

# The Grand Design Exposed Chapter 8 The Catholic Maryland Colony

## Maryland

- Founded in 1634 by Lord Baltimore
- Haven for Catholics in Prot. England
- Jesuits part of first colony in St. Mary's City, said first mass in English Colonies
- Act of Toleration – 1649 – Religious Freedom
- Mixed success for Catholics, becomes Protestant majority and later Royal Colony

### LAYING THE GROUNDWORK

Now it was for quite some time set in the heart of King James I the marrying of his son Charles, then heir to the throne, to the princess of Spain. This unpopular effort at royal matchmaking, doomed from the first to failure, was also very much looked forward to by King James I's Secretary of State, George Calvert. As a Roman Catholic, Calvert saw the advent of a queen of his own faith as likely to be of considerable advantage to him. When it became known that the marriage negotiations had failed, the "Spanish party," as the few court sympathizers were called, among whom George Calvert was most conspicuous, fell into immediate disgrace. With his political future wrecked, he placed his resignation in the hands of the king, and as a way of escape and a door of hope to retrieve his fallen fortunes, he looked across the seas to the Island of Newfoundland. He could there take possession of land which was already his and establish a prosperous plantation.

King James I died 25 March 1625. His son Charles I then reigned until 1649. George Calvert sailed into his Newfoundland colony August 1627, two years after the death of James I. Newfoundland was not regarded as a very desirable place, whether for settlement or investment. The harsh Newfoundland winters convinced George Calvert that this was not the place he could make his fortunes. So he left Newfoundland, never to return, like closing the chapter on that part of his life. He sailed south into the James River and colony of Virginia, October 1629. His eyes, beholding the lushness of Virginia, were in stark contrast from where he had just been. His mind was made up, Virginia was the place he would found his new colony.

Once again George Calvert Lord Baltimore is back in England. He makes his wishes known to King Charles I, even though the land he covets is already occupied by Virginian colonists. The Virginians had received him kindly and treated him with the utmost consideration, yet he hesitated not only to beg for their land, but to go to very considerable trouble to deprive them of it. This was the atmosphere that began Lord Baltimore's colony of Maryland.

As regards King Charles I's part in the transaction, it has been rightly characterized: "A more iniquitous and unjust piece of business never stained Charles I's reign. An English nobleman sets foot upon a colony in which his countrymen are already settled; surveys the vastness and fertility of its territory; finds that he is prohibited, alike by the laws of the province and

of his native country, from obtaining his object unless he takes the "oath of supremacy"; refusing to take that oath, he returns to England, and secures, through his influence at court and his personal friendship with the king, property and privileges within the borders of the desired land, far greater than had been conferred upon any British subject." Being a Roman Catholic nobleman in the presence of a sympathetic king had its great advantages. In Protestant England, it had its pitfalls too.

Before George Calvert, the first Baron of Baltimore, could reap his rewards, there was a Reaper of another kind that had marked George Calvert for his own. The 15 April 1632, at the early age of fifty-two, a worn out man before his time, he passed away, bequeathing his worthless estates in Newfoundland, and all his Irish and English property, together with his expectations in Maryland, to Cecilius, his eldest son.

In memory of George Calvert, the first Baron of Baltimore, there is an interesting legend, of Roman Catholic origin of course, that Sir George Calvert sought and obtained from King Charles I his charter of Maryland for the purpose and desire to found a colony where religious liberty, sternly prohibited and under ban elsewhere, should find, in at least one place in all the world, protection and a home for true religious toleration. A Roman Catholic aristocrat, a preacher of religious toleration? But the legend goes on to say that: although stricken down himself by the hand of death before he could fulfill his splendid purpose, that purpose still lived on destined to a "glorious fulfillment." Wow! what a saintly halo this man must of worn on his brow. But history sees him in a different light. Not as a philosopher, pilgrim father, nor even a public benefactor – but instead, a politician, merchant, and an adventurer.

There is another interesting fact, this time almost a marvel, about this great benefactor to the Christian world and Maryland. Search as you may, but you will not find a single public memorial that exists in Christendom to remind them, in a too forgetful world, of Sir George Calvert's benevolence. Most of all, we are astonished at this neglect in Maryland. But imagine it! Go through Baltimore's streets and squares and see those who have served their country – orators, statesmen, generals, judges, poets – are all suitably remembered. But Sir George Calvert's memorial is nowhere to be found. The first preacher of liberty of conscience – unhonored in Baltimore? And comprehend this: Leonard Calvert, son of Sir George Calvert and Cecilius Calvert's brother, who he appointed the first Governor of Maryland, lies in a nameless grave; his sepulcher no man knows unto this day. What could be the reason for this lack of honor?

The legend of Maryland is pure fiction. For in George Calvert's day, the duty of tolerating religious error was a part of no man's creed. No preacher of true toleration had yet arisen among men. Nor was the world ready for such a prophet. Neither the Church of England, the Puritans, and certainly not the Roman Catholics believed in religious liberty at that time. Each believed, as was handed down from Mother Rome, in a state church established by law, and each was intent on establishing its own faith to the exclusion of every other. It took another thirty years before a colony was founded on 'true religious liberty'. Roger Williams and John Clark, a baptist preacher,

obtained their charter for Rhode Island in 1663. Baptists, or "Ana-Baptists", as they were called, suffered horrendously from both Catholics and Protestants alike. Roger Williams, who was banished from the Massachusetts Bay colony, by Protestants too entrenched in Romanism to ever understand the true principles of religious freedom, ordered in the Rhode Island colony "that no man should be molested for his conscience"; arguing, what government had the right to "persecute" him for his religious opinions? Eight years later, William Penn established in 1681, his colony in Pennsylvania as a refuge for the Society of Friends, known also as Quakers.

