

CONTENTS

BOOK ONE: ANTECEDENTS AND PREPARATIONS

Forward.....	3
CHAPTER	
I. The English Mission Field.....	5
II. Between Two Fires.....	11
III. Early Attempts At Catholic Migration.....	14
IV. George Calvert The First Lord Baltimore.....	17
V. Westward Ho for Avalon.....	23
VI. The Promised Land	
VII. The First Lord Baltimore And The Jesuits(counter reformation)	
VIII. The Royal Charter And Its Antecedents	
IX. From Father To Son	
X. The Voyage	

BOOK TWO: THE PLANTING

I. The Landing of the Pilgrims	
II. Old St. Mary's	
III. Christian and Heathen Neighbors	
IV. Real Religious Liberty	
V. The Exercise of Self-Government	
VI. The Leaven Of Democracy	
VII. Some Contrasts in Law Making	
VIII. As to Roger Williams and Rhode Island	
IX. A Rude Awakening	

- X. The (counter reformation)Jesuit-Baltimore Controversy
- XI. Governor Leonard Calvert
- XII. An Act Concerning Religion
- XIII. Puritan Ingratitude
- XIV. A Land of Sanctuary
- XV. The End Of Catholic Rule In Maryland

BOOK THREE: THE HARVEST

- I. From Baltimore To Carroll
- II. Charles Carroll Of Doughoregan
- III. Charles Carroll of Carrollton
- IV. Preparing For Independence
- V. Supporting The Revolution
- VI. John Carroll
- VII. James Wilson And Daniel Carroll
- VIII. Saving The Constitution
- IX. The First Amendment
- X. The Tenth Amendment

In this world it really does not matter what your personal religious beliefs are, but what is happening in the world today has everything to do with Sun(Baal) Worship. It does not matter if you believe in Sun(Baal) Worship or not, if the people who believe in Roman Catholicism(Sun(Baal) Worship) are in government this will most assuredly affect you.

FOREWORD

A little more than three centuries ago, in the late autumn of the year 1699, two ships set sail from the Isle of Wight and, with a favoring wind, headed for the open sea. As it was too late in the season to venture in a direct course to the Chesapeake Bay Country whither they were bound, these ships chose a southwesterly course to avoid the storms that were sure to come on the North Atlantic before a crossing could be made. The larger of the two ships was the Ark of three hundred tons burden. The other was the Dove, a little ship of only fifty tons and of the type of the old English pinnace. Her ability to cross the sea was measured by the sturdiness of her crew.

It so happened that the names of these two ships were strikingly significant of the motive that prompted the voyage. The sailing of the Ark and the Dove took place at a time when there had long been a misalliance of religion and politics. Sir Philip Sidney during the Elizabethan reign had said that the highest political wisdom was to be found in the dictum that religion and politics must never be separated along into the seventeenth century.

There was much religious persecution that had its source in politics. Of real religion there was little. In the words of Dean Swift, most men had just enough to make them hate one another and not enough to make them love one another, bigotry was enthroned, and its rule suffered no dissent and granted no freedom.

Toleration was little understood. Lord Stanhope in the debate on the repeal of the Test and Corporation Act in 1827 made the comment that the "time was when toleration was craved by dissenters as a boon, it is now demanded as a right, but the time will come when it will be spurned as an insult." In the days before the sailing of the Ark and the Dove mere toleration would have been a welcome blessing to those who could not conform to a faith that was not theirs but which the government insisted should be imposed upon them.

There were few men in England at the time who had any sympathy for toleration, much less any conception of the idea of freedom of conscience. But because of these few the voyage of the Ark and the Dove was made possible. It was the ideal of religious freedom transmitted from father to sons and put into actual practise when the voyage was ended that bore rich fruit on Maryland soil.

It may be easy to attribute other motives for this venture, but to the father who conceived it and to the sons who led it the need of a greater freedom was very real. It was the realization of this need and the desire for the attainment of this ideal that accomplished the end they sought.

There could have been **no religious freedom** where those who having *gained it for themselves, denied it to others*. God fearing men and women, sturdy and courageous, had crossed the sea in ships in order that they might worship God after their own fashion, but the truth as they saw it forbade them to grant to others the same privilege they sought for themselves. In such a gain of freedom there was little of value for posterity.

Those who set sail from the Isle of Wight in the late autumn of 1633 sailed under orders that proclaimed **religious freedom for all** who might seek sanctuary at the journey's end. On these two ships were men of different faiths and creeds and these faiths and creeds were to be equally respected before the law. Herein the voyage of the Ark and the Dove was quite without a precedent in the history of the **Christian era**.

History has quite generally ignored the Ark and the Dove. Their names are not familiar and there is scant mention of them by most historians. History as it has been written has been more than kind to the Mayflower, which thirteen years before the departure of the Ark and the Dove sailed from old England to new England. In fact it may be said that the name "Mayflower" is a household word in America and has been widely used and recognized in many ways. Yet after all is said and done, the Mayflower really brought little to America, for it was overladen with the spirit of the Old Dispensation with a goodly mixture of rigid Calvinistic theology. Fortunately, the Maryland Ark of the old covenant was leavened with the mildness and charity of the Dove, the spirit of the New Dispensation.

On the voyage of the Ark and the Dove were three missionaries of the Society of Jesus(counter reformation), two priests and a lay brother. They did not take passage until the day of final departure. Jesuits(counter reformation) in the England of those days had to be wary of their comings and goings and it would not have been prudent to have had their departure heralded so that everyone might know of it. The influence of the English (counter reformation) mission on the foundation of this most interesting of the thirteen colonies needs to be told. Out of the English mission came the first American Jesuit(counter reformation) mission which constitutes the Maryland-New York Province of this great religious order.

American historians, notably Bancroft and Parkman, have not failed to pay tribute to the heroic missionaries who came to New France to suffer privation and unspeakable cruelties in order that they might carry the Message of the Cross to the natives of the North American wilderness, and they have painted a soul-stirring picture for their readers to behold and admire, yet there has hardly been mention made of the holy influence of the little band of Jesuit(counter reformation) missionaries sent out on the voyage of the first colonists of Maryland and those who followed them, to bring to America not bigotry and intolerance, but the message of peace and good will.

The seeds of both religious and civil liberty were planted on the banks of the St. Mary's after the landing of the Ark and the Dove. There was not only freedom of religious worship in early Maryland. There was equality before the law and a representative democracy wherein the people became the real source of power. The electoral franchise was freely given and was dependent neither upon church membership nor ownership of property. In later years there was much to retard the growth from that early planting, but the harvest time came finally with the American Constitution and the first amendments thereto. It was a long time from seed-time to harvest – a little over a century and a half. It is some of the events of this period and the great silent forces that gave rise to these events that the following pages attempt to Portray.

For the use of the map of St. Mary's City and Bay and for the drawings of the Ark and the Dove I am indebted to Mr. Swepson Earle of Baltimore, author of. The Chesapeake Bay Country.

J. Moss Ives
September 8, 1935

THE ARK AND THE DOVE

BOOK I

ANTECEDENTS AND PREPARATIONS

CHAPTER I

THE ENGLISH MISSION FIELD

Forty years after Ignatius Loyola founded the order which became known as the Society of Jesus, and as many years after Henry VIII, for the love of Anne Boleyn, broke from the See of Rome to become the head of his own ecclesiastical establishment, two English-born Jesuit(counter reformation) priests returned to their country to attempt to restore it to the old faith. It was likewise forty years since Edmund Campion first saw the light of day in London. Now in the year 1580, with his companion, Robert Persons, he was returning to his native land, to minister to the faithful and within a year to suffer a martyr's death on the gallows of Tyburn. Graduate of Oxford, former Anglican, brilliant in intellect, eloquent of speech and of attractive personality, Campion had abandoned the path of opportunism and preferment to take the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience. Persons, also an Oxford man, had been fellow and tutor at Balliol and had attained eminence in scholarship.

It was a dangerous time for these priests to come back to their native country, for England had placed their church under the ban of persecution and had outlawed all Catholic priests. Three years before, Cuthbert Mayne, a Cornwall priest, was found guilty of denying the spiritual supremacy of the Queen and saying Mass. He became the first member of the Catholic clergy to suffer capital punishment in England.

The exercise of his priestly functions was construed as an act of treason. With Father Mayne, there had been convicted as aiders and abettors of his treason, sixteen of his parishioners, including the owner of the house where Mass was said, for which heinous crime he languished in prison for twenty-eight years and his estate was seized by the crown.

The majority of the English people were Catholic by tradition and by choice, and had desired no change in the established religion of the realm. Elizabeth, who had been half inclined to be a Catholic herself, would not have persecuted her Catholic subjects of her own will, but behind the throne was her wily minister, William Cecil. It was the hand and mind of this able politician that ruled the land. It was he who decided there should be no return to the ancient faith. With the aid of a powerful minority that, like its leader, had become immensely wealthy from the loot of the churches and the confiscation of monastery and friars' lands, he had his way and England became and remained Protestant. This came about not because of any hatred of the Catholic religion, but because Cecil and his followers were determined to protect their fortunes-they were fearful lest the plunder they had amassed would be lost to them if the old religion was restored.¹

Pope Pius V had played into the hands of these men when he issued his bull of excommunication against the English Queen. Elizabeth had feared it, but when it came it only angered her and made it all the easier for Cecil to bend her to his will. It served the cause of the English Catholics poorly and made their lot the harder. Anti-Catholic legislation of the most drastic nature was enacted. Conformity to the national church was made the dividing line between patriotism and treason and the oath of supremacy was the means whereby conformity was enforced.

There were more Catholics in England all through the reign of Elizabeth than most historians have ever been willing to admit. These two Jesuit(counter reformation) missionaries had come to satisfy what they had reason to believe were the longings and desires of the larger part of their fellow countrymen. They knew that their task would be a difficult one and fraught with danger. Prior to their coming every jail in England numbered among its inmates Catholics who were imprisoned solely for their religion. Many of these had died while they were incarcerated, so foul were the conditions that were allowed to exist in all the jails. Death had annually thinned the ranks of the secular clergy who had remained in the face of persecution and who were endeavoring as best they could to minister to those who like themselves had kept true to the faith. Following the fate of Father Mayne,

priests were tortured and put to death. There was a call for help to save the faith. These Jesuit(counter reformation) missionaries like him who crossed from Troas to Philippi and heard the cry to "come over into Macedonia and help us" obeyed the summons and had no fear of persecution or death.

At the Jesuit(counter reformation) residence at St. Omer's where the missionaries stayed on the eve of their departure, the fathers tried to dissuade them from attempting to enter England. Their coming had been known for some time. News had been received that full particulars of both Campion and Persons had been furnished to the Queen's council and that portraits of the expected Jesuits(counter reformation) had been sent to all the government searchers at the ports. Persons insisted that if their entrance was dangerous now it would only be more so later on. They had made deliberate choice and no fear of danger or peril to themselves could now deter them.

It was decided that Persons should first make the attempt and if he succeeded he would send for Campion. By adopting clever disguises they were able to elude the cordon of spies and watchers that had been thrown out to prevent their landing. Persons was disguised as a soldier and obtained consent for his friend to follow him. Campion came over a few days later disguised as a merchant. When it became known that the Jesuits(counter reformation) were actually in England and had outwitted the police, there was consternation in the Privy Council. Cecil had both respect and fear for "the light cavalry of the Pope" and had made up his mind that there would be no work of the counter-reformation in England to thwart his ends. He knew Campion. He had been captivated by the eloquence of the young priest as had Elizabeth herself, when Campion was a student at Oxford and he had called him "one of the diamonds" of England. He now had reason to fear his power and influence. A royal proclamation was issued which warned all persons who knew or heard of any Jesuit(counter reformation) in the kingdom and did not reveal where he was concealed, that they should be prosecuted and punished as abettors of treason.

