

## CHAPTER 13

# ENGLAND'S RELIGIOUS WAR EXPANDED TO NEW WORLD

---

### THE EUROPEAN BULLY

To bring the issues we have been discussing into better perspective and to give a clearer picture, let's take a brief walk down history lane. — For example, there was not so very long ago, a bully who stalked the fair land, whose ferociousness and appetite to mutilate tender human bodies never seemed to be satisfied. But wait! Don't be alarmed. The shrieks of the dying was sanctioned on good authority — the name of God and the 'Holy' Roman Catholic religion. However, there seems to be a unique feature built into every bully, and in this particular bully it was working quite well — when getting a slight taste of its own medicine, to be able to yell the very loudest.

Rome's screams and cries from England's horrible persecution against her saintly Jesuits defending their faith is enough to win over the most sensitive of all sympathetic ears. But — in doing so, one must disregard completely — England's Queen Elizabeth excommunicated by the pope, her subjects urged to rise up against her, the Spanish Armada, the Gunpowder Plot, the Inquisition, St. Bartholomew's massacre, the Thirty Years' War, the Irish massacre, and the Bible, and come back into the fold — the only and true fold — that guarantees mankind his eternal salvation. How nostalgic. With this kind of thinking it becomes understandable and generally accepted, the belief in the saying that, "the whole world loves a lie". Certainly the whole world is 'living' a lie. And giving it just a little more time, will surely die in its lie.

The Bible is a most hated and detested book. Why? Because

it contradicts everything that intellectual man teaches and believes. Like — the Bible teaches truth — such as, man, his earth, and all things upon it were created in a literal seven day week, just under six thousand years ago, by a personal and loving creator God. That there was sin, a universal flood because of sin, the promise of a 'Saviour' to bring man back in right-standing with God, who actually came, died in our stead, was resurrected, received into heaven, and upon departing, gave the promise that He would return at an appointed time to gather all those who believed these truths to be sacred.

But man loves and prefers his lies! — Like the evolution of this planet taking billions of years to form or the big bang theory or man evolving from a monkey. Intellectuals dismiss any such thing as sin, a world flood is considered preposterous, homosexuality is A-okay, and Jesus Christ is just one of many cosmic christs. Above all, there certainly is not a God who judges man or will ever intervene in his affairs. Therefore the Bible is ridiculed, mocked, and scoffed at and held in such contempt and derision by the educated class that it discourages all, except the most weak-minded, according to them, to even approach the book. So by undermining the Bible, a more effective means to prevent it from being read is accomplished than ever by placing it on the index of forbidden books. Thus, in one master stroke, the only true source of 'truth' is destroyed. However, Jesus Christ declared, "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me". (John 5:39)

One thing the Bible consistently emphasizes throughout its pages, is the overwhelming ratio of those who reject Bible truth, as compared with the almost insignificant few who embrace it. And as the whole world marches along in perfect step and harmony in its absurd and superstitious beliefs, Scripture also teaches quite plainly something else. Break ranks or bob out of step with the hallowed opinions and sacred oracles of the world, and you have the most excellent opportunity to become a member of their casualty list. The entire history and teaching of the Bible is a record of those two simple facts — the whole world contentedly believing a lie, and anyone challenging or supporting contrariwise will end up stigmatized or suffer a martyr's death. The eleventh chapter of Hebrews has been called

the faith chapter. However, its last portion reads more like an obituary notice for believers. The life and 'death' of Christ graphically bears witness to this, as well as what He taught His disciples, that, "Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it". (Matthew 10:22 & 39) So the people of God recognize full well that they can never win the war with the world's most beloved Roman Catholic religion and its pope. For Scripture itself declares, (Rev. 13:7) "it was given unto him to make war with the saints and to 'overcome' them".

The theme of denouncing the existing system as traditional, old, and no longer workable, and then urging for a "change" in the 'order of things', began with the so called Enlightenment Movement and its Illuminati which produced the American and French Revolutions, abolished the monarchy system of government and replaced it with democracy. It now extends itself full circle with its propaganda campaign that is prodding us for a 'change' today. But the concept to bring about a 'change', as we are referring to here, had its inspiration and "roots" in only one place — England's intense historical struggle with the Roman Catholic "bully" to brutally force her to "change" her religion to that of Rome's. When force didn't work, then more and more subtlety was resorted to. And the greatest of these, the Master Plan, or the Great Work or "Grand Design", was to deceptively and covertly set up a Roman Catholic colony among the Protestant North American English colonies. Then cautiously and meticulously pose it as a haven of civil and religious freedom for all worshipers, so as to be accepted by Protestantism, and in enough time, bring the Great Work to a "glorious fulfillment". — That is, to bring not just the English, but the whole world to the realization that it needs to "change" and worship according to Rome.