Maryland, and the legend of Maryland, both destined to a "glorious fulfillment", was being guided by the Jesuits for a definite purpose. English colonies in the New World, even though some fiercely opposed the Church of England, wanting to 'purify' it, were never-the-less "Protestant" in nature – all except one, the colony of Maryland. The Proprietaries of Maryland were Roman Catholic; so was its first governor. The Calverts became a useful tool in the Jesuit's hands, leading to a life and death struggle between them. Yet this opportunity now quickly opened for Rome and her Jesuits to begin the ground work for their 'Grand Design'. The rest is history, as it records how the Maryland area was developed and became the seat and capital of the world's greatest power, the United States of America – "new Rome"; what Scripture calls the "likeness" or "image" to Rome, the Beast. This will be explained in a later chapter.

The history of Maryland that we are about to study, is documented and preserved in the Maryland Historical Society. Also, there will be quotes directly from the 1907-1914, fifteen volume, Catholic Encyclopedia. To many, history might be dry and boring, yet if we have a burning desire to understand what is truth, then history becomes vibrant and alive. History sheds light on our present world and also gives understanding for the future. It is through history that we find our roots, and has become the reason and object of why much of our history today has been thoroughly censored; so that our roots will be purposely obscured.

### **CECILIUS CALVERT – A MAN OF BUSINESS**

Two months after Sir George Calvert's death, 20 June 1632, a charter was issued, written in Latin, the only one of the colonial charters of which the original was in that language; it finally passed the Great Seal of England, with no other changes in its wording than the substitution of the name of Cecilius in place of his father's. The king was firm for naming it Maryland or Tera Mariae. Virginia memorialized the virgin queen, Elizabeth, and Maryland should memorialize his own beloved Catholic queen, daughter of Henry IV of France, so that side by side in the New World there should be the twin memorials of the two English queens.

Cecilius Calvert, the second Baron of Baltimore, was the very man Maryland needed; for he was a clear-headed man of business, giving his chief attention to business rather than religion, the area where he and the Jesuits clashed, not that he was an irreligious man. The task before him was stupendous. A province of eight million acres, an area much larger than Maryland is today, we find him with great promptness and vigor, rousing public attention to the

golden opportunities; no matter what station a man was in life, profits were absolutely sure. The grandest descriptions were given to induce emigrants; a country abundantly rich in rivers, fish, mighty oaks, wild fruits and berries, wild animals and fowls, a soil so rich the seed in the worst years yielded two hundred fold, and moreover, the soil afforded three harvests a year!

One would have almost supposed that an appeal as this would have been very disastrous in depopulating England herself, especially the Roman Catholic portion of the population, rushing as it were, from the evil English kingdom to that land of religious toleration and material paradise. Apparently, strange as it seems, the New World held no such charms for them. For only two hundred and some odd persons in all came forward in response to Cecilius Calvert's public appeal. But even more remarkable, of the two hundred that came on board the two ships sailing from England, over three-fourths were of the English Church, of which most of those were commoners. Of the Noblemen on board, Roman Catholics outranked those of the English Church.

The two ships, the Ark and the Dove, with their mixed religionist emigrants departed Gravesend England, 19 October 1633. The Lord Proprietary Cecilius Calvert did not accompany them, nor did he ever set foot on his Maryland shores. But as they were about to depart, he gave them some wise instructions. Understanding the growing tensions between the Parliamentarians and those sympathetic to Romanism; and because he was wise and business-minded enough to not have his colonial enterprise wrecked for religious reasons, he counseled them to "cause all acts of Roman Catholic religion to be done as privately as may be, and that they instruct all Roman Catholics to be silent on all occasions of discourse on Religion... and this to be observed at land as well as at sea". With this they departed, having yet three more passengers to be picked up, they made one last stop at the small south English Isle of Wight.

At the very outset can be seen the intentions of some of those on board. The counsel of Cecilius Calvert obviously fell on deaf ears. For the stop at the Isle of Wight was for the opportunity to smuggle on board three Jesuit priests. Traveling to Maryland at first under assumed names, Jesuits Andrew White, John Althan, alias Gravenor, and a lay brother, Thomas Gervase, were all fully conscious that they were lawbreakers, and were so at their own peril.

As the ships set sail 22 November 1633, we find the Jesuit priests engaged in a public Roman Catholic ceremony invoking the Blessed Virgin, the saints, and the guardian angels of Maryland for protection for a safe voyage. On reaching the shores of Maryland, another very Roman Catholic ceremony was held. A great cross was hewed out of a tree, and then being planted, the day being the Day of the Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the 25 March 1634, the priests celebrated Mass, "a thing which had never been done before in that part of the world". On bended knees, they recited the Litanies of the Sacred Cross with great emotion, taking possession of the country for Christ and the sovereign Lord the King of England. This conduct of disobedience was the first of a long series of deliberate acts of disloyalty credited to the Jesuit Society in Maryland, causing great distress for Lord Baltimore and

eventually the revoking of his charter.

The first several years however, went smoothly. Everyone worked at the task before them, establishing their new home. Trees were felled, fields planted, homes built, streets laid out; everything was done in the most practical and business-like manner. Soon the settlers were able to abandon the ships which had so long sheltered them, and take up their dwelling on the land. But on the 8 August 1637, another group of emigrants came to the Maryland colony. Along with them was a man whose name was Thomas Copley, alias Philip Fisher, a Jesuit priest, who carefully hid his priestly status, so that for a time he was not suspected by the colonist. With his arrival, things changed drastically.