Within a few days after the landing of Persons and Campion, had come the close of the session of Parliament in the twenty-third year of the reign of Elizabeth. With its closing was passed the usual act of grace and pardon covering every crime from murder to petty larceny, but there was one exception. The new crime of non-conformity was not to be condoned, nor the offender pardoned. To this land of persecution overshadowed and overlorded by the greatest arch-plotter in English history came these Jesuit(counter reformation) missionaries with the fond purpose at heart to restore their native land to the orthodox faith.

As Jesuits(counter reformation) had been accused of complicity in every plot against established rule in Protestant countries, it is not surprising that in the reign of Elizabeth they should be accused of plotting to overthrow the English government.

Secrecy and the use of disguise necessarily surrounded the labors of the mission priests, but these had nothing to do with political intrigues and plots of assassination. There was no trace of secular intrigue in the reports of the early missionaries sent to Rome. "About parliament," writes one of them to his superior, "I say nothing as I desire my letter like my soul to have nothing to do with matters of state." Had not the mission kept clear of politics in the way it did, Professor Meyer says, "it could not have achieved its great religious success."²

There may have been at times exceptions to this rule. Even Catholic writers have claimed that Persons was guilty of political intrigue, but if he was they admit "he threw obedience to the winds."³ The general of the order had given the English missionaries specific instructions not to interfere with matters of government and directly forbade them to discuss political questions. When he arrived in London, Persons assured the secular clergy that he had come only to treat of religion "in truth and simplicity, and to attend to the gaining of souls without any pretense or knowledge of matters of state."⁴ If Persons did stoop to intrigue it was in disobedience to orders. Exceptional cases always attract the attention of historians because they are exceptions, but are seldom noted as such.⁵

As the persecution became more severe more priests came to England to brave death in the perilous mission field. In their panic the Protestants magnified the little group of missionaries into a host of disguised Jesuits. The invasion of this imaginary host was met by the seizure of as many priests as the government could lay hands on and the imprisonment of hundreds of lay Catholics throughout the country.⁶ This was followed by the calling of an assembly of parliament early in 1581. The parliament solemnly enacted that:

All persons pretending to any power of absolving subjects from their allegiance or practising to withdraw them to the Romish religion with all persons after the present session willingly so absolved or reconciled to the See of Rome shall be guilty of High Treason.

Hiding by day and going forth only by night and under disguise, seldom spending more than one night under the same roof, the mission priests were tracked and hounded by the agents and spies of Cecil. "We shall not long be able to escape the hands of the heretics," wrote Campion from one of his hiding places, "so many eyes are centered on us, so many enemies beset us. I am constantly disguised, and am constantly changing both my dress and my name." So hot was the pursuit that Persons was forced to flee to the continent while Campion was apprehended within a year from the time he crossed the Dover channel. Persons never returned to England or he would probably have suffered the same fate as Campion.

Father Campion suffered a cruel martyrdom. England had borrowed her methods of torture from the Spanish Inquisition after these had long been abandoned, and put them into service in the torture of Catholic priests. After his arrest Campion was racked and tortured with the utmost barbarity. Brought before the Queen to speak in his own defense it was seen that when he was making a gesture in his speech all the finger nails had been torn by force from the flesh. A vain attempt was made to have him implicate others in a plot concocted in the fertile imagination of Cecil. He was finally brought to trial with no less than twelve secular priests and one layman. To their astonishment they were indicted for a conspiracy to murder the Queen and overthrow the government. There was no evidence to support such a charge. The trial was a travesty. Hallam acknowledged that "it was as unfairly conducted and supported by as slender evidence as can be found in our books."⁷

One was remanded, the others, including Campion, were found guilty and condemned to suffer the death of traitors. This was the sentence pronounced:

You must go to the place from whence you came, there to remain until ye shall be drawn through the open city of London upon hurdles to the place of execution and there to be hanged and let down alive, and your privy parts cut off and your entrails taken out and burnt in your sight; then your hands to be cut off your bodies to be divided into four parts to be disposed at Her Majesty's pleasure. And God have mercy upon your souls.

Upon hearing the sentence Campion burst out into the triumphant hymn, "*Te Deum laudamus. Te Dominum confitemur*," in which the others joined. He was carried back to the tower and put in irons. His keeper said he had a saint to guard. Friday, December 1st, was fixed for the execution. The day was dismal and raining. Campion and two secular priests, Sherwin and Briant, were led out and tied to the hurdles. Through the mud and slush they were dragged with a rabble of ministers and fanatics beside them. The three priests, with faces lit with the internal joy that filled their hearts, actually laughed as they neared Tyburn, and many of the onlookers wondered how this could be. It is said that several converts to the Catholic faith were made that day.

The executions were unnecessarily cruel. Before his death Campion forgave his persecutors and prayed for the Queen whom he acknowledged to be his sovereign. "We are come here to die, but we are not traitors," he said upon the scaffold. "I am a Catholic man and a priest. In that faith I have lived and mean to die. If you consider my religion treason, then I am guilty. Other treason I never committed as God is my judge."

The heroism of the martyred priests won the respect of many Protestants, and when they saw one of the hated Jesuits(counter reformation) go to his death with a prayer for the excommunicated Queen on his lips, they questioned whether a system that could send to death such a man as this could prevail. Some there were who gave warning that too many martyrs were being made for the Church of Rome. Henry Walpole came as a Protestant to witness the death of Campion. He went away inwardly convinced of the truth of the martyr's faith. He afterwards became a Catholic and a Jesuit and suffered a similar fate to Campion. Cecil afterwards issued two pamphlets to explain and justify the severities and tortures that were used in the cases of Campion and the other priests who suffered with him, but his excuses were so weak that Hallam says they only served to "mingle contempt with detestation."

The protests that came as the result of these executions did not stay the hand of Cecil. The persecution went on and "the rack seldom stood idle in the Tower for all the latter part of Elizabeth's reign." No Catholic could longer enjoy liberty of worship. There was risk of torture and death for the priest and imprisonment and confiscation of property for the layman. Pursuivants and recusants now became familiar terms in English history. To the pursuivants, officers of the humblest rank in the college of heraldry, but with powers and emoluments by no means humble, was given the privilege of tracking down the Catholic non-conformists and for reward they received one-third part of the property confiscated. In this way there was raised a zealous army of heresy hunters and to each was given "a sense of importance in being an assistant district attorney of God, to prepare

indictments for the last judgment, together with the excitement of playing the amateur detective in uncovering mysterious evil doers."⁸

Spying came to be considered an honorable means of livelihood, and the sport of tale-bearing became more popular than ever, now that it was placed on a paying basis. The Catholic victims of these heresy hunters became known as recusants, and their refusal to conform to the national religion made a rich living for the army of pursuivants. Their homes were subject to search and their property to seizure at any hour of day or night. Names of recusants in each parish, amounting to about fifty thousand, had been returned to the Privy Council, and the jails were filled with persons suspected of being priests or harborers of priests.

Next to enter upon the scene of the Elizabethan drama was the "provocateur," a sinister creation of Walsingham, Cecil's chief ally and organizer of the spy system. There had to be Catholic plots with which to frighten the Queen and win her over to the Cecilian policy. *As there were no real plots, some* had to be manufactured. The provocateurs were fewer in number than the pursuivants, but their rewards were greater as the result of their work was more momentous. There were more of these creatures than has been revealed, for they moved stealthily behind the scenes of history, and the names of only a few ever came to light. When a plot was needed, a provocateur was ready at hand to instigate one, and once instigated, it was carefully nurtured until the time came for the great expose'.

When Campion came to England on his perilous mission the luckless Mary, Queen of Scots, was held a prisoner in the land where she had sought a refuge. She threw herself on the mercy of Elizabeth, only to become a victim of the wiles of Cecil. Elizabeth's promised help for the exiled Scottish Queen was not forthcoming. Cecil stood in the way. It did not fit in with his policy to permit a possible Catholic successor to the English throne to be at large. Mary had become the rallying point for the hopes and ambitions of the English Catholics who had good reason, if they saw fit, to attempt her liberation, for there was nothing to justify her imprisonment. There had been a Catholic uprising in the north country which was poorly organized and quickly and ruthlessly put down. In order to convince Elizabeth that her life was in danger as long as the Scottish Queen was living, there was a plot needed which should have for its double purpose the liberation of Mary and the assassination of Elizabeth. No such plot as this had been forthcoming, but Walsingham, the fabricator of plots, was equal to the occasion. The necessary provocateur was found in the person of one Gilbert Gifford, whose perfidy, aided by the cunning of Walsingham and directed by the finesse of Cecil, was soon to bring the Scottish Queen to the block and rid England of a Catholic heir apparent to the throne of the Tudors.

There was a strong spiritual bond between the missionaries and the lay-Catholics which had been riveted by their common dangers and perils. It is safe to say that it was the work of the missionary priests that saved the Catholic faith from being utterly exterminated in England. Their most difficult task was to strengthen the faith of those who were easily frightened into conformity to the new religion. The attacks upon the Catholic Church and its priests were making headway with the weaker members of the flock. It was a case of the survival of the most devout. Those who did survive were those whose faith was real, and whose spiritual lives had only been deepened by the experiences and sufferings they had undergone. These numbered many of the best families of the nobility and for them to remain true to their faith meant far more than to others who had less to lose.

The loyalty of the English Catholics met a severe test when Philip of Spain sent his Armada to drive Elizabeth from the throne. The militant faction of the Catholics was mostly on the continent, receiving many recruits from the ranks of the English refugees, and there can be no doubt but that this faction planned and hoped for a Catholic uprising in England to aid the Spanish forces in placing a Catholic on the English throne. Cardinal Allen was leader of this faction, and attempted to enlist support for the Spanish invasion of his native country. Persons' forced exile on the continent and the Spanish influence to which he was subjected unfortunately led him to take the side of Allen. He was betrayed by the hope of regaining; England through the intervention of Spain, rather than through the toil and sacrifice of the missionaries.. Not all the exiles, however, favored the armed intervention of Spain. Many of these viewed with disapproval"the sight of ministers of a kingdom not of this world dabbling in politics to the certain disgrace of their cause."⁹ Flanders was the great place of refuge of the English exiles who "were not by any means all favorable to the Spanish policy of aggrandizement under the plea of religion."¹⁰ Only a few, if any, of the Catholics in England, gave encouragement to the invaders. There was a Catholic uprising when the Armada neared the English coast, but it was an uprising in support of the Protestant Queen.

All religious differences were forgotten and all Englishmen, Protestant and Catholic alike, rallied to the standard of their Queen. The persecuted, and even the imprisoned Catholics, laid aside all resentment for their past

treatment and offered their services to the government, but it was the Queen and not her ministers, to whom they pledged their support. The Catholic prisoners in Ely signed a declaration of their readiness to fight in defense of their sovereign against "all her enemies, were they kings or priests or pope or any other potentate whatsoever." The ministers, themselves in a report published later stated that "no difference could be found on this occasion between the Protestants and Catholics," and mentions the Catholic Viscount Montague, who, with his son and grandson, presented himself before the Queen "at the head of two hundred horse that he had raised for the defense of her person."¹¹

"The Catholic gentry who had been painted as longing for the coming of the stranger," says Green, "led their tenantry to the muster at Tillbury. The loyalty of the Catholics decided the fate of Philip's scheme."¹² The Catholic lords on Allen's list of those from whom help for the invading forces might be expected, Cumberland, Oxford and Northumberland brought their vessels alongside the English naval fleet as the Armada appeared in the channel.

