

“The Jesuits Did It!”
Charles Chiniquy’s Theory of Lincoln’s Assassination¹

PAUL LAVERDURE

Like any good preacher, or public speaker, there are three points I want to make. First, I will describe briefly the religious impact Lincoln’s assassination made on the minds of millions. Second, I want to share one religious theory about the assassination. Hence, we have “The Jesuits Did It!” in the eye-catching first spot of the title which undoubtedly gave me the privilege of catching your attention. Third, I will give you some of my thoughts on what this theory means, not only in the fertile brain of Charles Chiniquy but also in the religious hate literature of modern North America.

The sixteenth president of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, as we know, preserved the American Union through the Civil War and brought about the emancipation of the slaves. Among American heroes, Lincoln continues to have a unique appeal for his fellow countrymen and also for people of other countries. Fifteen years ago, I gave an early version of this paper to the Lincoln Society, the oldest continuous Lincoln organization in the world. The headquarters and meeting place are in Hamilton, Ontario. Lincoln’s continuing appeal is based on the charm of his remarkable life – the rise from humble origins, the dramatic death (no pun intended) – and his distinctively human and humane personality, as well as from his historical role as a saviour of national unity (a Canadian fixation), emancipator of the slaves, guardian of self-government and spokesman for democracy. He was an inspiration to liberty lovers in France, Germany, Italy, England, and of course Canada.

Historical Papers 2001: Canadian Society of Church History

Tragically, on the 14th of April 1865, five days after the surrender of the Confederate forces under Lee, Abraham Lincoln was assassinated by the actor, John Wilkes Booth. The entire nation went into mourning. The North lamented the passing of a victorious president at the height of his success. The South feared the arrival of a less conciliatory one.

Lincoln had become too great. His murder was seen as a martyrdom. The fact that he was killed on Good Friday and buried on Easter Sunday – Black Easter on American calendars – was too circumstantial for people to avoid thinking of a crucifixion or at least a type of civil sainthood. Lincoln's birthday, 14 February, still celebrated on American calendars, sometimes falls on Ash Wednesday or on Shrove Tuesday and is always St. Valentine's Day.

The race to find the assassin ended in Booth's bloody death, but the shameful trial of the "conspirators" dragged for weeks, as the military tribunal sought scapegoats to atone for the national, almost religious trauma. One murderer was not enough for such a crime.

Charles Chiniquy was born in Beauport, near Quebec City, in 1809. As an ordained Roman Catholic priest he gained fame as a powerful temperance preacher until his exile to the United States where he left the Catholic Church and eventually joined the Old School Synod Presbyterian Church of Illinois. After a series of sensational exposés of supposed Catholic immorality, published most notably in the 1875 *The Priest, the Woman and the Confessional*,² he published his first autobiography in 1885. This was a hefty collection of his anti-Catholic pamphlets, together titled *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, in which one section was dedicated to joining religion to Lincoln's murder. It was Chiniquy's conviction that "Booth was nothing but the tool of the Jesuits. It was Rome who directed his arm, after corrupting his heart and damning his soul."

Others have analysed Chiniquy's writings – Joseph George, Jr., "The Lincoln Writings of Charles P.T. Chiniquy" in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (1976) and William Hanchett, *The Lincoln Murder Conspiracies* (1983) – and have ridiculed Chiniquy's theory as being so obviously bogus that words and breath spent refuting Chiniquy were almost wasted. But truth must be served. As some of you know, I am a self-employed historian, researcher, writer, translator, and editor. I have sometimes worked as a consultant on film and television projects, for Vision and History Television. I was recently approached by one film company asking, in effect, for historical vindication of Chiniquy's theory, since the

company, which had the word, White, in its title – I will say no more – wanted to sell a proposal for a documentary to History TV showing how the Catholic Church had been involved in every presidential assassination. I will do almost anything related to religious history. Not quite anything. My research and the writings by George and Hanchett disappointed the would-be KKK film writers.