It was chiefly due to Jesuit Thomas Copley's efforts that the few Roman Catholics who were on board the Ark and the Dove had been a part of the Maryland expedition. When Lord Baltimore advertised for emigrants, the Jesuit society considered that it had in his new plantation a favorable opportunity of extending its influence in America under the English flag. Maryland, to be sure, offered them opportunities in this direction denied them elsewhere. New England was forbidden territory to them; so was Virginia. The Lord Proprietary of Maryland was a Roman Catholic, and with him and his relatives, they had great influence. Why not accept the Lord Baltimore's terms and furnish him with just the settlers his province needed? The terms were good. Two hundred acres for every man sent out went to the successful agent.

The Jesuit Society became one of Lord Baltimore's recruiting agencies; its executive officer for this purpose was Thomas Copley. His venture as an emigration agent resulted in sending to Maryland, not less than twenty-eight persons. Jesuit Copley subsequently presented on behalf of the Jesuit Society a claim against Lord Baltimore for six thousand acres of Maryland land. Successful, however, as it was, this process of acquiring land was too slow for Copley's energetic soul. He himself, with nineteen more emigrants under his charge, was looking for four thousand more acres of land. But soon after coming to the colony, he inaugurated so specious a scheme of securing land from the Indians, that had it eventually succeeded, Baltimore would soon have no land to call his own. Acquiring land, was not the only area that Jesuit Copley was aggressive in.

With Copley's advent in 1637, the relations existing between the Anglicans and their Roman Catholic brethren were at once changed. Copley was of an energetic nature and matters religiously were not moving fast enough. Following upon his arrival, the policy of the Roman Catholics suddenly became one of aggression. Work must be undertaken; more converts were needed in the colony where it was infested with "heretics". Their methods of accomplishing this were various; chiefly, however, they sought success by vigorous efforts of proselytizing, even forcing their way into Protestant homes; by rigidly excluding Anglicans from political office, and by working the legislature in their own interest.

Even though the Anglican Churchmen were in the majority numerically throughout the province, many were not freemen; being either slaves or indentured servants, and by law they did not possess the right of speaking

and voting upon the laws by which they were to be governed. The "gentlemen" in the colony, of this class, the Roman Catholics were in the majority. It was these conditions then, at the beginning of the colony, that made the Anglican Churchmen politically weak. And so when the first Assembly was gathered together on a basis of freemen suffrage, even though the Anglican Churchmen on actual ballot were in the majority, the Romanist were in a position to materially influence proceedings in their favor.

### **THE GOVERNMENT IS CATHOLIQUE**

"The Government is Catholique", it was said. Thus the first Maryland Assembly presented the singular spectacle of a considerable community of Englishmen subject to Roman Catholic influence at a time when the celebration of the Mass was a capital felony in England. For the first time since Mary's reign, English supporters of the papacy found themselves able to dominate a legislative assembly in their own interest. And they were not slow in taking advantage of the situation.

It is incredible, that the first order of business at hand was to pass the "Act for Church Liberties". This Act, in direct violation of English statutes, immediate but hidden effect, was to place the clergy of the Roman Church beyond control of the civil power, exempting them from taxation and many of the duties of citizenship, and enabling their Church, among other things, to hold property independent of the state, a right by law, which even the English Church herself could not do. In essence, they had established the Roman Catholic Church as the religion of the state; hardly a wise proceeding, forcing such a radical measure as this through the infant legislature, especially considering the religious climate at the time in England. And that climate was not the result of bigotry or prejudice, but like a burnt child who dreads the fire, it was just a matter of self survival. England had had enough of Rome.

Even before the Act for Church Liberties was passed, 23 October 1640, Lord Baltimore was receiving news informing him of the bitter feelings against the aggressive measures which had been agitated in the colony. Even worse, he received first hand a letter from Jesuit Copley, 3 April 1638, of demands of very extravagant privileges and news, asking Lord Baltimore to approve the proceedings as a 'son' of the Church. On the margin of this letter Lord Baltimore had written: "All their tenants as well as servants he intimates here ought to be excepted from the temporal government". The news came as a bombshell to Lord Baltimore; he was aghast. At the same time, affairs in England were casting dark shadows. So that however a good Romanist he was, and however anxious he may have been to further the interest of his Church, he could not prudently have followed Copley's advice.

Lord Baltimore knew the law and he was without excuse if he broke it, and he had no intention of being pilloried as an example of disobedience to it, nor would he imperil his property by any ill-timed generosity. Indeed, so impartially did he act, that one would scarcely have suspected him of being a Roman Catholic at all, much to the extreme disappointment, resentment, and chagrin of the Jesuits.

It was all very well for Lord Baltimore to lay down laws, but it was another thing for him to enforce them. The distance between him and his province, making communication slow and uncertain, and always irregular, bred the feeling that much could be done in which the absent lord would never hear of at all, and at any rate, if they chose a course of action contrary to his laws, months would elapse before they could ever be repudiated. And so it speedily became evident that it is one thing to give laws, and another to enforce them, when you are dealing with men who have their own purposes to serve. Ignoring alike the dictates of prudence and the injunctions of Lord Baltimore, they began a contest for supremacy in Maryland which was to end in their own undoing. And as the Jesuits chose to pursue a policy of aggression, they were overwhelmed by disaster which finally swept them away. – But only temporarily; like shooing blackbirds from your corn field, turn your back, and they always return.

To purport the claim that only one organization in all the earth has the “truth” for man’s salvation, and being an aristocratic member of that organization, sharing in the mission to extend that claim, makes for a very arrogant, bold, and aggressive person, transcending all others of their rights, human justice, and feelings. Romanism had established herself in South America, setting up her so called “reductions” among the native Indians – miniature socialized communistic compounds, becoming laboratories that developed today’s communism – and now Rome was bent and determined to plant a Roman Catholic colony among the English on the North American continent. Rome succeeded in her Maryland “glorious” undertaking, but not without a fight. The sad thing with Protestantism is, they have only won battles. Rome has all but won the war.