After the defeat of the Armada the Catholics received no reward for their loyalty through any cessation of the persecution. There was no recognition in any way of the part they had taken in the defense of their queen and country, and no gratitude shown. The persecution was continued with renewed severity, and from the defeat of the Armada to the death of Elizabeth, fourteen years later, no less than sixty-one priests, forty-seven laymen and two women suffered capital punishment for their religion. On one fateful day in August 1588 no less than thirteen men – six priests and seven lay-men – suffered death on the scaffold.

The persecution spared neither age nor sex. "Religious fanaticism was at its height," writes Professor Meyer, and it "developed traits hitherto foreign to the character of the English people. In the ferocity with which they treated women and children Englishmen acted contrary to their true character, even more than by resorting to unscrupulous espionage."¹³ It was not uncommon for women and children to be arrested while hearing mass and cast into prison.¹⁴ A Catholic boy was racked and tortured to make him betray his friends and died a traitor's death. According to Willis-Bund, *State Trials*, he was only thirteen years of age. The executions continued to be featured with unspeakable cruelty. In addition to this, the penalties of recusancy, heavy fines, frequent search and seizure and imprisonment visited nearly all who remained true to their faith. There was more need than ever of the ministrations and sacrifices of the **mission priests**.

There were always recruits ready to fill vacancies in the ranks caused by the deaths of the martyrs. These came from the young men who had left their homes in England to receive their training and education in the colleges in France and Belgium, and then to return to brave the perils of the mission field. The dawn of the new century found the missionaries gaining in numbers and influence, and all this was to be needed, for the end of the Tudor dynasty was not to mark the end of the persecution.

1. Belloc, *Charles the First*, 43,
2. Meyer, *England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth*, 204,
3. Taunton, *English Black Monks of St. Benedict I*, 240.
4. Simpson, *Edmund Campion*, 183.
5. LaFarge, *Jesuits in Modern Times*, 141.
6. Green, *History of the English People, II*, 396.
7. *Constitutional History of England*, (5th Edition, N.Y., 1870), 92,
8. Van Dyke, *Ignatius Loyola*, 109
9. Taunton, *History of the Jesuits in England*, 104,
10. *Ibid* 108
10. *Ibid* 108.
11. Lingard, *History of England 4th Edition*. VIII, 277, note.
12. *History of the English People II*, 422
13. *Op. cit.*, 176.
14. Strype, *Annals*, II (1824), 11,660,662,

CHAPTER II

BETWEEN TWO FIRES

James VI, King of Scotland, only off-spring of the unfortunate marriage of Mary, Queen of Scots, and Lord Darnley, paid a price for the English throne and so became James I of England. **The price paid was his tacit consent to his mother's execution.**¹ In addition to receiving the promise of his succession to Elizabeth, he received, to boot, a liberal pension and six pairs of bloodhounds. When his mother's life was in peril and she needed the support of her son, he abandoned her to her fate. Soon after her sentence he sent envoys, one of whom was a pensioner of the English court, to request that proceedings against his mother be stayed until he could be made acquainted with her offense. It was suggested that man's life be spared on condition that she resign her rights to her son. This would secure Elizabeth from the fear of a competitor and the established church from the danger of a Catholic successor. When it was replied that Mary had no rights to resign, the envoys represented that their master would be compelled in honor to avenge his mother's death. One of the envoys assured Elizabeth, however, that James had sent them merely to save appearances and that whatever he might pretend, he would be easily pacified with a "present of dogs and deer."² On the receipt of the news of his mother's execution, he wept and talked of vengeance, but when members of the Scottish parliament on their bended knees implored him to avenge his mother's death, he put them off by saying he must consult his allies. His resentment, such as it was, soon evaporated. It was believed at the time that he looked upon the death of his mother as a personal benefit for it relieved him from his fear of a rival for the Scottish throne.³

In justice to Mary Stuart it can be said that her son inherited more from his father than from his mother. He inherited nearly all of Darnley's weak traits, including a trait of cowardice. He had read and studied much but had learned little. Of what little learning he had, he made a great show. He claimed, with some excuse, to be a great theologian but religion to him, as to most of those who were to help him rule his new kingdom, was a matter of politics.

When he came to England, James had three choices of outward religious faith, Anglican, Catholic and Puritan. Presbyterianism offered him no choice. He knew that if he espoused the cause of the state church he would be its head. This appealed to his pride and vanity, and of these traits there was far more in his character than any real religion. There were reasons why he should be inclined toward a policy of toleration. It was for his interest to effect a compromise among the opposing factions. He had shown favor to Catholics and had promised to relieve the severity of their fines. The Pope looked favorably upon him and ordered the missionary priests to countenance no action against him.⁴ There were two factors, however, that militated against a change of religious policy and shattered the early hopes of the Catholics for a lessening of the persecution.

While there had been a change of dynasties in the English monarchy, from the House of Tudor to the House of Stuart, there was no change in the power behind the throne. When Walsingham died in 1590, the first Cecil, Lord Burghley, had his son, Robert, become his assistant. Upon the death of the father, the younger Cecil took control of the invisible government, and true to his father's policy, he saw to it that England remained anti-Catholic. It was Robert Cecil who placed James on the throne, as his father before him had given the throne to Elizabeth. Without the new king being quite aware of what it was all about, his prime minister became master of the government, and the first Stuart king yielded unconsciously to the dictatorship of the House of Cecil, as had the last of the Tudor monarchs.

Robert Cecil was aware of the danger to his power and fortune that would come **if James was allowed to grant toleration to the Catholics.** Then there was the slowly rising tide of Puritanism which was as inimical to Catholicism as was the government under the sway of Cecil. The Catholics soon found themselves between two fires, the stern repressive policy of the government, prompted by political and mercenary motives, and the enmity of the Puritan party motivated by religious bigotry and prejudice. It is difficult now to see which was the worse for them.

Although James was at first inclined to be tolerant toward his Catholic subjects, it was not long before he was accused of being at heart a "Papist," and this was a little more than he could stand. In order to remove the impression that he had any leaning toward the Catholic faith, he issued in the second year of his reign a proclamation enjoining the banishment of all Catholic missionaries and the magistrates were ordered to put the penal laws of the Elizabethan reign into effect. As a result, between five and six thousand Catholics had to

surrender two-thirds of their estates and incur enormous fines. Many forfeited their entire personal property.⁵

In the star chamber James avowed his detestation of the Church of Rome and declared he wanted no child of his to succeed him on the throne if that child should become a Catholic. He did not put to death as many Catholics as did his predecessor, but he made the lot of the living so miserable that they might just as well have suffered martyrdom by death.

Then in 1605 came the gun-powder plot, and this did not help matters any. For the incredible folly of a few hotheaded fanatics, the great body of loyal Catholic subjects, who had never countenanced resort to force and violence, had to suffer. The plot was so clumsily executed that it was soon discovered. Then there followed what might have been expected. Cecil's power became supreme, England as a nation became definitely Protestant, and Catholics were placed under a ban of suspicion which lasted for over a century.⁶

In 1606 new and more severe penal laws were enacted. Under the provisions of an "Act for the Better Repressing of **Popish Recusants**" a fine of twenty pounds each month was imposed on all over the age of sixteen who refused to attend the services of the Church of England, or in lieu of a fine, to suffer forfeiture of two-thirds of their lands. Power was given to the king to refuse the fine and seize the lands at will. The fine of twenty pounds a month was exacted only of those who were possessed of large estates. At the accession of James there were not more than sixteen Catholics whose landed estates were large enough to allow them to escape forfeiture of their lands by paying fines. Upon the less wealthy fell the hardest exaction of all: the forfeiture of two-thirds of their lands. Those without landed estates were mulcted of their personal property. When the fine of twenty pounds a month was exacted for non-conformity, it was made to cover a period of a year, a demand which reduced many families to absolute beggary.⁸

The pursuivants were not forgotten. A supplementary bill was passed providing that anyone discovering Mass being said or relief being given to a Jesuit missionary priest, should receive a reward of one-third of any fine imposed or one-third of the property forfeited. Again the heresy hunter stalked through the land. Catholic subjects were at the mercy of these paid spies. They knew not whom to trust among their friends and neighbors, for friendship was often used as a cloak to hide the work of the informer seeking his reward.

Added to the army of pursuivants were the King's indigent favorites. It was a chance for them to obtain money and property which they very much needed. Catholics were "farmed out" to these needy courtiers who were allowed to make such terms with the recusants as they might please.

Many of these courtiers so favored were men who had come with the king from Scotland. There had been intense jealousy between the two kingdoms, and these Scotch favorites were looked upon as foreigners. For the king to place English subjects at the mercy of these Scottish minions was only to add insult to injury. King James did not hesitate to enrich his own purse at the expense of his Catholic subjects and before he allowed his favorites to receive plunder, he saw to it that he had some for himself. By his own account, he received a net income of thirty-six thousand pounds per annum from fines and forfeitures imposed on Catholics.

It was not in money and property alone that the English Catholics suffered in the reign of James. They were deprived of most of the rights and liberties which were dear to them as English freemen. No Catholic who refused to conform could seek redress in a court of law or equity. He could not hold public office nor be an officer in the army, nor could he practise law or medicine. Any Catholic married except in the Church of England was disabled to have any estate of freehold in the lands of his or her wife or husband. He could not educate his own children. Catholic children sent to foreign Catholic schools or colleges forfeited their inheritance to their Protestant next of kin. Furthermore, when parents tried to send their children to seminaries on the continent, the English schools and colleges being barred to Catholics, the state interfered, took the children from their parents and had them educated in the homes of Protestant clergymen, at their parents' expense. The right to search homes was greatly abused. Armed with warrants anyone could visit a Catholic home under the pretext of enforcing the law and then exact bribes. From the poor, the pursuivants usually seized furniture and cattle. The old common law maxim that "a man's house is his castle" gave no protection to a non-conforming Catholic. Even after death, his troubled soul was not suffered to rest in peace. His body could not be buried in consecrated ground, but in the burial ground of the established church. The right of holy sepulchre was denied him. In death as in life, he was pursued by the grim specter of conformity.

After the exposure of the gun-powder plot, Robert Cecil was at the zenith of his power, but his reign was only to last six years longer. In 1616 came his death, but with it did not come the end of the Catholic persecution. The

Cecilian policy, selfish and mercenary, had sapped the economic strength of the monarchy and, contemporaneous with it, had come the gradual ascendancy of the Puritan party. James, after the death of his minister, found himself greatly handicapped by what the House of Cecil had taken from him. The monarchy, weakened not only in power and influence, had lost heavily in worldly estate. As the church lands had been confiscated and sold by the elder Cecil, the royal lands had been sold by the younger Cecil on a ruinous scale.⁹

James was now forced to compromise with the Puritan taxpayers and to meet the pressing needs of royal rule, he must now yield to the policies of the new parliamentary party. Little pressure was brought to bear on the throne by the English churchmen who were not particularly hostile to the old church. The Catholic persecution under the Cecils was ostensibly to protect the established church, but it was based more on political and economic grounds than on religious. The Church of England had tried to take a middle ground between Rome and Geneva, but leaned more toward Rome. But there was no middle ground for the Puritans.

It was an uncompromising, relentless persecution so far as they were concerned, and James did not dare to show any favor to his Catholic subjects, although there were times after the death of Cecil when he seemed disposed toward a mild toleration. Although never enforced with uniform rigidity, the penal laws were always on the statute books as ready weapons that could be used at any time.

Persecution was relaxed when the crown prince Charles was suitor for the hand of the Catholic Infanta Maria of Spain. As an indication of how the prisons were crowded with Catholics "so that there was little room for thieves," no less than four thousand prisoners obtained their discharge when the King in 1616 preparatory to the Spanish match, ranted liberty to Catholics under the penal laws.¹⁰ As soon as the Spanish match was broken off, the persecution which had temporarily abated, began again with renewed vigor.