For our amusement tonight, let us go into details. I will not indulge in an *ad hominem* argument, giving Chiniquy's biography and discrediting him and his anti-Catholicism. We do not have the time and others, most notably Marcel Trudel and I, have already done so at length elsewhere.³ Chiniquy's theories can be divided into the following two statements. (1) The Catholic Church was antagonistic to the Northern Union, to republicanism, and to Lincoln who represented the republican ideals of the United States. Lincoln, therefore, was a target for Catholic hatreds. (2) Lincoln's assassination had been announced in certain Roman Catholic circles before it had taken place. So, Booth and the conspirators were Roman Catholics and tools manipulated by the Jesuits.

Does this first theory hold any water? Was the Catholic Church antagonistic to the United States, to Republicanism, or to Lincoln? Thundering pronouncements coming from the beleaguered palace of Pius IX seemed to imply Catholic rejection of republican democracy. This was taken for granted by many Americans, both Protestant and Catholic. The New World's seeming departure from hierarchical traditions and its emphases on freedom of conscience and liberty of speech ran counter to the retrenchment of a Rome faced with the revolutions of nineteenth-century Europe. It also seemed particularly dangerous to the Dominion of Canada, a Canada which pointed to the Civil War as proof of the insanity of republicanism.

Many Americans, such as Samuel Morse, the inventor of the telegraph, had long been convinced that Catholic immigration was a plot by Roman Catholic despots to inundate the States with the poor and ignorant rejects of their own societies.⁴ These people would form a majority and would replace republican freedoms with Catholic monarchical, repressive institutions. The large number of Roman Catholics in French Canada, Louisiana, Mexico, and California, as well as in the expanding cities of the east gave rise to fears and the nativist, "Know-Nothing party" (1845), which became a bulwark of the Whig-Republican party headed by Lincoln. The Democrats, the party of the cities, of the immigrants, and of the south,

received the Catholic vote in return. Lincoln, as the head of the Republicans, then became the target of the Democratic south and the Catholic immigrant.

As Chiniquy phrased it:

Above everything, it was ordered to oppose the election of Lincoln at any cost. For, from the very first day his eloquent voice had been heard, a shrill of terror had gone through the hearts of the partizans [sic] of slavery. The Democratic press, which was then, as it is still now, almost entirely under the control of the Roman Catholics, and the devoted tool of the Jesuits, deluged the country with the most fearful denunciations against him. They called him an ape . . . ⁵

So, it was possible to conceive of the fantastic idea that the whole affair was a Catholic plot. It seems to fit some of the facts so well. But what were Chiniquy’s proofs? They rest on three interviews Chiniquy claims he had with Lincoln. Chiniquy affirms that Lincoln knew of the Catholic danger for Union forces and had spoken of it to Chiniquy. On Chiniquy’s first visit to Lincoln (c. 14-31 August 1861),⁶ Lincoln had said, Chiniquy reports, that he felt

. . . that it is not against the Americans of the South, alone, I am fighting, it is more against the Pope of Rome, his perfidious Jesuits and their blind and blood-thirsty slaves, than against the real American Protestants, that we have to defend ourselves. Here, is the real danger of our position . . . It is Rome who wants to rule and degrade the North, as she has ruled and degraded the South . . . There are only very few of the Southern leaders who are not more or less under the influence of the Jesuits . . . The fact is, that the immense majority of Roman Catholic bishops, priests and laymen, are rebels in heart, when they cannot be in fact; with very few exceptions, every priest and every true Roman Catholic is a determined enemy of Liberty.⁷

Chiniquy’s second visit (c. 1-7 June 1862)⁸ was uneventful, but on his third visit (8 June 1864)⁹ Chiniquy states he was warmly received and honoured. He stood at Lincoln’s right hand to receive a delegation and, later, travelled with him to visit wounded soldiers. They repeated their conversation of 1861¹⁰ and discussed the significance of a recent letter by the Pope to Jefferson Davies. The Pope acknowledged the legitimacy of the Southern Republic. Chiniquy informed Lincoln that this means the Pope “tells

logically the Roman Catholics that you are a bloody tyrant!”¹¹ and worthy of death. Lincoln supposedly agreed with Chiniquy’s opinion and added that, “From the beginning of our civil war, there has been, not a secret, but a public alliance, between the Pope of Rome and Jeff Davies.”¹² “The true motive power” of the South, furthermore, “is secreted behind the thick walls of the Vatican, the colleges and schools of the Jesuits, the convents of the nuns and the confessional boxes of Rome.”¹³