### ENGLAND STANDING ALONE

The little island of Protestant England had not a friend or ally in all of Europe; only a ring of watchful enemies waiting to pounce on her at the first sign of weakness, restrained only by their distrust of one another. The clamor for the blood of English heretics and their Jezebel Queen Elizabeth, was for over thirty

years a rallying cry that swept the people of Europe back and forth in blind storms of emotion, spurring them on to hasten their plans for an English invasion.

Vigorously involved were Spain's governor general, Alexander Farnese, duke of Parma, who was ruthlessly suppressing the Protestant rebels in the Netherlands to bow to Rome; Enrique de Guzman, count of Olivarez, the Spanish ambassador at Rome; Don Bernardino de Mendoza, the Spanish resident ambassador in Paris; and King Philip II himself of Spain, the most powerful sovereign in Europe and champion of Catholic orthodoxy, who in his youthful years had been king of England through his marriage to (bloody) Mary Tudor.<sup>55</sup> Mendoza, known for having sent a message to Queen Elizabeth, "that Bernardino de Mendoza was born not to disturb kingdoms but to conquer them", acted also for his king as paymaster of the ultra-Catholic conspiracy, known as the Holy League. The League, whose powerful chieftains, Henry, duke of Guise, and his brothers, served the religious interests of the papacy and France and was closely allied with the ultramontane wing of the clergy, the Jesuits, also for the preservation of the orthodox Roman Catholic faith.

It was a fearful and menacing array of forces that was foaming and frothing across the channel, that was preparing an invasion fleet, marshalling soldiers and war supplies and labeling their intentions to bring England back to Rome as the "Enterprise". But add to this the active underground Jesuit mission that conveyed priests, students, couriers, and refugees in and out of England, who distributed clandestinely their printed books and pamphlets by the thousands, that incited and agitated and kept the minds and hearts of the Catholic faithful panting for the day of liberation. — Is it any wonder that from the intense stress and apprehensions inflicted on the English, that it would not cause them to react severely in the defense and security of their nation. Certainly, any rational government would have. Amazingly though, with all the acts of treason that outsiders hyped up and encouraged against the government of England, when the invasion actually came, not one Englishman sided with the enemy or forsook their beloved Queen.

## ROME'S OFFENSIVE

The English government decreed: that since the Catholic priesthood and their schools instructed its students in the skills of conspiracy, to rebel and overthrow their Protestant government, then the priests would be banned from England and the Catholic schools closed. It was during these times that an aristocratic English Catholic, by the name of Dr. William Allen, left his country, in 1565, for the last time, with a dream vaguely hatching in his brain. He pondered, that if the 'Faith' was to be preserved and restored in his "lost fatherland", then a freshly trained priesthood had to be organized, explicitly for the purpose of being secretly sent back into England to exhort, encourage, and rouse the persecuted flock to action, in defiance of the law. It was this dream, this vision, to bring about a religious 'change', that formed in the head of William Allen, unwittingly to him, that became the birth place and seed that was destined to grow, expand, and be molded to fit each situation, that later emerged as the "Grand Design".

William Allen was ordained a priest shortly after his departure from England at Mechlin, Belgium. Then, after a visit to Rome, his dream began to take shape as a reality when, three years later, in 1568, he founded his first English college in Douay, France. This was ten years after Queen Elizabeth had come to the English throne and twenty years before the attempted Spanish invasion. In 1575, Allen made a second visit to Rome. This time to help pope Gregory XIII found another English college, that would be in Rome and also to train missionaries for England. Being greatly attached to the Jesuits, it was only natural that they joined him in the work of the English mission. The first two English Jesuits to reenter England were Robert Parsons and Edmond Campion. Campion was executed for his troubles, but Parsons escaped, and returning to Allen, they collaborated together and became joint leaders of the "Spanish Party" among English Catholics. The career of William Allen in his obsession to restore Catholicism in England won for him universal admiration and gratitude in the Catholic realm.

