the debate over Catholicity and civilization, they usually followed the lines of the continental controversialists. They acknowledged that the Protestant nations were, in general, more wealthy, but they objected to definitions of national well-being in strictly economic terms. Nor did they accept the implicit message that Protestants' prosperity proved that Protestantism was the superior form of Christianity. They rejected any equivalence between material conditions and spiritual truths. The "superiority" of Protestant nations could be accounted for by differences in climate, government, natural resources and social habits, but not by confessional affiliation. The poverty of the Irish, for example, resulted from English tyranny, not popery.²⁵ Catholic critics also made a number of important qualifications to European anti-Protestant arguments. "Throne and Altar" conservatives like Balmes were hostile toward republicanism and liberalism, which they identified with the rebellious spirit of the Reformation and the French Revolution.²⁶ American Catholics, ever sensitive to the criticisms of nativists, denied any essential connection between Protestantism and republicanism.²⁷ They insisted, instead, that their faith would be the necessary element in

CATHOLICS AND THE CAPITALIST ETHIC

American social and political stability: the Church alone could provide the common moral leadership required by the citizenry. This assertion appeared especially true of the marketplace, where Protestant individualism encouraged avarice and selfish amorality. Catholicity would ensure probity and the authentic “self-denial” required for sound commerce and a stable civilization.²⁸

Nor were such reviewers as John L. Spalding and Orestes Brownson prepared to concede that only Protestant states were economically and socially advanced.²⁹ They suggested that Catholic states, too, showed signs of material progress. Belgium was as developed a society as any in Europe, and the other Catholic nations were sure to follow its lead.³⁰ In making such comparisons, the Americans were less concerned with the relative position of European societies than with the prospects for their own republic. The United States, they presumed, would one day become a Catholic nation. Protestantism, in their analysis, was collapsing under the weight of its own contradictions; while religious indifferentism, the final product of the Reformation, could not meet the needs of a deeply devout populace. Since Catholicism would soon be the predominant religious force in the land, they wished their fellow citizens to see the Church as an advocate, not an opponent, of economic and scientific progress, and as the final guarantor of public morality.

Catholicity and American civilization—as construed by Spalding, Brownson and company—were moving towards convergence. The Catholic America projected by American Catholics would integrate the particular genius of the republic with the strength and stability of the Church. Catholicism would direct the acquisitive drives of an energetic commercial people towards spiritual, not selfish, ends. The Church would infuse an increasingly amoral market-place with the principles of natural law and distributive justice. The plight of the poor, while not eliminated, would be greatly reduced under the Church’s care. And Christian philanthropy would restore the wealthy to their roles as patrons and benefactors.

These members of the Catholic community—an articulate minority within a religious minority—dissented from the faith of the American Protestant majority. But they did not reject the political and economic ideologies of the dominant culture. Rather, they assimilated them whenever possible, and tried to adapt them to Catholic ends whenever necessary. Little evidence appears in their speeches and writings of preferences for “traditional” economic endeavors or encouragements of an exclusive other-worldliness. While not Protestants, they preached a gospel of work in the world quite similar to their confessional rivals. And while quite concerned about the excesses of capitalism, these Catholic authors promoted many of the values of capitalist culture. If, as Weber suggested, a “Catholic ethic” persisted in nineteenth-century Europe, a similar “ethic” did not emerge in the public discourse of Catholics in nineteenth-century America.³¹