Even during periods when enforcement of the **penal laws** was relaxed, a Catholic was never better off than a **paroled prisoner**. He was always circumscribed in the exercise of his religion. He had no church to attend and could only worship in secret. So all through the reign of James the tide of persecution ebbed and flowed, sometimes abating, at other times setting in with increased severity, but never ceasing. Through all these years the missionary priests remained at their posts to be shepherds of the little flock of the faithful.

In the face of tremendous odds the mission had a phenomenal growth. In 1610, thirty years after two solitary priests came to England to establish the mission, the membership was so large that there were fifty-three in England, all being priests except one lay brother who was in prison. The roll of death showed the martyrdom of sixteen members at Tyburn, St. Paul's church-yard, or on the rack. In 1623 the mission was enlarged into a province and ten years later was to send its first missionaries to America. At this latter time no less than three hundred and thirty-eight members referred to the province as their own, although they were not all in England.¹¹ Many of the priests had been banished and some of these returned at the risk of being executed in accordance with the statute prohibiting the return of priests from exile. According to Bishop Challoner, forty-seven mission priests were sent into perpetual banishment at various times.¹² It was long before the sending of the first missionaries from the English province to America that groups of English Catholics made attempts to migrate across the sea to escape the double fire of persecution.

1. Belloc says: "Young King James of Scotland who was, by that time, in Cecil's pay, consented to his mother's removal by the axe." *A History of England*, IV, 378.

2. Egerton, *Life of Lord Egerton*, (r8oz) 116.

3. Lingard, op. cit., VIII, 255.

4. Belloc, op. cit., IV, 439.

5. Gardiner, *History of England*, I, 224-9.

6. Belloc says: "From that date, May 9th., 1606, begins a new chapter in the story of English religion. For it was the gun-powder plot which turned the tide, left great masses of the Catholic body doubtful of their own position, and made them all criminals in the eyes of those hitherto indifferent." Op. cit., IV, 448.

7. 2 and. 4 Jac. I, caput 4.

8. Lingard, op. cit., IX, 31.

9. Belloc, op. cit., IV, 449.

10. Lingard, op. cit., IX, 157.

11. Hughes, *History of the Society of Jesus in North America*, I, 162.

12. *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, (revised edition, 1924) 282.

CHAPTER III

EARLY ATTEMPTS AT CATHOLIC MIGRATION

It was not long after the first Jesuit(counter reformation) missionaries came to England that the colonization of the North Atlantic seaboard began. With the closing years of the Tudor dynasty a new era was to bring to an end the days of discovery and adventure. Men were no longer to seek an easy passage to the sea of India, and fabulous tales of gold and treasure were no longer to lure them to America. With the Turks blocking the overland route to India, English adventurers had ever been on the lookout for a western passage to the Orient and, in search of this, they heard stories of hidden riches. The discovery of a vast new continent had aroused the spirit of adventure and tainted it with a good bit of greed. Ralph Lane, governor of Raleigh's first colony on the coast of what is now North Carolina, believed that the Roanoke River was the gateway to the South Seas. Both he and his colonists at the same time gave credence to the wild tales brought to them by Indian interpreters, of great treasure and of a town the walls of which were made of pearls, near the headwaters of the river. Raleigh did turn his mind to the settlement of an agricultural colony, but his followers were soon distracted by stories of mysterious rivers and hidden gold. Colonization could not be permanent, nor could foundations of a stable government be laid when men were **victims of phantasies and delusions.**

With the turn of the century there came the end to the days of adventure and discovery. The time for permanent colonization had come. It was to be no longer love of adventure, nor the seeking of gold, nor a search for a new route to the Orient, that was to send ships from England across the sea. There was to come a change in the impelling force of the English exodus. Permanent settlement was to be largely motivated by the desire to escape conditions that made life at home intolerable. Discriminatory laws and persecution were to turn the eyes of many to a possible refuge beyond the sea. With the exception of the early settlements of Virginia, **religion had much to do with the settlement of the American colonies.**¹

The last quarter of the sixteenth century witnessed the beginning of a Catholic exile movement to America. As early as 1574 Sir Humphrey Gilbert, half-brother of Sir Walter Raleigh, conceived a plan of colonization which was to have the support of two Catholic gentlemen, Sir George Peckham and Sir Thomas Gerard. A state paper hinted that he was hand in glove with "the Papists" in looking for relief to a new world. Sir Humphrey was not a Catholic but he was glad of support from this quarter. It was not until four years later that he was able to obtain a grant to discover and colonize any land in North America then unsettled.

At the time of this venture there was in force a statute with the true Cecilian flavor, called "An Act against Fugitives over the Sea" which was designed to prevent the migration of Catholic recusants. Any Catholic successful in escaping persecution by flight was told to return at once to the privileges and blessings of his native land, repent and conform to the state religion, and for failure so to do, would suffer disfranchisement and the confiscation of all property. Cecil did not intend to let the Catholic recusants slip from his grasp. He and his favorites had looted the Catholic churches and enriched themselves by confiscating monasteries and abbeys, lands and buildings. When there was no more church property to loot and appropriate, they pounced upon the Catholic laity and had their share of fines and forfeited estates.

Sir Humphrey evidently had his eye on the fugitive statute, since he succeeded by some process of political legerdemain in having a saving clause inserted in his charter exempting all members of the expedition from the provisions of this law. He, with Gerard and Peckham, presented a petition to Walsingham, the secretary of state, to be allowed to take "recusants of ability" whose finances would enable them to discharge the "penalties due to her Majesty," and such others who were not able to pay the fines and penalties of their religion but might be able to pay them later. Walsingham seeing no diminution in the revenue from wealthy Catholics and anticipating further revenue from the new colony, favored the plan and prevailed upon the Queen to sign Gilbert's patent.²

In November 1578, Gilbert, with Raleigh in command of the Falcon, sailed with seven ships and 350 men for America. Encounters with the Spaniards and storms forced them to return three months later without having attained their objective. It is safe to infer that the majority of the voyagers were Catholics and that the purpose of the expedition was to found a Catholic colony in America. Another attempt at a similar voyage was made early in the following year, but owing to the fact that Raleigh had had a dangerous sea fight with the Spaniards, the Council forbade Gilbert to sail.³

Six years had been allotted to Gilbert within which to launch his colony. The failure of his first expedition caused him financial embarrassment, and then there came opposition from an unexpected source. Many of the English Catholics did not agree with their brethren on the continent including many of the refugees from England, in the method of combating the persecution. They thought they saw a way of giving political allegiance to the crown without violating the tenets of their faith. The so-called Spanish party, which had only a few adherents in England, favored constant opposition to the Protestant English government and a resort to force if need be to bring about the restoration of the Catholic faith. The Spanish government at that time did not look with favor upon Catholics founding an English colony in America. Mendoza, the Spanish ambassador to England, as head of the Catholic Spanish party, did all in his power to dissuade Catholics from supporting Gilbert's expedition, not for want of sympathy with the persecuted Catholics, but rather because he foresaw a menace to Spanish supremacy in the New World.⁴

Notwithstanding this opposition the English Catholics, led by Peckham and Gerard, continued their efforts to plant a Catholic colony under the Gilbert grant. In 1582 they renewed their contract with Sir Humphrey and made plans for another expedition. At this time a zealous informer with hope of reward submitted to Walsingham secured information to this effect:

There is a muttering among the Papists that Sir Humphrey Gilbert goeth to seek a new found land; Sir George Peckham and Sir Thomas Gerard goeth with him. I have heard it said among the Papists that they hope it will prove the best journey for England that was made these forty years.⁵

Walsingham still adhered to his policy to allow Catholic recusants to accompany the expedition provided they made provision for the payment of their fines. On June 11, 1583, Sir Humphrey's fleet of five ships and some two hundred men, with Catholic recusants on board, sailed from Plymouth to America. Four of the five ships arrived at St. John's, Newfoundland, after a voyage of two months. Finding the climate unsuitable for colonization, Gilbert sailed for the coast of Maine, August 20, 1583. Off Cape Race he lost all his supplies in his best ship. He then set sail for home. At midnight September 9, during a heavy storm, the ship on which he was sailing went down with all on board. The Golden Hind, under command of Captain Edward Hayes, finally reached Falmouth with the first tidings of the disaster. This ended the second attempt of the English Catholics to find a refuge in America from persecution. Father Powers says that from the Catholic viewpoint:

The importance of these voyages lies in the fact that by them was abrogated the law of 1571, by which Catholics were forbidden to leave the realm, thereby setting a norm for all future exile movements. The words of the letters patent were to the effect what in Sir Humphrey was vested the authority to make all laws, political and religious, for his colony, provided, of course they were not against the true Christian faith, i.e., the Church of England. The phrase "**the true Christian Faith**" was a stock phrase taken from Magna Charta of 1215 and it was capable of being interpreted, as it was by Calvert in 1634, to mean the Catholic faith.⁶

For twenty years no more was heard of a Catholic migration. When it became known that King James I was not to grant toleration to the English Catholics, plans were again made for the planting of a colony on the Maine coast. Based hugely on the report of James Rosier who had accompanied Bartholomew Gosnold on a voyage to New England in 1602, a Catholic gentleman by the name of Winslade interested Lord Thomas Arundel, Baron of Wardour, a wealthy Catholic nobleman in a colonization venture.⁷ Winslade consulted Father Persons who did not give his approval. Such a project, he said, would cause prejudice to be done to the cause of Catholicity by exasperating the public authorities who would proceed to tighten the restraints upon priests and interfere more effectually with students passing over to the seminaries on the continent.

Despite Persons' objections the plans went forward, and on Easter Sunday 1605, the good ship Archangel under the command of Captain George Weymouth set sail from the Downs headed for the Maine coast. Rosier accompanied this expedition and wrote an interesting "relation" of the voyage as he did of the Gosnold expedition.⁸ There is reason to believe he was a Catholic priest and probably a Jesuit. The religious tone of his letters indicates this and there is no doubt but that he was sent on both expeditions by Lord Arundel.

The Archangel made its first landing on the beautiful island of Monhegan ten miles off the Maine coast and here a cross was planted which remained for several years being found by a subsequent expedition.⁹ The landing was made on Saturday, May 18 ("Whitsun eve") and Rosier says the island was "the most fortunate we ever discovered." The next day the Archangel sailed into what is now Boothbay Harbor. This was named Pentecost Harbor, the landing being made on Pentecost Day. After exploring one of the large rivers, probably the Penobscot, and planting another cross on an island at its mouth, which was named *Insula Sanctae Crucis*, the

expedition returned to Monhegan. For some unknown reason, no permanent settlement was made and the Archangel sailed back to England. Knowledge of this expedition is very meager and all the information is that given in Rosier's Relation. It is certain, however, that it represented another effort on the part of English Catholics to find a refuge from persecution.¹⁰

For a period of eighty years after Sir Humphrey Gilbert's first venture, no less than fifty-nine colonial charters were granted by the British crown. The settlements so authorized ranged in territory from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the mouth of the Amazon. Nearly all of the early charters were avowed to be granted for the purpose of propagating the Christian religion among people as yet living in darkness. The light of the gospel which was to come to those in darkness, however, was to be filtered through the windows of the established church. **These charters were strongly inoculated with the anti-Popery virus.** As a specimen, an enlargement of the Virginia charter in 1609 declared:

Because the principal effect which we can desire or expect of this action, is the conversion and reduction of the people in those parts unto the true worship of God and Christian religion, in which respect we would be loathe that any person should be permitted to pass that we suspected to affect the **superstitions of the church of Rome**, we do hereby declare that it is our will and pleasure that none be permitted to pass in any voyage from time to time into the said country but such as first shall have taken the oath of supremacy.¹¹

In the closing days of the reign of James I, it remained for a catholic convert who had received preferment from Robert Cecil and advancement from the king, who had been a member of the Privy council and a secretary of state, to obtain a liberal charter permitting a Catholic migration to America. This charter was to be a variant from previous charters in that there were to be no disabling clauses barring Catholics and no restrictions preventing those "living in darkness" from hearing the gospel as it was preached by St. Augustine to the Britons. Furthermore there was to be religious liberty accorded to all Christian sects and creeds.