This brings us to consider independent corroboration of Chiniquy’s conversations with Lincoln. Marcel Trudel claims that Chiniquy’s first and third visits may be true, but the second is impossible, because Chiniquy was defending himself before a Chicago Presbyterian Synod on charges of unbecoming conduct and language. Joseph George says that Lincoln’s private records and date books do not mention the first and third visits and argues very strongly that the first is out of the question. As for the third visit, it coincides with the day Lincoln was officially renominated for the Republican Party. It does not seem that Chiniquy ever met Lincoln on these three occasions.

Chiniquy wisely wrote that Lincoln concealed these private conversations and fears because, otherwise, “if the people knew the whole truth, this war would turn into a religious war, and it would, at once, take a tenfold more savage and bloody character.”¹⁴ Convenient!

Marcel Trudel states, “Nowhere in the most modern and complete editions of Lincoln’s writings, do we find the smallest bit of paper which mentions such a warmly awaited visitor: a man whom Lincoln takes as a confidant and whom he wishes to name as secretary to an embassy: a man on whom he depends to end the papist plot. Not once do Lincoln’s most detailed biographers . . . print Chiniquy’s name.”¹⁵

Not so. Carl Sandburg’s comprehensive and exhaustive biography mentions Chiniquy. Once, in Sandburg’s *Abraham Lincoln. Volume 4. The War Years*, page 325. Lincoln travelled on a regular court circuit to Urbana, Illinois in 1856. There he was involved in a case defending Chiniquy. Sandburg mentions little else. Pierre Berton went into this detail for a television series later published in book form and found out that Chiniquy was on trial for slander and defamation of character of a man named Spinks. Chiniquy claimed in return that Spinks was hired by the Church in the person of Bishop O’Regan to put Chiniquy in jail. Lincoln arrived, Chiniquy states, won the case, and the two men, Chiniquy and Lincoln, became fast friends in their anti-Catholic feelings.¹⁶ Actually, Berton, Trudel, George, Sandburg

and anyone else interested in looking out the court records and the newspaper accounts found that Lincoln arrived as a court-appointed defendant, sized up the situation as a petty, dirty business, had Chiniquy apologize, pay his share of the court costs (and Lincoln's entire fee), and convinced Spinks to drop the case that had Chiniquy jailed. There had been no Lincoln victory over a Catholic bishop. There had been no bishop, no victory, and probably very little contact between Lincoln and Chiniquy. One may, therefore, look at Chiniquy's later assertions of a fast friendship with a sceptical eye.

Was Lincoln anti-Catholic in his political or religious beliefs? In a study of Lincoln's religious influences, Glen Thurow could not find any particular instance of Lincoln giving evidence of a precise belief except his refusal to accept the "Hebraic-Puritan" traditions of New England.¹⁷ Lincoln was personally unfavourable to religious particularity. What Thurow showed is that Lincoln attended Presbyterian services with his wife in Springfield, Illinois, and in Washington, but never joined any church. He once explained, "When any church will inscribe over its altars, as its sole qualification for membership, the Saviour's condensed statement of the substance of both Law and Gospel 'Thou shalt love thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and thy neighbour as thyself' That church will I join with all my heart and all my soul." Basically, Lincoln knew his Bible and did not care for religious divisions and did not care about them.