Notes

1. Max Weber, "Die protestantische Ethik und der 'Geist' des Kapitalismus," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 20, (1905): 1-54; 21(1905): 1-11. Weber published an extended version of these essays in 1920 in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1920). This latter version was translated by Talcott Parsons as: Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (New York: Scribner, 1930). The literature on Weber and his theses is extensive. Recent contributions include: Annette Düsselkamp, *L'ethique protestante de Max Weber* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1994); Hartmut Lehmann, *Max Weber's "Protestantische Ethik": Beiträge aus der Sicht eines Historikers* (Göttingen: Wandenhoek und Ruprecht, 1996); Hartmut Lehman and Guenther Roth, eds., *Weber's "Protestant Ethic": Origins, Evidence, Contexts* (Washington: German Historical Institute, 1993); Vicente Massot, *Max Weber y su sombra: la polémica sobre la religión y el capitalismo* (Buenos Aires: Grupo Editor Latinoamericano, 1992).
2. R. H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism: a Historical Study* (London: J. Murray, 1926); Amintore Fanfani, *Catholicism, Protestantism, and Capitalism* (London, Sheed and Ward, 1935); Gordon Marshall, *Presbyteries and Profits: Calvinism and the Development of Capitalism in Scotland, 1560-1707* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980); David Landes, *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some Are So Rich and Some So Poor* (London: Little Brown, 1998).
3. Talcott Parsons, *The Structure of Social Action* (New York: Free Press, 1968); Anthony Giddens, *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1971); Giddens, "Introduction" to Weber, *The Protestant Ethic* (London: Allen Unwin, 1976): 1-12.
4. Gerhard Lenski, *The Religious Factor: A Sociological Study of Religion's Impact on Politics, Economics and Family Life* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1963); S. N. Eisenstadt, ed., *The Protestant Ethic and Modernization* (New York: Basic Books, 1968).
5. Among the better guides to the strengths and weaknesses of Weber's work, and the terms of this still on-going controversy, are: Michael Lessnoff, *The Spirit of Capitalism and the Protestant Ethic* (Aldershot, Hants.: E. Elgar, 1994); Gordon Marshall, *In Search of the Spirit of Capitalism: an Essay on Max Weber's Protestant Ethic* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1982); Gianfranco Poggi, *Calvinism and the Capitalist Spirit: Max Weber's Protestant Ethic* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1983); Poggi, "Historical Viability, Sociological Significance, and Personal Judgment," in Lehmann and Roth, eds., *Weber's Protestant Ethic*, 295-304; Kurt Samuelsson, *Religion and Economic Action: The Protestant Ethic, the Rise of Capitalism and the Abuses of Scholarship* (New York: Basic Books, 1961). See as well Malcolm MacKinnon, "The Longevity of the Thesis: A Critique of the Critics"; David Zaret, "The Use and Abuse of Textual Data"; Guy Oakes, "The Thing That Would Not Die: Notes on Refutation," all in Lehmann and Roth, eds., 211-244; 245-272; 285-294. Examples of the many contemporary uses of Weber's work in the social sciences include: P. S. Gorski, "The Protestant Ethic Revisited: Disciplinary Revolution and State Formation in Holland and Prussia," *American Journal of Sociology* 99, no. 2 (September 1993): 265-316; H. B. Jones, "The Protestant Ethic: Weber's Model and the Empirical Literature," *Human Relations* 50, no. 7 (July 1997): 757-778; K. Sharpe, "The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Catholicism: Ideological and Institutional Constraints on System Change in English and French Primary Schooling," *Comparative Education* 33, no. 3 (November 1997): 329-348.
6. Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, chapters 2, 4. For a summation of Weber's analysis of Calvinism, predestination, and worldly callings see Marshall, *In Search of the Spirit of Capitalism*, 69-96.
7. Weber, *Protestant Ethic*, chapters 2, 4-5. A useful guide to what Weber's central arguments regarding capitalism were, and were not, can be found in Marshall, *In Search*, 17-68.
8. Weber, *Protestant Ethic*, chapter 1. For discussion of Weber's assumptions about Catholicism and the larger political and theological contexts in which they were developed see Paul Münch, "The Thesis Before Weber: An Archaeology," and Thomas Nipperdey, "Max Weber, Protestantism, and the Debate around 1900," in Lehmann and Roth, eds., 51-72; 73-82.
9. On anti-Popery in British North America see Frank Cogliano, *No King, No Popery: Anticatholicism in Revolutionary New England* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1995). For the nineteenth century see Ray A.

CATHOLICS AND THE CAPITALIST ETHIC

Billington, *The Protestant Crusade 1800-1860: a Study of the Origins of American Nativism* (New York: Macmillan, 1938); John Higham, *Strangers in the Land: Patterns of American Nativism*, 2nd ed., (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1988).

10. John England, *The Substance of a Discourse Preached in the Hall of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States* (Baltimore: F. Lucas, 1826). On John England, see Patrick Carey, *An Immigrant Bishop: John England's Adaptation of Irish Catholicism to American Republicanism* (Yonkers, N.Y.: U.S. Catholic Historical Society, 1982).

11. Mathew Carey, *The Calumnies of Verus; Or, Catholics Vindicated* (Philadelphia: Johnson and Justice, 1792); *Autobiographical Sketches* (Philadelphia: John Clarke, 1829); *Vindiciae Hibernicae; Or, Ireland Vindicated*, 3rd ed. (Philadelphia, R. P. Desilver, 1837); *Letters on Irish Immigrants and Irishmen Generally* (Philadelphia: 1838). On Mathew Carey see James Green, *Mathew Carey, Publisher and Patriot* (Philadelphia: Library Co. of Philadelphia, 1985); Martin J. Burke, "The Politics and Poetics of Nationalist Historiography: Mathew Carey and the *Vindiciae Hibernicae*," in *The Politics of Literature and the Literature of Politics*, ed. Joep Leerssen (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1994).

12. On the social and economic profiles of nineteenth-century American Catholics, see Jay P. Dolan, *The American Catholic Experience: A History from Colonial Times to the Present* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985).