1. Woodrow Wilson, *History of the United States*, I, 126; Eggleston *Beginners of the Nation*, 220; Charles Mclean Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, I, 66.

2. William J. P. Powers, "The Beginnings of English Catholic Emigration to the New World," *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society of Philadelphia* XI (March, 1929), 15.

3. Ibid 16

4. Ibid, 19.

5. Hughes, op. cit., I, 147.

6. Op. cit., p. 17.

7. Lord Arundel afterwards became the father-in-law of the second Lord Baltimore.

8. Rosier's Relation of the Weymouth voyage is found in *Purchas His Pilgrims*, (Glasgow, 1906) XVIII, 335 et seq.

9. Proper, *Monhegan the Cradle of New England*, Portland, 1930, 78.

10. Powers, op. cit., 30; J. T., *Adams Founding of New England*, 38.

11. Hughes, op. cit., I, 151.

CHAPTER IV GEORGE CALVERT THE FIRST LORD BALTIMORE

In the same year that saw the coming of the first Jesuit missionaries(counter reformation) to England, a son was born to Leonard and Alicia Calvert, farmer folk living in the little Yorkshire village of Kiplin in the valley of the Swale. Events of later years will show this to have been an interesting coincidence.

Little is known of the boyhood of George Calvert. It is maintained by some authorities that he was a Catholic from his early youth, by others that he was born in that communion. But as the first record we have of him is his matriculation as a commoner at Trinity College, Oxford, he must at that time have been a conformist to the Church of England, for at Oxford since 1581, subscription to the thirty-nine articles of religion had been required for matriculation.

The north of England was the stronghold of the Catholics during the reign of Elizabeth, and the county of York was the scene of the revolts of 1569, when the Catholic forces gathered" for the attempted liberation of the Queen of Scotland. According to Sussex, Elizabeth's general in the north, "there were not ten gentlemen in Yorkshire that did approve of her procedure in the cause of religion." It was said that the valley of the Swale was filled with devoted followers of Mary the Queen and Mary the Virgin. The influence of the environment of his youth may have had an effect on young Calvert's life which counter-influences, great though they were, did not eventually overcome.

The North Riding of Yorkshire contained much pasture-land and Leonard Calvert was a cattle farmer, so later those who envied his son's rise to Power had opportunity to sneer at him as "the son of a grazier." But this humble grazier was prosperous enough to give his son the advantage of a good education. His preliminary education may have been at the grammar school at Ripon founded by Queen Mary. At the early age of thirteen he entered Oxford, and received his bachelor's degree in 1597. At college it is said that he excelled in the languages, Greek and Latin, French, Spanish and Italian. He completed his education, as was the custom, by travel on the continent. It was during this time that he was afforded the opportunity of a public career, for by a strange irony of fate, he came into the favor of Robert Cecil, who was on an embassy from Queen Elizabeth at the court of Henry of Navarre.

Cecil saw in this young Oxford graduate not only promised ability, but traits of character that were unusual in young men of his day, and determined to make use of him in the affairs of state. This adroit politician had an ingratiating way with him which would readily influence a young man of talent and ambition. This influence started a cross-current in the life of Calvert, which was not to spend its force until many years later, when he openly confessed his allegiance to the church which his patron had persecuted.

When he returned to England Calvert became secretary to Cecil "being esteemed a forward and knowing person in matters relating to state." After the death of Elizabeth he had a seat in parliament as a member from Bossnay a small fishing village on the Cornish coast. He was employed by Cecil at this time in the management and settlement of certain estates included in the jointure of Queen Anne of Denmark, the consort of James. In 1605 he received his master's degree at Oxford on the occasion of the first visit of the new king to this ancient seat of learning. The master's degree was offered upon forty-three candidates, including many members of the nobility, upon lay and ecclesiastical lords, and on Cecil himself who had already received a master's degree at Cambridge.

In 1606, Calvert was appointed Clerk of the Crown and of assize and peace in County Clare, Ireland. This was an office of importance resembling that of attorney-general, and it was Calvert's first relationship with the affairs of this oppressed country. He was afterwards to hold considerable estates in Ireland and to occupy a place on the roll of its nobility. In 1610, the year of the accession of Louis XIII to the throne of France, after the assassination of Henry IV, he was sent on a mission to the French court to bring about friendly relations with the new king. The mission was apparently successful. He returned the next year and declared that it was with difficulty he was able to withdraw his mind from the pleasant memories of the Faubourg St. Germain.

After the death of Cecil, Calvert still had the favor of the King, and his advancement in the affairs of government continued In 1613 he was appointed clerk of the Privy Council and was entrusted with all the official Spanish and

Italian correspondence. The next year it was reported that he would be sent as Ambassador to Venice, but a contemporary wrote that he "was not likely to effect such a journey, being reasonably well settled at home and having a wife and many children, it would be no easy carriage for him." Calvert had married Anne, daughter of George Mynne, Esq., of Hertfordshire. She bore him eleven children. He was devoted to his wife and children, and his family life was singularly happy.

In 1617, George Calvert was knighted in recognition of his public services and two years later he was elevated to the office of Secretary of State and became a member of the King's Privy Council. There were two incumbents of this office at the time of Calvert's appointment and he succeeded Sir Thomas Lake. It was deemed necessary to remove Sir Thomas on account of the indiscretion of his wife, who had talked too much, and who, with her daughter, had become involved in a court scandal. A contemporary writer, referring to the dismissal of Lake, says that "the Papists were much dejected at his fall, for the secretary had given much satisfaction to the catholic element," and his own private chaplain was a suspected priest. This was not the real reason for his removal however. Lady Lake had talked her husband out of his office. In a speech in the star chamber a day or two after Lake's dismissal, James discoursed on the danger of secretaries entrusting their wives with secrets of state, and referred to Lady Lake as Eve, and to her daughter as the serpent in the Garden of Eden.

James, who was now solicitous about the wives of his secretaries, asked Calvert questions as to Lady Calvert. One of the answers to these questions shows that like her husband, the wife of the new secretary had virtues quite rare in the royal suite. "She is a good woman," he said to the King, "and has brought me ten children; and I can assure Your Majesty that she is not a wife with a witness."

There is justification for the belief that one of the chief reasons that prompted James to select Calvert for Secretary of state had to do with the negotiations for the proposed marriage of the crown Prince Charles with the Spanish Infanta, Donna Maria. Not long after his appointment, Calvert was given the delicate and difficult task of continuing the negotiations already begun. He was well qualified for this undertaking and thoroughly in sympathy with the plan. It would not have done to have trusted the negotiations to anyone with strong anti-catholic views. Gardiner states that Calvert's opinions fitted him to be "the channel of communications which could not be safely entrusted to one who looked with extreme favor upon the Continental protestants," and that while Calvert "was anything but a thorough-going partisan of the Spanish monarchy, yet he had no sympathy whatever with those who thought a war with Spain was to be desired for its own sake."¹

The King knew that Calvert had tolerant views on the subject of religion and this was all the more reason for his selection. An old authority, the Biographica Britannica says that:

Calvert was the only statesman who being engaged to a decried party, managed his business with that great respect for all sides that all men who knew him applauded him and none that he had anything to do with complained of him. He was a man of great sense, but not obstinate in his sentiments, taking as great pleasure in hearing others' opinions as in delivering his own.

The negotiations for the Spanish marriage treaty began as early as 1614, when after the dissolution of Parliament, James addressed a proposal of marriage to the Spanish court. Spain, playing a waiting game, slowly fed the hopes of the English monarch. Both the Crown Prince and the Infanta were young, and the marriage would have to wait for some years. In the meantime, while negotiations were pending, there would be hope of relief for the *oppressed Catholics who were suffering from the persecution following the exposure of the gun-powder plot*. Moreover James would be kept from giving aid to the German Protestants. The real significance of the negotiations and the part taken therein by Calvert cannot be fully appreciated without taking into consideration the religious situation in Germany and the smoldering fire that was soon to break out into the Thirty Years War.

Just before he died, Robert Cecil planned the marriage of James' daughter Elizabeth to Frederick, the successor-apparent to the Palatine-Electorate and one of the leaders of the German Protestant Princes. Cecil intended to give the support of the English government to the Protestant cause in Germany and the proposed alliance with Catholic Spain would not have been in keeping with his policy.

But now that Cecil was dead, James proposed to act as his own minister. Spain's star of empire was gradually declining. Since the defeat of the Armada, she was no longer powerful on the sea, but she was still the strongest power in Europe, believed to be by far the richest, still in the lead in the settlement and colonization of the Americas, and still regarded as a strong ally in peace and a dreaded opponent in war. An alliance with Spain

appealed to James' sense of pride. Then there was the bride's dowry which was to be considered, as the royal treasury was low. James must be given credit at least for his reluctance to be drawn into the threatening religious war in Germany. *There was a strong war party arising in England, and it was an anti-Catholic party determined to give aid to the **German Protestant cause**.*

The Protestant war party besought James to come to the support of his son-in-law when the nobles of Bohemia, invoking the penalty of fenestration, threw the Catholic Ferdinand's deputies from the windows of the palace at Prague and called the country to arms. Bohemia had been Protestant Prince the days of John Huss. In 1619, when Calvert was appointed Secretary of State, Ferdinand became emperor. The nobles of Bohemia declared the realm vacant and chose Frederick as their king. This was at variance with James' pet idea of the divine right of kings. He regarded Frederick as an usurper and advised him to renounce his kingship and return to the Palatinate. Frederick disregarded this advice, but he was only "king for a winter." The next summer he was defeated by the army of the League before the walls of Prague and driven a fugitive to north Germany. The following year saw the Spanish battalions marching up the valley of the Rhine, for Spain, now powerless on the seas, must have a highway to the Netherlands in order to hold what was left to her in the low countries. Fierce passions were roused and the Thirty Years War that was to desolate Central Europe had begun.

Calvert now became an open and zealous advocate of the alliance with Spain, and he encouraged the King to adhere to his policy of peaceful intervention through a Spanish alliance, rather than to become involved in the European war. Calvert was by nature a man of peace and opposed to war, but this fact alone cannot account for his reversal of the traditional policy of his old patron, Cecil. The only reasonable explanation for his course was his natural inclination toward the old religion. His predisposition drew him toward the Catholic side.

In England during the negotiations with Spain the line between Catholics and anti-Catholics was sharply drawn. The war party had its adherents, not alone in the Parliament, but also among the King's ministers and councillors. Calvert was the leader of the Spanish cause in the Council.

At a meeting of the Privy Council held in the year 1619, the Bohemian representatives, in urging the claims of the Palatine, told how they had inflicted the penalty of fenestration upon their enemies. One of the councillors whispered to another that it would give him pleasure to see some of the Hispaniolized members present treated to the same reward. Streeter, Maryland historian, says that "had the penalty been carried out in English Council, as intimated, several among the members would have found it necessary to make their exit by another way than the door, and among them, Sir George Calvert."²

When Parliament reassembled in 1621, after its seven years' recess, the storm of opposition against the Spanish match broke loose. There was a demand for the repudiation of the proposed alliance, coupled with a demand for a Protestant marriage, as the parliamentary party would brook no plan that would place a Catholic queen on the throne of England. The war party was active for a declaration of war against Spain and an alliance with the German Protestants. There was also a demand "**for the better execution of the laws against Jesuits, seminary priests and Popish recusants.**" The King refused these demands and declared he would govern according to the common weal, and not according to the common will.