Politically, Lincoln refused to endorse the Know-Nothing Party. In 1855, he declared,

Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a nation, we began by declaring "*all men are created equal*." We now practically read it "all men are created equal, *except negroes*." When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read "all men are created equal, *except negroes, and foreigners, and catholics*." When it comes to this I should prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretence of loving liberty.¹⁸

Lincoln had publically repudiated a part of the Republican party's possible constituency. During the Civil War, overzealous American nativist Protestants put their anti-Catholic concerns in storage. The Republican Party was a Union party, not an anti-Catholic one. As Ray Allen Billington states, the slavery issue sounded the "death knell of Know-Nothingism. This greater sectional problem and the civil war alone proved strong enough to

break the hold that the [Maria] Monks . . . the Morses . . . had on overzealous American Protestants.”¹⁹

Was Lincoln personally fearful of a Catholic plot? If Chiniquy was not alone in speaking of Lincoln’s concern for his life, one might give Chiniquy the benefit of the doubt. Lincoln, however, received several threats and “had persistently dismissed all such rumours.”²⁰ Lincoln was quoted by one biographer as saying, “I know I’m in danger . . . but I am not going to worry about it.”²¹ Other biographies agree with this portrayal. Chiniquy’s picture of an obsessed Lincoln is hardly credible. Every president has had to deal with cranks and lunatics.

But was Lincoln a victim of a Catholic plot? That is Chiniquy’s main point. Was it possible that the Catholic Church in America, because of historic ties with Catholic countries which condoned slavery, opposed the Union? Here again, Chiniquy is misleading. Although the Catholic Church was the only Christian Church in America not to split over the issue, yet it did experience some division. While Catholic priests were blessing standards in the South,

The Roman Catholic Church in the North, never vocal on the subject of slavery, followed traditional church practice in giving its support to the established government . . . Archbishop John Purcell demonstrated his espousal of the Union cause in 1861 by directing that the American ensign be flown from the spire of his cathedral.²²

Was the institutional hierarchy in Rome favourable to Jefferson Davis rather than to Lincoln? No. It could be argued that the Confederacy and the United States were equally strange beings to Rome. As well, the Catholic Church in the United States became so involved in the fight that, in October 1862, Pope Pius IX addressed letters to Archbishop Hughes of New York and to Archbishop Odin of New Orleans asking for mutual conciliation.²³ This was no papal letter acknowledging the South’s legitimacy.

Chiniquy was not finished. He presented the information that St. Joseph, Minnesota, a small town populated mainly with Catholics, had already received the information about Lincoln’s assassination approximately four hours before the fact.²⁴ He gathered affidavits in 1883 attesting to that fact, and concluded that the town “got the news from your priests of St. Joseph!”²⁵

The 14th of April, 1865, the priests of Rome knew and circulated the death of Lincoln four hours before its occurrence in their Roman Catholic town of St. Joseph, Minnesota. But they could not know it, without belonging to the band of conspirators who assassinated President Lincoln.²⁶

Such a leap in logic is unsubstantiated. Chiniquy had no proof of a priest's participation in the rumour. The affidavits make no mention of it. Chiniquy's affidavits, furthermore, are dated 1883. Memories about a "strange coincidence" after a lapse of eighteen years could have been the result of some judicious prodding. One must also remember, however, with Marcel Trudel and other historians, that the threats against Lincoln's life never stopped and that rumours about his death were constantly circulating.²⁷

The matter rests, then, in the evidence of the suspected conspirators. Were they Catholics? Were they under the influence of Roman Catholics? Chiniquy states, "There is a fact to which the American people has not given a sufficient attention. It is that, without a single exception, the conspirators were Roman Catholics."²⁸ Actually, four out of the ten people brought to trial were Catholic.²⁹ Chiniquy himself recognizes that three of the people hanged asked for Protestant ministers, but states,

But when those murderers were to appear before the country, and receive the just punishment of their crime, the Jesuits were too shrewd to ignore that if they were all coming on the scaffold as Roman Catholics, and accompanied by their father confessors, it would, at once, open the eyes of the American people, and clearly show that this was a Roman Catholic plot.³⁰

John Wilkes Booth, who had little chance to explain the reasons for Lincoln's assassination, was accused of being a Protestant "pervert to Romanism."³¹ Chiniquy bases this claim on the similarity of Booth to Ravailac, the Catholic assassin of Henry III in 1589.³² The similarity is, almost needless to say, forced.