### **ENGLAND’S BLACK CLOUDS**

Puritan forces were rapidly gaining power in England. The political sky was black with clouds. Every day the king was becoming more unpopular. Threats of civil war began to be heard on all sides. Cecilus Calvert sent his brother Leonard, governor of Maryland, anxious instructions for curbing or rather eliminating Jesuit aggression in the colony. Leonard, not realizing the seriousness of the conditions in England, thinking Cecilus’s actions were too radical, and also prompted by Jesuit influence, chose to ignore his brother’s authority altogether. Word of the Jesuits’ doings and the trouble it was creating in the colony soon reached England. In consequence of this agitation, on 26 March 1642, Cecilus Calvert was summoned to appear before the House of Lords to answer for the alleged misconduct of his officers in Maryland. He cleared himself of the charges, but the incident drove home the fact that he would have to walk warily if he was to retain possession of his proprietary rights. Even the likelihood of his being involved in whatever hard fate that threatened the king.

Another severe letter dated 23 November 1642, to his brother in Maryland, accompanied by gentlemen from England to give a verbal account of the gravity of the situation, was written and sent on its mission. The seriousness and impact of the news when reaching Governor Leonard Calvert, so disturbed and alarmed him, that he rushed to England to get a first hand account and personally counsel with his brother. Already on 23 October 1642, war between

the King's army and the Puritan forces had begun the terrible strife, which was in the end, 30 January 1649, to witness the beheading death of King Charles I. Lord Baltimore Cecilius Calvert had every reason to begin fearing for his own life. In the events lifting up Oliver Cromwell and the Puritans to supreme power in England, it was a dangerous thing for a man to be suspected of encouraging Romanism.

## **COLONY IN REBELLION**

While Governor Leonard was in England, the smoldering fire existing in and around the Maryland colony burst into flame. The resentment of the Virginians in the way the territory of the Maryland colony was wrest from them, especially William Claborne, Virginia's Secretary of State, who keenly felt he was unjustly deprived of his Kent Island trading station and the manner its Protestant settlement was broken up; the resentment of the Virginians having a Roman Catholic colony in their front yard; the escalating overbearing conduct and attitude of the Jesuits within the Maryland colony itself; were all emotional feelings brought to an igniting point when the news arrived from England of the remarkable successes of the Parliamentary forces. Anticipating the ultimate downfall of the king, Protestants saw that the hour of deliverance had come. They would now look to it that Rome's dominion was at an end. In England the Jesuits lay under a ban, and it was intolerable that in an English colony, and in defiance of English law, they should be permitted to conduct themselves as they had been doing.

Leonard Calvert arrived from England during the midst of the trouble, but was powerless to bring order out of chaos, and before the end of the year – 1644 – William Clayborne had the supreme satisfaction of coming into possession of Kent Island. The following spring, St. Mary's, the seat of the Maryland government, was attacked, and without a struggle the city was captured; Lord Baltimore's authority in Maryland ceased. The downfall of the proprietary government caused a panic among the Jesuits. The more prudent sought safety in flight, recognizing that they had fallen upon evil times. Even the governor fled the province. However two priests, Jesuit Thomas Copley, the most guilty in fermenting strife and dissension, along with Jesuit Andrew White, were seized and confined and later sent in chains to England. Both were convicted of teaching doctrines contrary to the laws of England and sent to prison, and both were later released. Copley seems to have found his way back into Maryland while White, because of his age, was refused permission and died in Europe.

The colonist's rebellion was over when Romanism was crushed. Their grievances not being against the Catholic people themselves, were handled much less harshly. But by the banishment of the Jesuits, and the overthrow of Roman influence, the colonists had accomplished their aims. Such a condition of affairs from the very beginning had been flagrant lawlessness, existing as it did in the face of the lord proprietary's initial injunctions and his often repeated protests, to say nothing of the charter to which Maryland owed her existence, and the statute law of England herself.



## ONE HUNDRED YEAR STRUGGLE

The “struggle” – the intense struggle, that was going on in England during those crucial one hundred years between 1603 and 1702, became the very years that England was establishing her American colonies. And that struggle, the bloodshed, and oppression, during those years, and just previous to those years, where the events of Queen Mary, the Bartholomew massacre, the Spanish Armada, the Gunpowder Plot, the Thirty Years’ War, and the Irish Massacre, either had or ‘was’ taking place – had its direct impact on the thinking and the manner of governments set up in the American colonies. And you can thank God, whether you grasp the scope of that struggle or not, that when the American Constitution was formed, the founders adopted the English form of government.

To cite just one example of that “struggle”, consider the two forms of laws that ruled the people of Europe during that time. One, “Canon Law”, which regulated the Roman Catholic nations of Europe; the other, the “Common Law” of England. In comparing one feature alone will reveal the stark differences between the two. Under Roman Catholic Canon Law, a person was arrested, placed in prison indefinitely, left even to die there, never knowing the reason why, if the authorities so chose. Under English Common Law – and understand that this was progressive as the voice of the people was heard, pressuring laws for human rights to be legislated – a habeas corpus was provided. The word being Latin means, you have the body.

In the English common law, habeas corpus was a writ directed to a person detaining another, commanding him to produce the imprisoned individual at a designated time and place. Its primary purpose was to obtain prompt relief from illegal confinement or restraint. Because of the ineffectiveness of habeas corpus in cases involving imprisonment by order of the Crown without cause or for political and religious reasons, Parliament in 1628 passed the Petition of Right. The petition cited the portion of the Magna Charta which provided: “No freeman shall be seized or imprisoned, or dispossessed, or outlawed, or in any way destroyed; nor will we condemn him, nor will we convict him in prison, excepting by the legal judgement of his peers, or by the laws of the land”. When abuses still continued, Parliament passed the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679. This Act made the writ of habeas corpus “the most effective weapon yet devised for the protection of the liberty of the subject, and for a speedy trial of prisoners remanded to await trial”.