Calvert had a seat in this parliament, having been elected to represent his old home county of Yorkshire. As Secretary of State he was given the unpopular role of spokesman for the King. It was a trying experience, but his "unruffled and conciliatory demeanor and his fairness in debate" frequently disarmed his opponents. He was accused of undue favoritism toward Count Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, with whom he was brought in close relationship during the negotiations for the Spanish marriage. Although he realized he was not on the popular side of the controversy, he did not waver in his course. "He did not follow the king blindly," says Wilhelm, "nor from sordid motives. He recognized and accepted the issue."³

In 1622 there were negotiations with Rome. A dispensation for the marriage had been solicited from the Pope by the Spanish king, through the agency of his ambassador and of the Padre Maestro, one of the Catholic clergy attached to the Spanish legation in London. Calvert had charge of all the correspondence relating to the English part of the negotiations. He sent George Gage, an English Catholic, to Rome with letters for the Pope. Father Bennett, an English Catholic priest, was later sent for the same purpose. He went as a representative of the secular clergy. To the requests of these envoys, the Pontiff replied that he could not dispense with the canons unless it were for the benefit of the Church, that James had promised much, but had done nothing, so let him **first relieve the Catholics from the pressure of the penal laws**, then there would be sufficient ground for the dispensation.

James lost no time in acting on the suggestion. He ordered the lord keeper to issue under the great seal pardons for recusancy to all Catholics who should apply for them in the course of five years, and instructed the judges to discharge from prison, during their circuits, every recusant able and willing to give security for his subsequent appearance. This indulgence awakened the fears of the zealots. To silence their complaints Williams, a member of the council, explained that some modification of these seventies had become necessary to satisfy the Catholic princes who threatened to enact against the Protestants in their dominions, laws similar to those against Catholics in England.

While these explanations *appeased the Protestants*, they **alarmed the Catholics** and there was a suspicion that James had acted with duplicity. If Gondomar boasted in Spain that four thousand Catholics had been released from confinement it was replied that "they still had the shackles about their heels" and would enjoy their liberty no longer than might suit the royal convenience.⁴

It was during the time that Calvert was carrying on negotiations with the Papal court that he had the misfortune to lose his wife by death. Lady Calvert died August 8, 1622, after giving birth to a son, the eleventh child of this happy pair. Her husband had a tablet placed in the Hertingford Church as a memorial of her virtues. There is every reason to believe that Calvert's decision to enter the Catholic Church was made not long after the death of his wife. Just what direct effect his wife's death had upon his decision may be conjectural, but there are unmistakable evidences that within a year thereafter he showed a strong leaning toward the Catholic faith, and that it was during this period he definitely made up his mind to take the step which he later publicly announced when resigning office.

The negotiations for the Spanish marriage reached their climax when the Crown Prince and Buckingham went on their secret mission to the Spanish court, where Charles appeared in person as the suitor for the hand of the Infanta. Calvert was one of the few who knew of this hurried trip, but it is not known whether he approved of it. The plan is said to have originated with Gondomar. It is certain that it did not meet with the approval of Bristol, the English ambassador at Madrid, with whom Calvert was corresponding.

While Charles was urging his suit in Spain a "solemn and royal entertainment" was given to the Spanish representative at Whitehall. The proposed marriage treaty had been prepared in Latin by Calvert and was read to the assembly in the royal chapel. He had been careful to include a clause granting full religious liberty to the Catholics of England and freedom from further persecution. This clause provided that "no particular law against Roman Catholics or general laws under which all are equally included, if they are of the kind that are repugnant to the Roman Catholic religion should be executed as regards the said Roman Catholics, at any time, in any way on any occasion, directly or indirectly."⁵

A Catholic education for the children of the marriage, a Catholic household for the Infanta, and a Catholic chapel at the English court, were all guaranteed. "We are building a chapel to the devil," said the King, but he signed the treaty with due solemnity. A secret treaty granting further concessions was signed later at the home of the Spanish ambassador and when the oath was taken by James, he exclaimed: "Now all the devils in hell cannot hinder it." But he reckoned without Buckingham and the Crown Prince. Whatever hope he had for a happy consummation of the marriage treaty was dashed by the excursion to Spain. Buckingham and Charles made a mess of the negotiations which had been handled so skillfully by Calvert and which would probably have reached a successful conclusion had it not been for their conduct at the Spanish court.

Buckingham was indiscreet and offensively arrogant. Charles was too glib with his promises. There was offense given and taken by both sides, and the final result was failure, the prince and his envoy returning without the bride.

On their journey to Spain, Charles and Buckingham had stopped off at Paris where the prince had seen Princess Henrietta Maria, who afterwards became his bride, dancing gracefully at a court ball. She may have had more attraction for him than the young Spanish Infanta, and this may account for the reason that his heart did not seem to be in his wooing at Madrid. Their return to England was made the occasion of great rejoicing by all who were opposed to the Spanish marriage and the streets of London were lighted with bon-fires as the pair made their way to the palace. But there was no joy for George Calvert. He knew that his cause was lost and that his days of influence and usefulness to his king and country were over.

Buckingham, quick to sense the popular feeling, abandoned the Spanish party. The King also soon forgot his enthusiasm for the Spanish match and turned his mind toward an alliance with France. Charles no doubt had

told him-of the pretty French princess he met on his journey to Spain. A contemporary wrote that the King was "almost as much in love with France as with Spain and is merry and jocund." Several of the advocates of the Spanish cause had gone over to the other side and more were wavering, ready to desert their party when opportunity arose. Calvert, now practically alone, still remained loyal to the cause he favored.

The anti-Catholic party had its opportunity when James called a session of parliament at the suggestion of Buckingham. Calvert had opposed such action, fearing it would mean a declaration of war with Spain. His whole effort had been to keep his country out of war. Buckingham and the prince supported a demand for the repudiation of the treaty with Spain and a declaration of war. It was as if the King had abdicated and turned over the government to his son and favorite.

Calvert had a seat at this session, representing the University of Oxford. He was astounded to hear the King in his speech from the throne repudiate his oath and declare that he never in any treaty public or private promised to dispense with the execution of the **penal laws against Catholics**. Calvert there after took little interest or part in the proceedings of parliament. It is recorded that he quite frequently absented himself on the plea of illness. It is not difficult to diagnose the nature of the ailment.

At a general conference held between the two houses, Buckingham delivered a long and misleading address narrating the negotiations at Madrid. The only man who could have exposed the falsity of his statements was the Earl of Bristol, English ambassador to Spain and a Catholic. Bristol had incurred the enmity of Buckingham and was ordered to return home after the failure of the negotiations, to repair to his house in the country and consider himself a prisoner. All his entreaties were fruitless. The disgraced minister was not suffered to visit the court or take his seat in parliament during the remainder of the reign of James.⁶

The Spanish ambassadors protested against the speech of the Duke, but in vain. The two houses defended the conduct of Buckingham, and in an address to the throne, pronounced their opinion that neither the treaty for the Spanish marriage nor that for the restoration of the Palatinate, could be continued with honor or safety.

James, now drifting helplessly with the tide, in answer to the address, said that his debts were enormous and his exchequer was empty, but that if a vote of a grant of money were passed, he would carry on a war with Spain which could not end until he was advised by Parliament. The King asked for seven hundred thousand pounds to begin the war, and an annual supply of one hundred and fifty thousand pounds toward the liquidation of his debts. This demand made the parliamentary leaders gasp, but the Prince and the Duke assured them that a smaller sum would be acceptable, and three hundred thousand pounds were finally voted, coupled with an address vindicating Buckingham and followed by a royal proclamation announcing that both the treaties with Spain were at an end. Parliamentary orators told of the "alarming growth of popery in the land," and declared that "connivance of the evil would beget tolerance." In the eyes of these men tolerance was, of all things, to be abhorred.

After the Easter recess a joint petition was presented to the King, praying him to enforce the penal statutes against Catholic recusants. James once more called God to witness that he never intended to dispense with those laws, and promised that he would never permit in any treaty the inclusion of a clause granting indulgence to Catholics.

A proclamation was issued commanding all missionaries to leave the kingdom under penalty of death. The judges and magistrates were ordered to put into execution the laws as in former times. The lord mayor was directed to arrest all persons coming from Mass in the houses of foreign ambassadors. All Catholic children were to be taken from their parents and brought up as Protestants. The tide of persecution which had abated during the years of the Spanish negotiations was setting in once more.

After Buckingham had secured the vote of confidence of Parliament he set about to crush the leaders of the Spanish party. A former associate of Calvert in the treasury commission, Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex, received the brunt of Buckingham's first attack. He had done all in his power to prevent a rupture with Spain and continued to urge a peaceful policy. This was enough for Buckingham. Cranfield was impeached, heavily fined and removed from office. Gardiner says that as Lord Treasurer, Cranfield had "done more than any other man to rescue the finances from disorder." James did not favor his impeachment, but lacked the courage to intervene. He told the Duke he was a fool for "making a rod for his own breech" and warned his son that he would live to have his "belly full of impeachments." Little did he realize the ominous portent of his warning, for Charles unconsciously had aided Buckingham in giving to Parliament the weapon that was finally to be used to end his own

fateful career and bring his head to the block.

Calvert was saved from attack only because it was known that he had the favor of the King in greater degree than any others of the council. The Duke could not resist the opportunity however to obtain from Calvert by "false promise, a paper he wanted for his own use. The secretary had in his possession a copy of a letter sent to the Pope to secure approbation of the Spanish marriage. Buckingham wanted this to use as a model for another letter to the Pope in reference to the French marriage, and he obtained the copy by assuring Calvert that he would be asked to serve the King in the French treaty negotiations. "If this be a lie," wrote Buckingham to the King, "as I am sure it is, then you may begin to think with a little more study I may cry quittance."?

A list of the names of Catholic lords and knights employed in the governmental service had been presented by the commons to the King with the strong intimation that their removal would be exceedingly gratifying to the people. Calvert's name was not on the list, but there was no disguising the fact that the parliamentary leaders were trying to force his hand as it was generally known at this time that he was honorably inclined toward the Church of Rome. In his capacity as secretary Calvert was named on a commission to try recusants and with other members of the commission was instructed to "examine parties charged with errors in matters of faith, tending to schism against the established church, who refused to have their children baptized or allowed that ceremony to be performed by a Jesuit or popish priests or were guilty of any offense against the established church." These instructions were aimed not only at Catholics, but at Puritans and Baptists as well.

Calvert now bowed to the inevitable. He refused to serve on the commission and publicly announced his allegiance to the catholic church. He had no difficulty in convincing the King, now on the verge of death, that the duties of his office were no longer compatible with his religious belief. The King respected his wishes and suffered him to resign from office and retire to private life. He held large estates under royal grant, and anticipating that he would not be allowed to longer hold these lands without taking the oath of supremacy, he surrendered them. He was willing to pay a heavy penalty for his change of faith. The King in gracious recognition of the loyalty and worth of Calvert, restored his estates with the religious clause omitted and asked him to remain as a member of the Privy Council. *Although Calvert knew that the King was favorably disposed toward him, he also recognized the growing power of the Protestant party and realized that he could no longer hold public office.*

In one particular at least James rose superior to his predecessor on the throne. Elizabeth, when she turned on the English Catholics who had come to her support when the Armada threatened the kingdom, showed that she was unworthy of the full measure of loyalty which her Catholic subjects had given her. James may have been a coward, but he was no ingrate. He did not forget the loyalty and devotion of George Calvert. One of the last acts of his reign was to elevate his faithful minister to the Irish peerage as Lord Baltimore, in recognition of his "singular gifts of mind, candor, integrity and prudence as well as benignity and urbanity toward all men."