Booth's sister, Asia Booth Clarke, in what is now an obscure book, *The Unlocked Book*, wrote of her brother's association with the Know-Nothing Party, where they debated the demerits of Irish and Catholic immigrants.³³ Booth eventually rose to be a steward of this anti-Catholic society.³⁴

John Surratt, however, the son of Booth's landlady, Mary Surratt, was a fervent Catholic and Booth's friend. He had studied for the priesthood.³⁵ Suspected in the conspiracy, he had fled through Montreal to Europe and to Rome wherein he clandestinely enrolled with the Papal Zouaves. These facts were knit together by Chiniquy to implicate by association Montreal's Bishop Bourget and Pope Pius IX.³⁶ The Pope, however, extradited Surratt to the States and the Zouave was acquitted by a different, non-military court, at a later time in a calmer atmosphere.

Weichmann, another Chiniquy-labelled "pervert," and Surratt's friend from seminary days, was released when he gave evidence against Mary Surratt after threatened with death and subjected to some physical abuse while in prison.³⁷ One can imagine the value of his testimony. Payne, Atzeroth, and Harold, "Booth's and Weichmann's proselytes,"³⁸ as Chiniquy calls them, were arrested and executed without right to speak except in court. They had been guilty of planning to kidnap Lincoln to exchange him for Southern soldiers. Mary Surratt hanged with them, in a tragic miscarriage of justice. No Catholic plot was mentioned.

Out of ten people accused, four were Catholic. Three of the four were hanged, probably unjustly. Weichmann and Surratt had the most obvious connection with the Catholic Church, but were allowed to go free. Chiniquy's thesis has little substance.

Why was and is this thesis given any credence? Richard Hofstadter, in his insightful and classic essay, "The Paranoid Style in American Politics," has outlined a useful method for understanding such North American religious mentalities.³⁹ The paranoid mentality, he explains, is one which perceives an apocalyptic conspiracy as a motive force behind events. The enemy is demonic and omnipotent, hated for its aims and admired for its power. The renegade from the enemy's camp is usually its most vocal opponent and uses a highly rational, pedantic style of rhetoric to state his case. Chiniquy, a "renegade" Catholic priest, certainly portrayed a demonic, omnipotent conspiracy behind Lincoln's assassination. He, too, marshalled pedantic, footnoted chapters, complete with affidavits, to support his arguments, but Hofstadter distinguishes the paranoid style as not "the absence of verifiable facts (though it is occasionally true that in his extravagant passion for facts the paranoid occasionally manufactures them), but rather the curious leap in imagination that is always made at some critical point in the recital of events."⁴⁰

Hofstadter does not claim to pinpoint this illogicality. Chiniquy, however, provides a clue. The flaw in Chiniquy's thinking about Lincoln may lie in the deductive syllogistic logic he employs. In his second autobiography, *Forty Years in the Church of Christ*,⁴¹ his Lincoln argument is much clearer and shorter, since he had posthumous editors, and can be abstracted as follows.

Fact: Catholics were charged as conspirators.

Chiniquy's Deductive Thesis: All conspirators are Catholic.

New Fact: Booth is a conspirator.

Chiniquy's Thesis: All conspirators are Catholic.

Conclusion: Booth is a Catholic.

Chiniquy's Thesis: All conspirators are Catholic.

New Fact: Mary Surratt is a Catholic.

Conclusion: Mary Surratt is a conspirator.

Northrop Frye noted the prevalence of a deductive mentality in the United States and explicitly connects this with the religious mentality.

A country founded on a revolution acquires a deductive way of thinking which is often encoded in constitutional law, and the American reverence for its Constitution, an inspired document to be amended and reinterpreted but never discarded, affords something of a parallel to the Old Testament sense of Israel as a people created by its law.⁴²

In a new country, there are few British precedents or inductive particulars to check deductive reasoning. Assuming that Chiniquy was wholly sincere in his writings, once a belief has been acquired, it is nearly impossible for the belief to be changed by contradictory proof. Contradictions become synthesized in ingenious rationalizations.