13. The literature of learned, political, and popular anti-popey in nineteenth century America is huge, and these arguments exist in hundreds of sources. For examples, see: Samuel F.B. Morse, *Confessions of a French Catholic Priest. To Which Are Added Warnings to the People of the United States* (New York: D. Van Nostrand, 1837); E.M. Atwood, *Present Aspects of Romanism* (New York: American and Foreign Christian Union, 1868); Samuel W. Barnum, *Romanism As It Is: An Exposition of the Roman Catholic System, for the Use of the American People, Embracing...Its Distinctive Features in Theory and in Practice, Its Characteristic Tendencies and Aims, Its Statistical and Moral Position, and Its Special Relation to American Institutions and Liberties...* (Hartford: Connecticut Publishing Co., 1871); Justin Fulton, *Washington in the Lap of Rome* (Boston: W. Kellaway, 1888).

14. As were the attacks of the anti-Catholic evangelicals and nativists, these Catholic replies were numerous. See, for examples: "Past and Present," *United States Catholic Magazine and Monthly Review* 3, no. 8 (September 1844): 545-559; "Who Shall Take Care of the Poor?," *Catholic World* 8, no. 47 (February 1869): 703-715; "The Duties of the Rich in Christian Society, No. 1," *CW* 14, no. 83 (February 1872): 577-581; "Duties..., No. 3," *CW* 15, no. 85 (April 1872): 37-41; "Duties..., No. 4," *CW* 15, no. 86 (May 1872): 144-149; "The Material Mission of the Church," *CW* 28, no. 167 (February 1879): 659-669; Patrick McSweeney, "The Church and the Classes," *CW* 47, no. 280 (July 1888): 470-471; George D. Wolff, "Socialistic Communism in the United States," *American Catholic Quarterly Review* 3, no. 2 (July 1878): 549-557. The *United States Catholic Monthly Magazine* was published in Baltimore; the *Catholic World* was published in New York; *The American Catholic Quarterly Review* was published in Philadelphia. See as well, Joseph Fransioli, *A Sermon on the Dignity and Value of Labor* (Brooklyn: 1867).

15. M. T. Elder, "Put Money In Thy Purse," *Catholic World* 50, no. 299 (February 1890): 618-628.

16. *Ibid.*, 618-622, 626-628.

17. Russell Conwell, *Acres of Diamonds* (Philadelphia: 1882). The best guide to American Protestant attitudes toward wealth creation and social obligations is Henry F. May, *The Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: Octagon Books, 1963). See as well, Daniel T. Rodgers, *The Work Ethic in Industrial America, 1850-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).

18. In addition to the Elder piece see: Orestes Brownson, "Rome and the World," *Catholic World* 6, no. 31 (October 1867): 1-19; "Duties of the Rich..., No. 5," *CW* 15, no. 87 (June 1872): 289-290; "The Next Phase of Catholicity in the United States," *CW* 23, no. 137 (August 1876): 577-592; "The Catholic Church in the United States," *CW* 29, no. 172 (July 1879): 451-452; M. J. Lavelle, "Catholic Young Men's Societies," *CW* 47, no. 279 (June 1888): 400-408; Augustine Hewitt, "Catholic and American Ethics," *CW* 50, no. 300 (March 1890): 804-816; "Review of *Le Capital, le speculation et la finance au XIX siecle* by Claudio Jannet," *American Catholic Quarterly Review* 17, no. 67 (July 1892): 663-664.

19. On the messages and the mechanics of fund-raising among American Catholics see Mary J. Oates, *The Catholic Philanthropic Tradition in America* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

ESSAYS IN ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS HISTORY (1999)