When George Calvert made public confession of his faith it was a step that could only have been taken by a man of rare courage. It meant for him the surrender of high office with all the privileges, emoluments and influence that went with it. It meant liability of incurring the penalties and disabilities of the **penal laws** now to be enforced with greater rigor. He saw in the rising tide of **anti-Catholicism in parliament**, the prospect that the ancient faith would soon be driven from the realm of England. To this faith, notwithstanding, he gave his support and allegiance.

No historian has ever been heard to say that Calvert's open profession of faith was not sincere and not the result of inward conviction. **Bancroft says:**

In an age when religious controversy still continued to be active and when increasing divisions among Protestants were spreading a general alarm, his mind sought relief from controversy in the bosom of the Roman Catholic church and preferring the avowal of his opinions to the emoluments of office, he resigned his place and openly professed his conversion.⁸

According to Wilhelm:

Calvert's conversion to the Catholic religion was thorough and honest though the change of belief had been gradual. At a crisis in his career he made an **open profession of his adherence to the Papacy** and accepted the consequences. . . The Church of Rome offered him, in his distress of mind, a surer peace than the deeply stirred Church of England or the **aggressive fold of the Puritans.**⁹

There is the testimony of some of Calvert's contemporaries and those not of his faith that he had been a catholic at heart for some time prior to his resignation from office. Archbishop Abbott of Canterbury, who was secretly opposed to the Spanish marriage, yet willing to put his signature to the treaty, wrote that "Secretary Calvert hath never looked merrily since the Prince's coming out of Spain," and that he had "apparently turned Papist which he now professeth, this being the third time he hath been to blame that way."¹⁰

The Anglican Bishop Goodman wrote:

He thought to gain by the Spanish match and did what good offices he could therein for religion's sake, being infinitely addicted to the Roman catholic faith, having been converted hereto by Count Gondamar and Lord Arundel, whose daughter, secretary Calvert's son had married. And it was said the Secretary did usually catechize his own children, so to ground them in his own religion and in his best room having an altar set up with chalice, candlesticks and all other ornaments, he brought strangers thither, never concealing anything as if his whole joy and comfort had been to make open profession of his religion.¹¹

There is no reason to believe that Count Gondomar had my influence upon Calvert so far as his change of faith is concerned. His attitude on the question of the Spanish treaty was largely the result of his own convictions, and he had evidently decided to make open profession of his real faith regardless of the result of the negotiations. It is far more likely that he was influenced by Lord Arundel as there was the closest relationship between the two families. According to the Aspinwall Papers, he began to turn towards the Catholic faith in 1620 but nothing was revealed of his state of mind until February 1625, when "he made known his change of faith to the King and then went to the north of England with Sir Tobias Matthews to be received into the church."¹² Matthews was an old schoolmate of Calvert. He was the son of the Anglican Bishop of Durham but had himself become reconciled to the Catholic religion much to the disgust of his father. The same authority states that **Matthews was a Jesuit**, but his name does not appear in the lists in the Jesuit archives. He had been knighted by King James for his services in connection with the Spanish treaty negotiations, and was one of the witnesses of George Calvert's last will.

On his retirement from public life we find the figure of George Calvert, the first Lord Baltimore, standing out in bold relief against a dark and sinister background of political intrigue and religious animosities. That, he remained aloof from the partisan influences that surrounded him is revealed by his life and character. He was tolerant in a day of intolerance, open-minded during a reign of bigotry, kind and considerate of others when cruelty was easily excused and quickly condoned, charitable in his opinions of his fellowmen when harsh judgment was the order of the day, and above reproach in his family and private life when a refined immorality spread its thin veneer over the lives of men and women. He became easily reconciled to withdraw from public life and to seek a refuge from political strife and religious controversy beyond the seas.

1. Prince Charles and the Spanish Marriage, 1617-1623, I, 164.
2. *The First Lord Baltimore*, mss.
3. *Sir George Calvert, Baron of Baltimore*; Fund Publication No. 20, Maryland Historical Society (1884), 71.
4. Lingard, op. cit., IX, 200.
5. For the Latin text of this clause in the treaty, see Lingard, op. cit., IX, 216-217, note, citing Prynne, 44; Hardwick papers, I, 428, 430.
6. Lingard, op. cit., IX, 217.
7. Wilhelm, op. cit., 103.
8. *History of the United States*, 18th edition, I, 239.
9. *Sir George Calvert, Baron of Baltimore*, 158, 168.
10. *Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe in his Embassy to the Ottoman Porte, (1621-28)* 372
11. *The Court of King James*, I, 376.
12. Massachusetts Historical Collections, 98-99.

CHAPTER V

WESTWARD HO FOR AVALON

In the year 1620 when the Pilgrims of the Mayflower landed on New England's stern and rock-bound coast, George Calvert purchased from a former classmate at Oxford, Sir William Vaughn, a plantation on the stony coast of Newfoundland. It would seem as if the voyage of the *Mayflower*, which came within his official purview as Secretary of State, had turned his attention to the need of a colonial refuge for the religiously oppressed. Sir Edward Sandys had already sent his invitation to the Pilgrim exiles in Holland to repatriate themselves to America, but there was no progress made with the plan until after Calvert became secretary of state. Matthew Page Andrews in his *History of Maryland*, has brought out that there is a logical inference at least "in the light of other events that as secretary of state, Calvert must have aided the Separatists directly or indirectly in obtaining their patent, which unfortunately is among the missing documents of history."¹

It would not have been possible for any such migration as that of the Pilgrims of the Mayflower to have been arranged without the knowledge and consent of the Privy Council, and much would have depended, so far as any favorable action was concerned, on the recommendation of one of the secretaries of state. Calvert's colleague in the secretaryship, Robert Naunton, who was subsequently disgraced and deprived of office, was given mostly routine matters to attend to, while the more important matters having to do with foreign and colonial affairs were entrusted by the King to his new secretary. It was no easy matter for any large group to secure permission to settle in the American colonies.

A band of Huguenots, who had fled to the Netherlands to escape persecution in France, tried to obtain permission from the English government to settle in America, and being unsuccessful in this, came over under Dutch auspices to settle New Amsterdam. It was not a foregone conclusion by any means that the English separatists who had gone to Holland to escape conformity in England would be permitted to make an English settlement in America. From all that is known of Calvert and his **tolerant views**, it is more than probable that he was largely responsible for granting permission to the Mayflower pilgrims to settle in New England.

Comments: *Notice the author is saying that Calvert a catholic is largely responsible for the granting permission to the Mayflower. Just because he was a member of the Privy Council, does not mean he has the deciding vote. This is a example of Jesuit Casuistry. What this does explain is yes he had inside favors because he was in the Privy Council.*

Calvert received a grant of the entire island of Newfoundland in 1622. The entry in the state paper simply reads: "grant to Sir George Calvert and his heirs of the whole country of Newfoundland." This was held by him only a few months. He applied for and received in April 1623, the charter of Avalon, the name he gave to his new colony. This was one of the earliest instruments for the organization of English colonists on the North American coast. The document was prepared by Calvert himself and later was made by him the model for his charter of Maryland. It introduced for the first time in English colonial history a **palatine** form of government. This system of government for minor principalities came into use in England during the thirteenth century, the counts or earls **palatine** ruling over entire counties as independent princes, swearing homage and fealty to the King. At the time of the granting of the charter, the bishopric of Durham was the only instance of a complete county **palatine** in England. The same rights were given to Calvert and his heirs "as any bishop within the Bishopric or County **palatine** of Durham in our Kingdom of England ever hath." The ancient bishopric of Durham, with its majestic Norman cathedral mirrored in the clear waters of the Wear, had long been a semi-independent government.² The American colonists, however, were given under the Avalon charter more liberty in self-government than was enjoyed by the freemen in the Durham bishopric, since an elective assembly curbed the sovereignty of the proprietary.³

Oldmixon, an early English authority on colonial history, throws interesting light on the Newfoundland grant to Calvert:

This gentleman being of the Romish religion was uneasy at home and had the same reason to leave the kingdom as those gentlemen had who went to New England, to enjoy liberty of conscience. He therefore resolved to retire to America and finding that the Newfoundland company made no use of their grant, he thought of this place for his retreat; to which end he

procured a patent for that part of the land that lies between the Bay of Bulls in the east and Cape Mary's on the south.⁴

According to this same authority Calvert was a Catholic when he procured the grant, and he gives this as the reason why the colony was called by him Avalon, out of veneration of the memory of Joseph of Arimathea who is fabled "by the Papists to have landed in Britain and to have built a chapel for the Britons at Glastonbury, Somersetshire, then called Avalon."

An old legend gives a little different version for the name, for it says that Avalon was named in honor of Avalonius, a monk who was supposed to have converted the British King Lucius and his court to Christianity. In memory of this event the Abbey of Glastonbury was said to have been founded.

There is a strong presumption that the, name of Avalon was suggested to Calvert by a member of the Catholic clergy, it was hoped that the gospel according to the ancient faith would be practiced and preached for the first time in the English colonies in America at Avalon. Dr. John G. Morris, Lutheran clergyman and historian, says:

As one of the oldest historians of Newfoundland attributes Sir George Calvert's design in planting his colony at Avalon to the desire of making a place of retreat for English Catholics, in which he is followed by other subsequent historians, such motive being founded on strong probability, may be safely admitted.⁵

Calvert was preparing his Avalon charter during the fall and winter of 1622, after the death of his wife and while he was engaged in the negotiation for the Spanish marriage treaty. He was in sympathy with the plans for the relief of the English Catholics from persecution and discriminatory laws, but he knew that if the negotiations were not successful, and there was no certainty that they would be, there would be little hope for the Catholics obtaining the relief they sought, and in that event, the colony of Avalon would be a place of refuge for them. At the very time he was drafting the clause in the treaty for the equal administration of the laws on religion and exemption from persecution, he was at work on the charter of Avalon with its broad provisions in the matter of religion. These facts show that the trend of his mind at this time was in the direction of a **greater toleration**, and that his chief purpose of securing the Newfoundland charter was to provide an American **sanctuary for the English Catholics** who were as much in need of it as the Puritans who then were migrating to New England.

In the early colonial charters, Catholics were barred by provisions which carried the disabilities of the Elizabethan laws to the colonies. The Virginia charter of 1609 required the oath of supremacy to be taken by all settlers. In the confirmation of the charter in 1612 instead of the oath of supremacy, King James' oath of allegiance could be taken, the colonial officials having the power to administer either or both, and so were enabled, if they chose, to debar Catholics. This power was invoked in 1629 to keep Lord Baltimore out of the colony when he came there from Newfoundland.

All **anti-Catholic restrictions** and disabilities were kept out of the charter of Avalon because the draftsman intended to omit them so that he *might open the door of his colony to Catholic settlers*. Calvert was familiar with the provisions of the Virginia charters. He had been a member of the second. Virginia company in 1609, and he was also one of the provisional council for the management of the colony after the revocation of its charter. He had had experience in charters and charter drafting and he knew what he was doing.