Now please pay close attention to the following words, quoting from the 1964 Encyclopedia Americana, volume 5, page 514, under the heading of: Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church. After reading it, there can be no question where anyone stands in the haughty arrogant eyes of Rome...

This canon code is based on the three fundamental principles of the constitution of the church:

(1) The Roman Catholic Church is the only and exclusive divine agency of spiritual welfare and of salvation. As such, the church by divine institution is a perfect society, autonomous and self-sufficient, endowed with sovereign, legislative, judicial, and coercive powers in

spiritual and moral matters and in all temporal matters connected directly or indirectly with its spiritual and moral mission (Canons 100, 1322, 1553, 2214). Since the sphere of spiritual and moral life is higher than that of temporal affairs, canon law is above civil law and in cases of conflict should prevail over it.

(2) The constitutional form of the church is by divine foundation that of an absolute monarchy. It is ruled by an ecclesiastical hierarchy having as its head the supreme pontiff, who exercises by divine right a universal direct jurisdiction over the whole church (Canon 218). As a source of law, his authority is above that of any general or local council, and he is infallible in his solemn decisions concerning faith and morals. He has the exclusive right to appoint the members of the hierarchy; he is the judge of last appeal in all matters affecting the church.

(3) The body of the church consists of two distinct classes; *ecclesia docens* and *ecclesia discens* (Canon 107). The former consists of the hierarchy and the clergy, who alone have the right to teach and to rule; the latter comprises the laity, who have the duty to accept this teaching and to obey.

The fast moving events spurred on during this one hundred year "struggle", affecting England and her American colonies, became much more than what first started out between the Church of England and Catholicism. There developed in England two streams of the Reformation – one which flowed out of the established Anglican Church of England, and one out of the life of the "Free" churches – the Congregational, Baptist, Presbyterian, Unitarian, and Methodist churches. These Free churches did not break off from the Church of England, but mark their beginnings from the influence of Martin Luther and John Calvin; many teaching, like the Baptists, their origin going back to the New Testament itself. But they all hoped, and actively struggled in that hope, that England and the new Anglican Church would be comprehensive enough to give them all a place in it. It was these organized Free churches that became such a force in England, waging their long fight for freedom and "true" religious toleration.

#### **FOUR STUART KINGS**

To simplify the complex and confusing maze of intrigues and counter-intrigues during that one hundred years, let's just look at briefly the kings that reigned during that time. Notice too, that these kings, through Margaret Tudor, who was the sister of King Henry VIII of England, who had married King James Stuart IV of Scotland, prided themselves with two royal blood lines. King James Stuart VI of Scotland, later also became King James I of England, establishing the Stuart name on the English throne, thus uniting the two nations. (Scotland, you remember, was the nation the aristocratic Knights Templar had fled to for refuge.) So these kings, by their very nature and tradition that had been bred into them, felt, allegedly by 'divine right', to assert their royal authority over others. It was their repressing the will of the people, trying to bring them primarily under the Roman Catholic Church

rule or at least the Church of England rule, that kept them in constant conflict with Parliament.

The first of these kings was James I, the great-great-grandson of Henry VII of England. He reigned from 1603-1625. His son, Charles I, then took the throne in 1625 and reigned until convicted of high treason. His absolutist beliefs, ruling without a Parliament for over ten years, and his Roman Catholic sympathies, alienated the Puritan dominated Parliament. He was forced to call a Parliament in 1640, which determined to curtail his powers. This led Charles I to engage his armies with the Parliamentary forces which began civil war in 1642. It ended by him being captured and later beheaded in 1649, with Oliver Cromwell raised up as lord protector of the Commonwealth, which means free state.

What the people and the Parliament had done, the like of it had never been heard of in the world before. Kings had killed each other often times enough; parricide, fratricide, assassination, this was 'their' privilege; but that a section of the people should rise up, requiring the king to give a moral account of himself to them, condemning him as a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and enemy of his country; startled the world. It was as if a council of deer had decided to execute a jungle rogue lion – lions in distant jungles growled, it was against nature!

The Puritans during the Cromwellian period, from 1647 till Oliver Cromwell's death in 1658, came fully into power. And as the Civil War and Commonwealth succeeded the rule of Charles I, the debate about a "free church in a free state" increased in intensity; for Cromwell's army was full of men who believed in the direct relationship of the soul to God and the right of conscience in political and religious affairs. They argued: the spiritual persuasion of Christ alone, and not the temporal ruler, is effective in cleansing men of heresy and error. The consciences of common men became a new phenomenon in religion and politics; one that would not disappear.

Yet there was one more thrust, the last attempt on a grand scale, called the "Restoration Era", to force the English people into a "one" church mold. You see folks, these people with their aristocratic mind-sets, never go away, never give up – never! Something like trying to stop a stream by putting a boulder in the middle of it; the stream can't go through it, so will go around it, over it or even under it, whatever it takes to get by – but it does get by... The next two kings were the second and third sons of executed King Charles I; his first born dying two hours after birth. During the Cromwellian years, these sons had fled England, going to the European Continent. After Oliver Cromwell's death in 1658, Royalists gained control of Parliament and mustered enough influence to get Parliament to extend an invitation to Charles II living in exile, to return as king. He reigned from 1660-1685. His brother, James II, who returned from exile with him, reigned after his brother's death, from 1685, till he had to flee again, in 1689.