At the request of King Philip II, Allen was created cardinal in 1587, and held himself in readiness to go to England immediately, should the Armada invasion, the following year, proved successful. He was sorely disappointed. One of his chief

literary works was the preparation of the well known Douay Bible that appeared complete in 1609, two years before the English King James version. In 1589, he co-operated with Jesuit Parsons in establishing a third English college at Valladolid, in Spain. His fourth and last visit to Rome, he resided at the English college there until his death, 16 October, 1594.<sup>56</sup>

Without question, Rome's most preferred method in dealing with challengers to her 'cooked up' divine authority, is to ruthlessly crush and eliminate them. However, clandestine tactics also become quite beneficial, especially when brutality seems to fail. It just requires a little more time and patience. Thus by the concerted efforts and legacy left by William Allen, his English colleges and seminarians, that collaborated with the Jesuits and their infernal intrigues, instigations, and deep layed conspiracies, gave the Catholic hierarachy assurance, if necessary, to wage a proficient and prolonged warfare. And Rome fully knows, as long as it takes, when she has conquered English Protestantism, then her victory over all Protestantism will be complete as well. Protestants sleeping today, are oblivious to what Rome does to her prisoners of war.

To the informed and unbiased observer, the fury and rage expressed by the Roman Catholic hierarchy at the conduct of King Henry VIII of England for usurping the position claimed by the pope of Rome, as the 'Supreme Head' of Christendom, then investing that same title in himself, over English Christians, must seem a little absurd and almost laughable. Pretty much like a petty thief heisting from a professional thief something he had previously stolen — certainly enough to set any thief into a frenzy. For the pope of Rome has no more right to that title, according to Scripture, than did King Henry VIII. The only difference is, the usurpation of the pope of Rome took centuries to accomplish, while it took Henry VIII only a few years.

But the fury and rage of Rome's propaganda nonsense rants on as it spews out its venom and misinformation upon unsuspecting and naive minds. And so pictured to the world, is the tyranny and horror of English Protestantism, enforced by excommunicated, illegitimate, bastard child of Anne Boleyn, Queen Elizabeth, and those who succeeded her, as a time of uncomparably vicious and unbearable persecution. Quite naturally, gone is the memory of that reign of five short years,

before Elizabeth took the throne, by her half sister, bloody Mary, who ordered the gruesome Smithfield fires, and others throughout England, that consumed alive over three hundred victims who refused to worship according to Rome.

Perhaps by now, the reader may think this book's main purpose is to bash Catholics and the Jesuits. Many will even cry out, denouncing it as hate literature. In all sincerity, this is just not the case. Let's be reasonable: Is it called hate when one is arrested for a crime, and the court demands a pre-trial investigation into the suspect's past criminal record? Certainly not. It's more likely to be called practical and plain good common sense. In effect, doesn't our past record actually become substantial proof of what our character is at present? Most of us are creatures of habit. What we did yesterday, we will surely do today. So for a judge to review a suspect's past history is paramount for him to understand the truth; enabling him to make a just and wise decision.

It has been said that the word philo-sophy actually means, "one who loves wisdom". Anyone who is curious enough to learn knowledge and is never satisfied, may be called a philosopher. The desire of this book is not to convey hate, but hopefully, to share knowledge, truth, and wisdom. For the evidence produced herein are not fabrications, but facts taken from record books of history. So now if the criminal just happens to be well loved, extremely rich, affluent and powerful with the public clamoring against even a trial — how does a just court rule? At the very least, to reveal past atrocious crimes? — or in the name of 'religion', grant full amnesty? Supposed it was your loved one that was butchered: You be the judge.

### ENGLAND'S LINE OF DEFENSE

The punishment for treason in England under Protestant rulership was real enough, but only in proportion to the aggressiveness of the priests of Rome. And so the tide of persecution ebbed and flowed, sometimes abating, at other times with increased severity, but always, Rome's hostile and criminal acts set the pace. And even though the penal laws were always on the statute books as ready weapons, they were never enforced with uniform rigidity. In Queen Elizabeth's forty-five year reign, there were one hundred and twenty-eight priests,

fifty-eight laymen, and three women executed for treason. During the reign of James I, twenty priests and eight laymen were executed, and in the reign of Charles I there were only two.<sup>57</sup> In most cases, they did not suffer death by burning. That vile method was consecrated for Roman Church use only; the fountainhead and chief perpetuator of torture in the West.