Father Hughes has given an interesting commentary on the religious feature of the **Avalon charter**:

The intolerance which had introduced test oaths into civil existence and which was fostering the growth at that moment on the soil of the new world, was not to be found in Calvert's earlier charter for Avalon. Nor had any mention been made there of the Anglo-American formulas about the **superstition of the Church of Rome**. Calvert had merely spoken of "God's Holy and True Religion" which like allegiance to civil authority, was to suffer no prejudice or diminution. All other artificial elements or odious incidents of an ancient people that had known strife and sorrow, like the laws of police and revenue, such as are enforced by penalties, the mode of maintenance for the established clergy, the jurisdiction of spiritual courts and a multitude other provisions, were neither necessary nor convenient for them, and therefore were not in force. And so with respect to the whole network of penal laws, the Catholic proprietary left in their native habitat those sanguinary and predatory intrigues which still found England a happy hunting ground and were to keep Ireland a rich preserve for 'two centuries to come. And keeping a free hand for equipping conscience and religion with their right, he assured civil freedom of a respectable and genial home.⁶

Under section IV of the Avalon charter, Calvert had a provision inserted which gave him the "patronage and advowsons of all churches which as the Christian religion shall increase within the said region isles and limits,

shall happen thereafter to be erected." Here was privilege only, which he could exercise or not as he saw fit. It did not prevent the erection of any Christian church, Catholic or Protestant. The provisions relating to churches and religion in both the Avalon and Maryland charters are somewhat vague and indefinite and this fact has led some non-Catholic historians to charge Calvert with having a **secret understanding with the King** with whom he connived for the purpose of "**blinding the public mind.**"⁷ He may have been disingenuous. Possibly there was a secret understanding between him and the King. But if so, it was all quite proper and justified. It was well that **the real meaning of the charter was hidden**, else the enemies of tolerance would have thwarted an accomplishment that was commendable and ideal. The non-Catholic historian Cobb has said if circumstances ever "justified a deceptive turn of words, they certainly justified this 'blinding purpose' of Baltimore."⁸

Calvert made no definite plans to visit Avalon until he retired to Ireland after his resignation and became Lord Baltimore. At that time, according to Archbishop Abbott, he bought a ship of four hundred tons. This was undoubtedly the **Ark**, which afterwards made two trips to Avalon, and then sailed with the **Dove** to **Maryland**. His visit was postponed for two years, for some unknown reason, and, in the meantime, affairs in England had assumed a more threatening aspect. James had died soon after elevating Calvert to the peerage and his ill-fated son had come to the throne as Charles I.

Before the marriage of Charles to Henrietta Maria, Cardinal Richelieu had insisted that the same concessions should be made for the English Catholics as were promised in the case of the proposed Spanish marriage. This demand coming so soon after the orders of King James to the judges and magistrates, and his promises to parliament, created a difficulty which was finally compromised by a secret treaty granting to Catholics as great a freedom of religion as they would have had if the Spanish marriage had been consummated. Both James and Charles signed this and ratified it with their oaths. Faced by a hostile parliament soon after his coronation Charles determined to violate the treaty. Every provision was violated, even those relating to the Queen's household. The **penal laws** were put into execution and again *Catholic recusants* were fined and imprisoned. The King of France remonstrated, but Charles dared not face his opponents in parliament and as an excuse to Louis, he said he had never considered the stipulations in favor of Catholics as anything more than an artifice to obtain the papal dispensation for the marriage. Lord Baltimore then heeded the call of "Westward Ho for Avalon."

In a letter to his friend Wentworth, dated May 21, 1627, Baltimore wrote that he had finally received the royal consent to cross the ocean and that he would soon have the pleasure of carrying out his long deferred desire of visiting Newfoundland. He promised to remain but a few months and to return not later than Michaelmas. He took with him on this first trip two Catholic priests of the secular clergy, Fathers Rivers and Longavilla. Father Rivers was a former Jesuit. Later Jesuit missionaries were sent. As soon as he announced his change of faith, Baltimore had applied for missionaries to be sent to Avalon and had partly arranged for sending members of the Order of Discalced or Barefooted Carmelites, but this arrangement was never carried out as the **two priests** of this order who were to have gone were then in prison, there having been a *sudden flare of persecution in England against the Catholic clergy.*

It must be clear that *Baltimore's reasons for now going to Avalon were mainly religious.* Although he may have hoped that the colony would prosper and that the fishing industry would be profitable, there is nothing to indicate that it was purely a money-making venture with him. The establishment of a colony as far north as Newfoundland could have offered little hope or inducement in a financial way. In fact, the colony caused its founder to suffer a loss of over twenty thousand pounds sterling. The *Biographia Britannica* said of him that he differed with others who were planning American settlements at the time in that he was for converting the Indians instead of exploiting them, that he was for taking "the soberest people to these places while others were for taking the lewdest," and while others were *for making present profit*, he was **satisfied with a reasonable expectation.**

Both Protestant and Catholic clergy accompanied the colonists to Avalon and were granted the fullest freedom in the matter of religious worship. The first Protestant incumbent was the Reverend Richard James, a clergyman of the established church who was sent over in 1622 with the first party of settlers. Having tried it with "its eight or nine months of winter," he abandoned it for the more congenial post of librarian to Sir Robert Colton in England. In a document of Jesuit missionary relations released by the Nuncio at Brussels in 1630 is found this report of the settlement at Avalon: "As to the practice of religion that was carried on under Calvert's roof, in one part Mass was said according to the Catholic rite, in another the heretics performed their functions." Here, indeed, was an unheard of measure of **religious liberty**, with Catholics and *Protestants worshipping under the same roof.* **Comments:** *Turning toleration into ecumenism. This was the birth of ecumenism. Where in history*

has the Roman Catholic church been for religious liberty?

Lord Baltimore was greatly misled in respect to the natural advantages of Newfoundland. No high pressure land salesman of this day could have painted in more glowing colors the attractions of a prospective realty development than Captain Richard Whitbourne described the imagined beauties of Newfoundland in his *Westward Ho for Avalon*, which was published in 1622. Whitbourne describes the island as a veritable earthly paradise where raspberries, strawberries, pears and cherries grow in abundance and flowers of every kind, including red and damask roses, make meadow-lands beauteous to behold. The woods are vocal with songbirds that rival the nightingale, the wild beasts are "gentle and humane," the harbors eminently good and in St. John's harbor had been seen a mermaid. Baltimore may have been impressed with this glowing description, but he was soon to be sadly disillusioned for he found that "it was not always June in Avalon." The bleak coast had been made to blossom with names of beauty. There was the "Bay of Plesance," the "Bay of Flowers" and the "Harbor of Heartsease." As Eggleston says, when winter time came "the icy Bay of Plesance and the bleak Bay of Flowers mocked him with their names of delight."

Although on his first trip, Baltimore came at the most favorable season of the year and his stay was short, he failed to find the Garden of Eden described by Captain Whitbourne. He found only a small strip of land fitted for cultivation and "all behind the little plantation lay this region of wild savagery of bleak and hopeless desolation and in front was the wild, stormy and inhospitable sea." And he had yet to see the northern winter.

In the summer of 1628 the ships of Lord Baltimore again crossed the sea to Avalon. This time he brought Lady Baltimore, his second wife, and several members of his family. With him also came forty colonists, including three Jesuit missionaries. Trouble soon came. First a French fleet came to attack the colony, England being at war with France. Baltimore was not a fighting man, but fight now he must. There was no other recourse. He fitted his ships, one of them the **Ark**, as men-of-war, and they were so well handled by the English seamen that with the help of the *Unicorn*, an English man-of-war, the attacking French fleet soon had the worst of it. How distasteful all this was to him is shown in a letter written at the time to Buckingham, in which he said: "I came to build and set and sow, but am fain to fighting with Frenchmen who have disquieted me."

The war with France was of Buckingham's making, and after the smoke of battle cleared, Baltimore wrote to the favorite saying, "whether the French gentleman may return again when the ships are gone, I know not, but if he do we shall defend this place as well as we are able," and asked that two men-of-war be allowed to remain all the year. Before the letter reached its destination Buckingham had been assassinated. The *St. Cloud*, one of the captured ships, was loaned to Baltimore, "in consideration of his good services," and was brought out to him by his son Leonard, afterwards Governor of Maryland.

Then bigotry raised its head in the Person of a Puritan minister, the Reverend Erasmus Stourton. Whether this clergyman came by invitation or as an unbidden guest, is not disclosed, but come he did and found hospitality and sanctuary. This did not deter him, however, from stirring up trouble for his host. He was horrified because Jesuit priests said Mass every Sunday and used "*all other ceremonies of the Church of Rome in as ample manner as is used in Spain*," and he had seen with his own eyes a Presbyterian child actually baptized by a "**Romish priest**." This was enough to send him back to England on trouble bent. As soon as he landed he went straight to the mayor of Plymouth with his tale of "**Popish doings**." The magistrates of Plymouth were greatly shocked and sent the informer to the Privy Council. Fortunately Baltimore had **friends in the Privy Council to whom differences in matters of religion meant little**. Nothing more was heard of the complaint.

Comments: *The author makes the point "he had friends in the Privy Council. Baltimore would of never got a charter if he had not inside help. Remember this book has three in books in it. 1. Preparation 2. Planting 3. Harvest. We are still in the preparation stage in book one. Also the Jesuits 1. infiltrate 2. educate 3. agitate.*

Bigotry had failed in its purpose and the tale-bearer, had spent his shaft, but the worst enemy of all was soon to come, and this was the northern winter. Baltimore in his own words tells of the sufferings of his colony in the long cold winter of 1628-29. In a letter to his King written in the following summer he says:

I have met with difficulties and incumbrances here which in this place are no longer to be resisted, but enforced me presently to quit my residence and to shift to some other warmer climate of the new world where the winters will be shorter and less rigorous.

From the middle of October to the middle of May he writes:

There is a sad fare of winter upon all this land, both sea and land so frozen for the greater part of the time as they are not penetrable, no plant or vegetable thing appearing out of the earth until about the beginning of May, nor fish in the sea, besides the air so intolerable cold as it is hardly to be endured.

His house had been a hospital all through the long winter, a hundred persons sick at a time, and because of his own illness he was not able to minister to the wants of others. Ten had died during the winter. Broken in health, and with a considerable loss of fortune, he was almost on the point of giving up further plans of colonization. That there was some deep underlying motive, other than the expectation of profit that led him to make another attempt, is indicated in the following, which appears in his letter to the King:

Hereupon I have had a strong temptation to leave all proceedings in plantations and being much decayed in my strength, to retire myself to my former quiet; but my inclinations carrying me naturally to these kind of works and not knowing how better to employ the poor remainder of my days than with other good subjects, to further the best I may, the enlarging your Majesty's empire in this part of the world, I am determin'd to commit this place to fishermen that are able to encounter the storms and hard weather and to remove myself with some forty persons to your Majesty's dominion Virginia; where if your Majesty will please to grant me a precinct of land with such privileges as the King, your father, my gracious master, was pleased to grant me here, I shall endeavor to the utmost of my power to deserve it.⁹

It is to be noted that Baltimore was careful to include in his request for a new grant the same privileges which King James had granted to him in the Avalon Charter. Without these his main purpose in affording an asylum for the religiously oppressed would have been defeated.

Charles wrote in reply, reminding Baltimore that men of his condition and breeding were fitter for other employment "than the framing of new plantations which commonly have rugged and laborious beginnings and require much greater means in managing them than usually the power of one private subject can reach unto." The King advised him to give up the further prosecution of his plans and return to England "where he would enjoy both the liberty of a subject and such respect from us as your former services and late endeavors do so justly deserve." There was a gracious side to the character of Charles revealed in this kindly letter to a loyal subject of another faith, but in those days it would have taken more than the favor and respect of a king to insure to a Catholic "the liberty of a subject." Charles' advice was not heeded, for before the letter was written Lord Baltimore had set sail from Avalon for a sunnier clime.

1. Loc. cit.,7. See also *The Founding of Maryland*, by the same author, 22.

2. Fiske, *Virginia and Her Neighbors*, I, 259.

3. Adams, *March of Democracy*, 34.

4. *British Empire in America* (London, 1708), I, 8.

5. *The Lords Baltimore*, Fund Publication No. 8, Md. Hist. Soc., 19.

6. Op. cit. I, 243. Eggleston says that the charter of Avalon naturally left open a door for the toleration of the faith to which he was already attached, *Beginners of the Nation*, 226

7. Anderson, *History of the Church of England in the Colonies*, 113.

8. *Rise of Religious Liberty in America*, 365.

9. Browne, *Calverts*, 24, 25.