Charles II returning from exile to succeed his father in 1660 after the death of Cromwell, reigned for twenty-five years. Charles II was a secret Catholic, but had sense enough to realize that his best course to keep the crown was to be conciliatory, showing moderation and tolerance. However, due to the

controlled Parliament favoring the Anglican Church, several stringent Acts were passed during his reign that reversed the Independent's cause and greatly oppressed the people.

The Corporation Act of 1661 prevented a person from holding a local public office, and the Test Act of 1673, mainly directed at Roman Catholics, forbid a person to hold an office under the crown, unless proven in both cases, they were members of the Established Anglican Church of England. The Conventicle Act of 1664, outlawed religious assemblies, other than the Church of England, of five or more persons outside a regular household. And the Five-Mile Act of 1665, ordered dissenting ministers to remain at least five miles away from any place where they had ever preached and forbid their teaching at schools. This series of harsh measures served to strengthen the Anglican Church against nonconformists, sending thousands to prison to languish and die. These were the prison years of John Bunyan. It also produced the Habeas Corpus Act of 1679.

Rumors persisted that Charles II had made a secret treaty with King Louis XIV, "the Sun King" of France, in which he had agreed to work to return Britain to the Roman Church, in exchange for a large sum of money. These rumors were indeed confirmed recently in 1988, when a signed copy of the actual agreement was found, showing that Charles II was to receive 1.2 million gold livres for his efforts to bring Britain back to Rome." There is however, no record that he received the money. Yet, King Charles II's true feelings did come out, when on his death bed and at his request, his brother, James II, brought a Roman Catholic priest up the back stairs to administer the last rites.

After the death of Charles II in 1685, his brother, James II, came to the throne. He was avowedly a Roman Catholic, and set in immediately, throwing all caution to the wind in his determination to restore the power of the Roman Catholic Church and make himself an absolute monarch. He exempted Roman Catholics from the Test Act, offering payments to individuals in high places to convert; the chapel at Whitehall was opened for public Catholic worship; a papal nuncio was received, and favors were conferred on the Jesuits with two of their schools being opened in London, with Jesuit Edward Petre being appointed to the Privy Council, and both he and Jesuit John Warner becoming his confessors. Further, James II found himself the supreme head of the Anglican Communion, and resolved to use his supremacy as a weapon for its overthrow. All of this in less than the three years that he reigned.

James II's reckless and ramrodding policy caused great alarm and distress among the English people; even among Catholics who feared later reprisals. It brought all the anti-Roman sentiments together in a common cause. Just a couple of years before, the same year James II took the throne, Louis XIV of France, revoked the Edict of Nantes, which had guaranteed freedom of religion for French Protestants, and were now suddenly subject to renewed persecution and deportation. Feelings ran high in England, spawning plots, schemes, and secret meetings, with the longest established secret society, Freemasonry, playing a major role.

From an earlier marriage, (his first wife had died) James II had two

daughters, Mary and Anne, who had been raised Protestant. Mary, the oldest, had married her cousin, William of Orange, who was the leader of Protestant Dutch against the Catholic Louis XIV of France. Together they were the strongest claimants to the English throne. James II not having a son, it was assumed and anticipated that one or the other daughter would become his heir and that England would again have a Protestant sovereign. With this hope, English people bided their time, tolerating, though reluctantly, waiting for James II to end his reign.

Then like a thunder bolt out of the blue, it was announced that the queen had given birth to a son. To make matters worse, the king declared that the boy's education and upbringing would be in the care of the Jesuits. Prudent Catholics and bristling Protestants came together. Jesuit Edward Petre was accused of being the father – by a nun – saying the baby had been smuggled into the royal bedchamber in a warming pan. The backlash from the oppressive Acts of Charles II and now James II's unrelenting campaign to return England to Rome, jolted the English people to action. Fearing another full-scale civil war, Parliament offered the throne to James's fervently anti-Catholic daughter, Mary, and her husband, William, prince of Orange. They accepted and on 5 November 1688, the Dutch prince became the new king of England who reigned until 1702. It was acclaimed, the "Glorious Revolution".

Without a fight, but with deep bitterness, James II went into exile once again in France, with Jesuit Edward Petre going with him. This began the long and intense Stuart quest, bringing the nations of France, Ireland, and Scotland, against England, involving plots, executions, and battles, to reclaim the English throne for the house of Stuart. They were called Jacobites, coming from the Latin word Jacobus, meaning James, who espoused the cause of James II, and his son, James III, known as the Old Pretender. It lasted for fifty-eight years, till 1746, when they were effectively crushed at the battle of Culloden Moor. It was during those years, that the aristocratic Jacobite cause produced their own brand of Catholic Scottish Templar Freemasonry, which we will look at in the next chapter.

What we have just lightly covered in the last few paragraphs, was a cataclysm of English events that was to change forever her history and the history of the world; guaranteeing basic rights for the common man. The great landmark and product of the Glorious Revolution was its Bill of Rights; giving protection for the "indubitable rights and liberties of the people of this kingdom". Laws also were passed by Parliament stating categorically that no Roman Catholic or spouse of a Roman Catholic could occupy the British throne. The English Bill of Rights became an influence and inspiration to future governments all over the world, but especially to the forming of our own American Constitution and Bill of Rights. The Glorious Revolution represented the triumph of Parliament and the people over the tyranny of Catholicism and the crown. It becomes obvious why the hierarchy of Rome wants to downplay and obscure this part of English history and hates everything it represents. With this background of English history in mind, let's now return and fit it into the happenings of the Catholic Maryland colony..