The penal laws of England that compelled all, (and that affected the Puritans, Reformed churches, as well as Catholics) to take the oath of supremacy and conform to the Church of England, continued in effect from the time Henry VIII enacted his Statute, called the Act of Supremacy, in 1535, for two hundred and fifty-six years after, till 1791. For those who chose to refuse, and you could, in lieu of conforming, a fine had to be paid or have your property confiscated. Only treason brought the death penalty, and even that dwindled, to where 1681 became the last year for a Catholic to be executed for his faith.

The evidence of leniency that the English government always seemed to nurture is recognized discreetly even in the 1909 Catholic Encyclopedia, volume V, subject England, page 449, where it states...

"Notwithstanding the severities of Elizabeth, the number of Catholic clergy on the English missions in her time was considerable. It has been estimated that at the end of the sixteenth century they amounted to three hundred and sixty-six, fifty being survivors of the old Marian priests, three hundred priests from Douai and the other foreign seminaries, and sixteen priests of the Society of Jesus". And page 450, "With the accession of Charles I (1625) a somewhat brighter time began for English Catholics. He was unwilling to shed their innocent blood — indeed only two underwent capital punishment while he bore rule — and this reluctance was one of the causes of rupture between him and the Parliament. His policy, Hallam writes, "with some fluctuations, was to wink at the domestic exercise of the Catholic religion, and to admit its professors to pay compensations for clemency, which were not regularly enforced." The number



of Catholic clergy in England received a considerable augmentation in his reign. Panzani reported to the Holy See that in 1634 there were on the English mission five hundred secular priests, some hundred and sixty Jesuits, a hundred Benedictines, twenty Franciscans, seven Dominicans, two Minims, five Carmelites, and one Carthusian lay brother, besides the clergy, nine in number, who served the queen's chapel".

The influx of priests had become so great that by 1598 Pope Gregory XIII appointed an archpriest and by 1623 the mission was enlarged into a province. Wonder of wonders, during the alleged most horrible time of Catholic persecution, Roman priests were literally flocking to England by the hundreds. Really now, can there be any doubt as to what all these priests were actually doing? — other than reviving the drooping spirits and rekindling a burning flame in the dying hearts of the Catholic faithful, which is innocently and noble enough. But to Rome that can mean only one thing. Complete submission by all to the authority of Rome. And to accomplish just this, a "Plan" was in the making; not only to cleverly circumvent English Protestantism, but all others as well.

There were two monumental factors about English Protestantism, that not only concerned and haunted Rome and her priesthood, but seemed to taunt them as well. First, Rome was not just dealing with the Church of England, which was bad enough, in that its arrogant heresy was made the law of the land. But there was a massive segment of Protestants rising up in strength, who believed, according to Scripture, that the Church of England, even though it had separated itself from Rome, was shamefully clinging on to most of Rome's tenets that were blatantly false doctrines. These Puritans wanted these corrupt practices abandoned immediately and the Church of England purified. But worse than that, because Rome had become such a virtual moral cesspool, the more one studied the Scriptures the more it became obvious just how much her doctrines were in rottenness of error. So many ardent reformers, in turn, rejected the Puritans too because they felt they had not cleansed the Church enough.

Like a horse that had been confined all its life in the deep darkness of a mine, bringing it into the light of day is blinding. So reformers in their blind condition could not bear to see the light of truth all at once. It was a gradual and painful learning process. And for most Protestants, which Rome fully recognized and despised, it was not a short lived passing fancy, for they were not motivated by politics, as was Henry VIII, but were completely sincere and intensely dedicated to the love of Scriptural truth; their consciences compelling them to live their lives according to the light they had come to understand. But the second and most disturbing problem that frustrated and gnawed at Rome, was that this deep rooted malignancy was being carried and planted in the New World. For it was exactly the same time when England had become a boiling cauldron of religious enmity, that she was also planting her colonies in the North American continent.