20. On the currents of anti-Protestantism in nineteenth-century Europe see Steven C. Hause, "Anti-Protestant Rhetoric in the Early Third Republic," *French Historical Studies* 16, no.1 (Spring 1989): 183-201.
21. François Guizot, *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe* (Paris: Didier, 1828-1830); Napoleon Roussell, *Les nations catholiques et les nations protestantes comparées sous le triple rapport du bien être, des lumières et de la moralité* (Paris: Meyrises, 1854); Emile Laveleye, *Le Protestantisme et le Catholicisme dans leurs rapports avec la liberté et le prospérité des peuples. Étude d'économie sociale* (Bruxelles: Merzbach, 1875). All three texts also appeared in English translations.
22. On Weber's connections to this nineteenth-century literature see Nipperdey, "Max Weber, Protestantism, and the Debate around 1900," in Lehmann and Roth, eds., pp. 77-78.
23. Jaime Luciano Balmes, *El Protestantismo Comparado con el Catholicismo en sus relaciones con la civilization Europea* (Barcelona, 1842-1844); Abbé François Martin, *De l'avenir du Protestantisme et du Catholicisme* (Paris: 1875); Prosper Charles Alexandre, Baron de Hauleville, *De l'avenir des peuples Catholiques* (Bruxelles, F. Haenen, 1878). All three texts were translated into English.
24. Balmes, *Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in Their Effects on the Civilization of Europe* (Baltimore: John Murphy, 1851): 115-117; 79-83; 260-274.
25. Martin J. Spalding, "Catholic and Protestant Countries," *United States Catholic Magazine* 6, no. 1 (January 1847): 1-12; 6, no. 3 (March 1847): 117-129. F. Deshon, "Comparative Morality of Catholic and Protestant Countries," *Catholic World* 9, no. 49 (April 1869): 52-62; Orestes Brownson, "The Future of Protestantism and Catholicity," *CW* 10, no. 59 (February 1870): 577-589; "The *New Englander* on the Moral Results of the Romish System," *CW* 11, no. 61 (April 1870): 106-114; Francis W. Howard, "Catholicism, Protestantism and Progress," *CW* 62, no. 368 (October 1895): 145-153; August J. Thebaud, "The Church and the People," *American Catholic Quarterly Review* 1, no. 4 (October 1876): 577-611; George D. Wolff, "Catholicity and Protestantism in Relation to Our Future as a People," *ACQR* 4, no. 13 (January 1879): 143-163; "Review of Baron de Hauleville, *Protestant and Catholic Civilization Compared*," *ACQR* 4, no. 13 (January 1879): 188; "Social and Moral Aspects of Italy and Other Catholic Countries," *ACQR* 7, no. 29 (January 1883): 1-8; John Walsh, "The Catholic Church and Civilization," *ACQR* 10, no. 38 (April 1885): 193-216; Brother Justin, "Review of *Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared* by Alfred Young," *ACQR* 20, no. 78 (April 1895): 421-423; See as well, J. J. Moriarity, *The Catholic Church in Its Relation to Human Progress: A Lecture* (Albany: Van Benthuyssen, 1874); John L. Spalding, "The Comparative Influence of Catholicism and Protestantism on National Prosperity," in *Essays and Reviews* (New York: Catholic Publication Society, 1877); Alfred Young, *Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared in Civilization, Popular Happiness, General Intelligence and Morality* (New York: Catholic World, 1895); Thomas Bouquillon, *Catholicity and Civilization* (Philadelphia: Diocesan School Board, 1904).
26. Balmes, *Protestantism and Catholicity*, 274-287, 324-329, 356-363, 388-391.
27. See the "Preface to the American Edition" of Balmes, *Protestantism and Catholicity*, iv-vi. Martin J. Spalding, "Influence of Catholicity on Civil Liberty," *United States Catholic Magazine* 3, no. 2 (February 1844): 112-124; John B. Byrne, "Protestantism—Its Tendencies and Effects," *USCM* 3, no. 7 (July 1844): 448-451; "Religious Liberty," *Catholic World* 9, no. 61 (April 1870): 1-14; "The Catholic Church in the United States," *CW* 29, no. 172 (July 1879): 433-456; Augustine Hewit, "Catholic and American Ethic," *CW* 50: 804-816; August Thebaud, "Church and the People," *ACQR* 1: 591-599; "Review of *The Church and the Age* by Isaac Hecker," *ACQR* 13, no. 49 (January 1888): 176-177.
28. "Past and Present," *ACQR* 3: 554-556; F. Deshon, "Comparative Morality," *CW* 9: 52-62; O. Brownson, "Future of Protestantism and Catholicity," *CW* 10: 579-582, 589; F. Howard, "Catholicism, Protestantism and Progress," *CW* 62: 151-153; G. Wolff, "Catholicity and Protestantism," *ACQR* 4: 144-163; "Review of de Hauleville," *ACQR* 4: 188; J. Walsh, "Catholic Church and Civilization," *ACQR* 10: 211-212; "Review of Hecker," *ACQR* 13: 178.
29. On John Lancaster Spalding see Thomas T. McAvoy, "Bishop John Lancaster Spalding and the Catholic Minority," *Review of Politics* 12, no. 1 (January 1950): 3-19. The best introduction to Brownson is Patrick Carey, ed., *Orestes Brownson: Selected Writings* (New York: Paulist Press, 1991).
30. Spalding, "Catholic and Protestant Countries," *USCM* 6: 9-10; Brownson, "Future of Protestantism and Catholicity," *CW* 10: 579, 582.

CATHOLICS AND THE CAPITALIST ETHIC

31. The relationship between Catholicism and capitalism in twentieth-century America is discussed in George Weigel, "Camels and Needles, Talents and Treasures: American Catholicism and the Capitalist Ethic," in Peter Berger, ed. *The Capitalist Spirit: Toward a Religious Ethic of Wealth Creation* (San Francisco: ICS Press, 1990): 127-153.