## BACK IN MARYLAND

The civil war was in full progress when Leonard Calvert left England to return to the Maryland colony in 1644. He had left one battle scene, only to arrive in the midst of another. Quickly sizing up the 'out of hand' situation, he fled the area to find refuge among friends in the Virginian colony. He wrote to his brother, Lord Baltimore in England, painting the dark picture. Lord Baltimore fearing all was lost, wrote back instructing him to salvage whatever he could, and then return home to England. However, after two years, in 1646, when feelings had subsided, Leonard Calvert, with some Virginian friends in a force of arms, recaptured and restored the Maryland colony back to his brother's ownership. Governor Leonard Calvert died the very next year, 1647, at the extremely young age of forty-one.

That was the first of three times the Calverts were to lose the Maryland colony. But now with the Jesuits gone from his Maryland colony, and his brother governor dead, but especially to appease the new Cromwell Puritan government that was coming to power in England, Lord Baltimore Cecilius Calvert did some fancy political gymnastics in order to secure his position as Lord Proprietary of Maryland. To avert the catastrophe of having his colony stripped from him, he would make Maryland thoroughly Protestant in its sympathy and in its religion. The times now demanded that the highest offices in the province, the governor, the secretary, and commander, should all alike be Protestants.

Lord Baltimore also launched upon a vigorous program to bring Protestant immigrants into the province. The new Governor, Colonel William Stone, who originally was high sheriff of Northhampton county Virginia, recruited from Virginia five-hundred immigrants of the Protestant faith. And Lord Baltimore in the same year, was also busily engaged in England enticing newcomers of the Anglican faith, to take up residence in his Maryland colony.

The marked success of Lord Baltimore's campaign became quickly evident as the great influx of new settlers from England, Ireland, Massachusetts, and Virginia began to swarm over the fertile lands of Maryland, which lay on both sides of the Chesapeake Bay. Homesteads rose as by magic, as broad acres suddenly came under cultivation, where shortly before the primeval forest had stood. But that success also brought new problems.

Puritans now becoming a large and flourishing settlement in Annapolis, began to agitate the fact that Lord Baltimore was a Romanist and they were Puritans. The issue was taken up in England as Cromwell turned his attention to the colonies. An Act was passed, "for the reducing, settling, and governing of all the plantations within the Bay of Chesapeake". William Clayborne was there in England, who had himself appointed as one of four commissioners whose duty it was to see that the work was faithfully done. In March 1652, they heralded their arrival at St. Mary's Maryland, by deposing Governor Stone, seizing the records of the province, and establishing a new government. Great was the rejoicing among the Puritans in Maryland; great too among the Puritans in England, at what they regarded as "Babylon's Fall in Maryland".

Lord Baltimore was once again without a colony. The new Maryland Puritan Legislature passed "An Act concerning Religion" which "provided that religious liberty be not extended to popery or prelacy" and "the popish religion could not be protected in the province, but were to be restrained in the exercise thereof". But the narrowness and intolerant minds of the Puritans also prohibited liberty to anyone else who was not a Puritan. That included Quakers, Baptist, Unitarians, Jews, and even Anglicans; all being put under a ban. This continued for four years, with skirmishes and battles ensuing in between.

But just when it looked the darkest for Lord Baltimore, the state of things not being in the interest of Maryland or England herself, Cromwell put a stop to it. Referring the whole matter to the Committee of Trades and Plantations, that committee on the 16 September 1656, decided wholly in favor of Lord Baltimore, with the result that his full authority was again restored by 1658. From that time until Lord Baltimore's death, 30 November 1675, there was a long period of rest, which Lord Baltimore diligently used to push forward by every legitimate means the material advancement of his colony; particularly by sending out new emigrants to develop its untold resources. His political gymnastics had paid off. At a time when being a Roman Catholic, you were thought to be politically a traitor, Lord Baltimore himself must have marveled at his own success.

Buffeted by the austerity of Puritan rule and the event of Cromwell's death, the pendulum swung again in favor of the restoration of the king. Charles II, in 1660-1685, then came out of exile to sit upon the English throne. And hardly before the Maryland colony had been returned to Lord Baltimore, we find recorded in 1658 a Jesuit priest named Fitzherbert, who like his cohorts, had entered Maryland under an assumed name, being recorded on the ship's books as "Francis Darby, Gentleman". He was being brought to trial on the charge of threatening a man because the man and his family did not come to church. Apparently Fitzherbert was bent on becoming a worthy successor of Jesuit Copley, who had recently died, and whose mantle had evidently been bequeathed to him. As quoted from volume IX, page 757, of the Catholic Encyclopedia, "Maryland now enjoyed another era of quiet and prosperity, and the Jesuits returning (from hiding in Virginia) to the province resumed their missionary labors".

Lord Baltimore Cecilius Calvert was both a true aristocrat and shrewd diplomat, who fully understood the use of his influence and power around Court. He knew how to effectively play both ends from the middle, weighing the odds with almost a sixth sense, to achieve his goals. While the Puritans were in power in England, he made great display of the fact that his Maryland officers were Protestant and his colony was a haven for Puritan emigrants. And even though he lost his colony to the Puritans, it is immediately, as that power of the Puritan Commonwealth begins to wane, do we see Cecilius Calvert's powerful influence working and contriving to recover the colony that he had lost. But notice! No sooner had he gained full possession in 1658, with Oliver Cromwell's death also being that same year, and the Puritan State Religion now removed, do the Jesuits come out of hiding, beating a path back to Maryland. With Charles II coming to the throne in 1660, it then

becomes obvious that Cecilius Calvert was shifting in an all together different direction.

The Protestant officers had fulfilled their purpose; the storm was over, it was now back to business as usual. In 1661, Lord Baltimore Cecilius Calvert appointed his very staunch Catholic son, Charles Calvert, as Governor of Maryland. He served as governor until his father's death in 1675, at which time he both governed and became the third Lord Baltimore. On the surface, there was now peace in the valley; Catholicism was again having its way. But on the horizon there was another storm coming, more intense and permanent in its effects than the one before.