No one recognized this dilemma of Rome better than the Jesuits; and they had a mind to do something about it. They would go to America! Not South America mind you, where Catholicism was already wondrously flourishing in a fresh new land, without pestilent Protestants, but where the horrors of the inquisition and genocide were deliciously in full swing. And not to the European Continent either, where Germany was being exterminated clean, during the 1618-1648 Thirty Years' War, to provide vast vacancies that could have been filled by the terribly persecuted English Catholics. But the Jesuits would plant a Catholic colony among the English North Americans. Imagine it — it's almost like a miracle or gift from God — as they piously declared, that it was to be a refuge and sanctuary, the 'only' in the world, where all the religiously persecuted and oppressed could come and find a safe haven of rest. — Or so the Catholic legend goes.

### **SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE CALVERT**

It seemed that whenever the English Crown had a need for matching a royal marriage, they couldn't resist going fishing in the waters of Spain. Henry VIII's first bride was Spanish, and so was his daughter, Mary Tudor's husband. And now James I, in spite of his professing to be Protestant, was also negotiating for a Spanish bride for his son, Charles I. But news about this

time in England of the Thirty Years' War eruption, that saw the army of the League and Spanish battalions marching up the valley of the Rhine, only served to accentuate and strengthen hidden fears and arouse fierce Protestant passions. A strong anti-Catholic war party sprung up, and when Parliament reassembled in 1621, after its seven years' recess, the storm of opposition against the Spanish match broke loose. The war party that was urging England to intervene and declare war against Spain and give aid to the German Protestant cause, certainly was in no mood to tolerate a plan that would place a Catholic queen on the throne of England. However the King, on the advice of his Secretary of State, George Calvert, and other Catholic counselors, refused the demands declaring, he would govern according to the common weal, not according to the common will.<sup>58</sup> And so the negotiations for a Catholic Spanish bride continued and a Protestant sore was left to fester.

George Calvert was a great favorite of King James I and after James I, that favoritism continued on through his son, Charles I. In 1617, James I, in recognition of Calvert's public services, conferred on him the order of knighthood and two years later he was elevated to the office of Secretary of State and became a member of the King's Privy Council. Also as a reward for faithful services, the King granted him, in 1621, a manor of 2300 acres, in the County of Longford, Ireland. In 1625, the King then elevated him to the Irish Peerage as Baron Baltimore of Baltimore in County Longford.<sup>59</sup> Thus in a matter of a few years, George Calvert rose to phenomenal power, wealth, and influence and in a few more years was to fix his name forever in a colony of the New World. But for the present time, King James I had selected Calvert, a man distinguished, well qualified, and anxiously in favor of the plan, to handle a very ticklish and delicate undertaking; to obtain a Spanish Catholic bride for his twenty year son. — Protestant England, with stringent anti-Catholic laws, negotiating with Catholic Spain, who demanded those laws repealed as a condition for granting a Spanish bride?

King James I and his small clique of Catholic Court advisors, known as the "Spanish Party", (the same that William Allen with the Jesuits more than forty years before had become a leader of, but was now headed up by George Calvert and the

Jesuits) became discreetly cautious as it became known of their plans to make an alliance with Spain through the proposed marriage of the Crown Prince Charles with the Spanish Infanta, Donna Maria. Throwing all caution to the wind, by ignoring public and Parliamentary outcries against such a union, George Calvert had made good progress with the treaty negotiations, that complied with the Pope's demands, that was stipulated in 1622, in return for his marriage dispensation. So Calvert was careful to include in the marriage treaty a clause granting full religious liberty to the Catholics of England and freedom from further persecution. Also 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. Then a secret treaty granting further concessions was signed later at the home of the Spanish ambassador, with James I giving his full approval, ratified by his oath.<sup>60</sup>

George Calvert was doing quite well in his efforts to shackle England again with Catholicism; that is, until Prince Charles got a brain storm and blew everything out of the water. Secretly, he had appeared in person at the Spanish court as the suitor for the hand of the Infanta. But it seems that while he was there, offenses were given and offenses were taken on both sides that resulted in a complete breakdown of discussions. So the prince and his envoy returned to England without the bride. When the news got out that the negotiations had ended up in a failure, celebrations rocked the streets of London with great rejoicing and lighting of bonfires. However, there was no joy for the Spanish Party, which had no other choice but to quickly vanish from public view. But Prince Charles had an alternative on his mind. On his way to Spain, he had stopped off at Paris and laid eyes on the lovely French Princess, Henrietta Maria.<sup>61</sup> That was the girl he wanted for his bride and actually afterwards married; a girl so Catholic she wouldn't even appear at his coronation,<sup>62</sup> and whose name Charles later named the colony of 'Mary'-land for. As for George Calvert, — he too had an alternative plan in mind.