Remember that Chiniquy made his first logical leap at the very beginning of his recital. He writes that Booth "was nothing but the tool of the Jesuits. It was Rome who directed his arm, after corrupting his heart and damning his soul." Then he gathered his materials. It is significant that the following sentence is placed after the accusation. "After I had mixed my tears with those of the grand country of my adoption, I fell on my knees and

asked my God to grant me to show to the world what I knew to be the truth, viz.: that that horrible crime was the work of Popery.” Chiniquy clearly had known his conclusions before gathering the affidavits in 1883.

In recent scholarship, Chiniquy’s thesis about the assassination of Abraham Lincoln has been ignored, although it has influenced some people in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.⁴³ Other authors have found the Eisenschiml thesis of a governmental conspiracy headed by War Secretary Stanton a more interesting one for debate.⁴⁴ Marcel Trudel, Chiniquy’s most implacable biographer, writes that only one writer mentions Chiniquy’s thesis, and he classifies it as a literary oddity.⁴⁵ Sandburg’s Lincoln biography which cited evidence of Lincoln’s brief acquaintance with Chiniquy was edited in 1954; Chiniquy’s existence was one of the casualties. Chiniquy’s own admirers in a later collected edition of Chiniquy’s life and works let the Lincoln episodes disappear.⁴⁶ Yet Chiniquy dedicated more than sixty pages in *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome* and his posthumous editors gave over twenty to this theory in *Forty Years in the Church of Christ*.

With good reason, Marcel Trudel and many other historians have consigned Chiniquy’s thesis of Abraham Lincoln’s assassination by the Jesuits to the dustbin of history. The “conspirators” were, in the majority, Protestant, if they were of any religious affiliation. Booth, whose religion was vague, seemed to have been activated by personal grandeur or Southern sentiment. Chiniquy’s proofs, as in much of his writings, fall to conjecture, insinuation, and slander.

Yet, while hate-filled and malicious, banned from entering Canada because classified as hate literature, Chiniquy provides insight into nineteenth century religious mentalities. Chiniquy should not be thrown out of the history books by disgusted editors. His is a classic deductive paranoid style of reasoning. This type of thinking is still with us and still has the power to ensnare unwary readers. Pamphlets are regularly passed out along the Pope’s route, repeating Chiniquy’s theories as fact. Chick publications of California and the Alamo Foundation of the American midwest put out new, glossier, more lurid illustrated versions of Chiniquy’s biographies. Lincoln’s name has been a peg on which to hang many things, Lincoln’s son, Todd, wrote. Chiniquy’s theories, too, seem to have taken on a life of their own, in comic books, and history television proposals. It is an interesting chapter in the Protestant pornography or hate literature of anti-Catholicism.

Endnotes

1. This paper was presented as a banquet speech to the Canadian Society of Church History, 24 May 2001.
2. Paul Laverdure, "Charles Chiniquy's *The Priest, The Woman and The Confessional: Protestant Pornography?*" *The Canadian Society of Presbyterian History Papers, 1984-1985* (Spring 1986): 59-71.
3. Charles-Marie Boissonnault, "Le Chiniquy de M. Marcel Trudel," *La Revue de L'Université Laval* 10 (1955): 900-905; Gaston Carrière, "Chiniquy, Charles Paschal," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia* (1967), 3:617; Paul Laverdure, "Creating an Anti-Catholic Crusader; Charles Chiniquy," *Journal of Religious History* 15, No. 1 (June 1988): 94-108; an earlier version published as "Charles Chiniquy; the Making of an Anti-catholic Crusader," *The Canadian Catholic Historical Association Historical Studies* (1987): 39-56; Paul Laverdure, "The Wandering Life of Charles Chiniquy," in *Called to Witness: Profiles of Canadian Presbyterians*, ed. John S. Moir (Hamilton: The Committee on History, The Presbyterian Church in Canada, 1991), 3:32-42; and Marcel Trudel, *Chiniquy* (Trois-Rivières: Éditions du Bien Public, 1955).
4. *Foreign Conspiracy Against the Liberties of the United States* (1835); cited in Clifton Olmstead, *History of Religion in the United States* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1960), 326.
5. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome* (Chicago: Craig & Barlow, 1885), 691.
6. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 691-697.
7. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 696-697.
8. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 698.
9. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 698-710.
10. Chiniquy has Lincoln saying, "This war would never have been possible without the sinister influence of the Jesuits. We owe it to Popery that we now see our land reddened with the blood of her noblest sons" (Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 699).
11. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 701.

12. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 703.
13. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 714.
14. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 699. He also has Lincoln say "But I keep those sad secrets in my heart; you are the only one to whom I reveal them, for I know that you learned them before me" (697). "I want your views about a thing which is exceedingly puzzling to me, and you are the only one to whom I like to speak on that subject" (693).
15. My translation from Trudel, *Chiniquy*, 241-242.
16. Pierre Berton, "The Zeal of Charles of Chiniquy," in *My Country: The Remarkable Past* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), 153.
17. Glen Thurow, *Abraham Lincoln and American Political Religion* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1976), 16.
18. Carl Sandberg, *Abraham Lincoln: The Prairie Years and The War Years* (one volume edition) (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1954), 120.
19. Ray Allen Billington, *The Protestant Crusade 1800-1860: A Study of the Origins of American Nativism* (New York: Macmillan, 1938), 430.
20. Stephen Oates, *With Malice Toward None: The Life of Abraham Lincoln* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977), 415.
21. Oates, *With Malice Toward None*, 416.
22. Olmstead, *History of Religion in the United States*, 387.
23. Olmstead, *History of Religion in the United States*, 389.
24. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 730-735.
25. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 734.
26. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 735.
27. Trudel, *Chiniquy*, 242.
28. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 723.
29. Trudel, *Chiniquy*, 243.
30. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 723-724.

31. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 723.
32. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 720-721.
33. Asia Booth Clarke, *The Unlocked Book: A Memoir of John Wilkes Booth by his sister, Asia Booth Clarke* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1938), 71-72, 75.
34. Booth Clarke, *The Unlocked Book*, 105.
35. Sandburg, *Abraham Lincoln*, 720.
36. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 727-729.
37. Joseph George, Jr., "Nature's First Law: Louis J. Weichmann and Mrs. Surratt," *Civil War History* 28, No. 2 (1982): 109.
38. Chiniquy, *Fifty Years in the Church of Rome*, 723.
39. In Richard Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics and Other Essays* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), 3-40.
40. Hofstadter, *The Paranoid Style in American Politics*, 37.
41. *Forty Years in the Church of Christ*. Rev. Charles Chiniquy, D.D. Author of "Fifty Years in the Church of Rome" (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1900).
42. Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature* (Toronto: Academic Press, 1983), 118.
43. An interesting example of this influence is Justin D. Fulton who quotes Chiniquy at length (*Washington in the Lap of Rome* [Boston: W. Kellaway, Office of the Free Press; Fremont Temple, 1888], 115-125). The copy I consulted is dedicated by hand "To my distinguished friend Rev. Charles Chiniquy with heartfelt love of Justin Fulton. Boston, Oct. 18th, 1888," and was donated to the Presbyterian College of Montreal by Chiniquy's son-in-law, the Reverend Mr. Morin, in 1899.
44. S.K. Ratcliffe, "Why was Lincoln Murdered?" *The Spectator* 158 (1937) 1046-1047, has not a word about Catholicism and concerns itself mainly with Stanton. See also William Hanchett, "The Eisenschiml Thesis," *Civil War History* 25, No. 3 (1979): 197-217.
45. Trudel, *Chiniquy*, 245, and xxxiii. The writer Trudel cites is George Bryan, *The Great American Myth* (New York: Carrick and Evans, 1940).

46. *Chiniquy (précédé d'une notice biographique par Hector Langevin)* (reprint Trois-Rivières: Éditions Beauport, 197-). This is one of the more interesting editions because the preface reveals the anti-clerical leanings of this prominent Liberal cabinet minister.