Charles Calvert was not the calculating diplomat that his father was. In fact, he found little pleasure in kings' courts, but instead, loved the plain life of a colonist in Maryland infinitely better than the fashionable life of an English nobleman. Nor did he ever seem to understand, or perhaps even cared about the spiritual needs of his Protestant settlers. But the man who could cut off his own son's annual allowance, and leave him dependent upon charity because he had become an Anglican, was not likely to be found providing for the needs of his Anglican tenants; of which they were justly entitled by the provisions in his Maryland charter. So going on his blundering way, profiting neither by his past mistakes, nor friendly warnings or advice, but instead, showing undue partiality and advantages to his Roman Catholic co-religionists; Charles Calvert, who governed the colony in person until 1684, when he sailed to England and remained there the rest of his life; had all the right ingredients for putting his colony once again in grave jeopardy.

When Charles Lord Baltimore sailed away from his Maryland colony in 1684, bound for England, he definitely had left a tempest in the teapot. In rapid fire, events took shape, both in England and in Maryland, that would in the end deprive him of his Maryland colony right up until his death in 1715, thus preventing him ever to return. King Charles II was causing his own stir in England, with his oppressive measures and rumors to sell out to Rome. Added to that, charges of just about every description were coming in thick and fast against Charles Lord Baltimore and his governing of Maryland. King Charles II wasn't much help. He died in 1685.

Surely now as King James II ascended the throne, the change would be a godsend to favor Charles Lord Baltimore's problems. King James II certainly would understand and sympathize with him more readily, since both were dedicated Roman Catholics. But shockingly, James II was hardly on his throne when he began proceedings to annul all the colonial charters then in existence. But even more shocking, especially in view of King James II being of like faith, was his particular hostile attitude directed against the colony of Maryland. What ever could be the reason for his belligerent behavior? But aah, now we see. There is someone whispering in the King's ear.

An enemy was secretly at work. The former Calverts had made a long record in their determination to oppose this group. If it had not been for the policy of Lord Baltimore Cecilius Calvert and his brother, Governor Leonard, Maryland might have been a Roman Catholic land by now. For the Jesuit agents



had truly worked and suffered long to bring that about, but just when they had reached forth to pluck the sweet fruit of their hard earned labors, the proprietary himself always blocked them. And as usual, according to Jesuit policy, it was pay back time. In their special hatred and revenge, Jesuit Petre, the King's confessor, was one of the principal instruments working to deprive Charles Lord Baltimore of his government.

In the judgment of the King and his confessor, Maryland should be punished for the record she had made for herself. Could this also be the reason for the lack of memorials honoring George Calvert, and the pure neglect of not remembering the burial site of Governor Leonard Calvert? But before James II could put into effect to end Charles Baltimore's rule, he himself had to flee England in 1688; eager not to want to provide the world with another royal execution.

Charles Lord Baltimore's troubles were now just beginning. The Glorious Revolution of 1689 in England fanned the fires of rebellion in Maryland. Under the leadership of John Coode, a former Catholic, the dissenters formed "The Protestant Association in arms to defend the Protestant religion". The government of the proprietary was overthrown, and a Committee of Public Safety was installed in its place. In 1691, England withdrew Charles Baltimore's authority to govern, making it a royal colony, but in leniency, he was allowed to retain his property rights so that he could collect his rents.

In 1692, an "Act of Religion" was passed and declared that all the penal laws of England existing at that time against Catholics were to be also enforced in the colony. The Act established the Church of England as the Church of the province, and provided for conformity with its worship and discipline. It was during this troublesome period that Charles Lord Baltimore in October 1688, sent to the Maryland colony as his property agent, a man named Charles Carroll; an extremely wealthy person who founded one of Maryland's leading families. We will have much to say about the Carroll's in a later chapter. But it was through this family that the Jesuits and Roman Catholicism were to "covertly" succeed in establishing themselves among the North American English colonies.

The Maryland colony, like England herself, became firmly Protestant. And for the only hope of the proprietorship of Maryland to ever be returned to the Calverts, was for them to become Protestant also. This is just what the son and grandson of Charles Calvert did; they became Anglicans. And in 1715, the year that his grandfather died, Charles II Calvert, the grandson, succeeded to the title of the 5th baron of Baltimore, and the Crown restored to the Calverts the full proprietary powers specified in the Maryland charter. The Roman Catholic Church, its priests, and the practice of its religion, was most actively and stringently suppressed, from the time the Catholic government was overthrown in 1689, up until the colonies declared their independence in 1776.

In spite of all the Acts legislated to proscribe Catholicism, by 1769, from an estimated Maryland population of about 300,000, there were nearly 12,000 Catholics with fourteen Jesuits supplying their spiritual needs. But a "new

order” of things was coming. The proclamation of independence was in the air. With the anticipation of the American Revolution, it became the hope to put an end to the royal authority in the American colonies, and loose the shackles that bound Catholicism, giving it the freedom that it wants to deprive all others of having.

(To be continued.)

## **All chapters of The Grand Design Exposed**

- [Chapter 1 Manufactured Crises – A Plot For World Change](#)
- [Chapter 2 The Knights Templar Paves Way For Protestant Reformation](#)
- [Chapter 3 Rome – Implacable Enemy of God’s Truth](#)
- [Chapter 4 Martin Luther – A Man Used of God](#)
- [Chapter 5 Rome’s Counter Reformation and the Jesuits](#)
- [Chapter 6 Society of Jesus order – A Look At Ignatius Loyola](#)
- [Chapter 7 English History American Heritage](#)
- [Chapter 8 The Catholic Maryland Colony](#)
- [Chapter 9 The Freemasonry Metamorphosis](#)
- [Chapter 10 The Jesuit Brothers of the Pyramid](#)