George Calvert understood perfectly which way the religious wind was blowing in England, and like all wealthy and influential Catholics who shuttered at the very thought of losing their popish powers, was determined to recapture those

strayed minds that had been so dangerously set free from the captivities of Rome, and were now disgracefully diverting precious funds from the pope's treasury. England, as far as Rome was concerned, was a religious mission, where its people had to be converted and brought back into the papal fold; if not by outright force, then by pressure or deceptive persuasion. This 'back up' tactic, of extending the hand of peace until superiority can be gained, is a hallmark of the Jesuits that has been used time and again to accomplish their purposes.

### **GEORGE CALVERT AND AMERICAN CATHOLIC COLONIZATION**

George Calvert was an agent and confidant of the Jesuits. Working in the English Court, he was their man. He believed fully in their goals and purposes, even though his long hard labors there, representing the Spanish Party, had come to naught. But Calvert had a very keen sense of where the rising tide of Puritans in Parliament were taking England's religious future. And so as a fabulously wealthy landed proprietor and Catholic nobleman, urged on by the Jesuits, there was only one thing to do. — Launch their back up 'Plan' and found a Catholic colony in English North America.

The idea of planting the Catholic Church in the New World certainly wasn't something new. Indeed, an organization that taught that theirs was the only means by which mankind could achieve salvation, converting the savages then became the authorized pretense and excuse for every expedition, no matter where it was going. And with the Jesuits in the vanguard, the mission of the Catholic Church was always guaranteed its works of 'holiness'. Spain and Portugal sent the Jesuits to South America, where they performed wonderfully their benevolent works of slavery and genocide. France established New France also with Jesuit pioneers, that historians, notably Bancroft and Parkman, pay such great tribute to for their heroic sufferings carrying the Message of the Cross to the natives of the North American wilderness. So the compulsion to plant the Catholic Church among the English New World was like second nature to the Jesuits, even automatic. Actually, the idea wasn't new to George Calvert either, because there were several expeditions before his that had failed, that were involved and spearheaded

by the Jesuits and wealthy Catholic noblemen. But our interest is in George Calvert's expedition, — not so much that he succeeded in planting a Catholic colony among the Protestant English, but because of what the Jesuits had secretly planned for the project's future; that if you have eyes to see, is quite evident today.

With the death of his father, James I, Charles I in 1625, came to the English throne. The outstanding figure of the English Jesuits during this time was Jesuit Richard Blount. When the English mission was made a vice-province in 1619, he became the vice-provincial or superior. He was vice-provincial from 1619 to 1623, having charge of all Jesuits' affairs in England, subject only to the General of the Society. This covered the period when Lord Baltimore first became active in American colonization. In the year 1620, when the Pilgrims of the Mayflower landed on New England's shores, George Calvert purchased from a former classmate at Oxford, a plantation on the stony coast of Newfoundland. He applied for and received from James I in April 1623, the charter of Avalon, the name he gave his Newfoundland colony. Calvert prepared the charter himself, in the fall and winter of 1622. It will be noticed that this was exactly the time he was engaged in the negotiations for James I in the Spanish marriage treaty. With the Jesuits' guiding hand, Calvert prepared both documents.

When a province was created in England in 1623, Jesuit Richard Blount was made provincial, and retained that office until 1635 when he was succeeded by Jesuit Henry More. Richard Blount was a member of one of the ancient families of England and of the nobility. He had close, if not blood relationship with Lord Baltimore's co-laborer, Lord Arundel of Wardour. In his veins ran the blood of the houses of Norfolk, Howard, and Warwick.<sup>63</sup> When Charles I took the English throne, and as soon as his Queen, Henrietta Maria, seemed able to provide a bishop in England, bishops of Chalcedon were sent in 1623 and 1625. The second of these, Dr. Richard Smith, became embroiled in a controversy that involved the whole future of the English Jesuit mission. George Calvert came to the aid of Jesuit Blount in the controversy that arose, and took the side of the Jesuit missionaries. In 1628, so great an opposition had arisen to the action of the bishop that a number of the Catholic lords

and gentry signed a brief and letter of remonstrance, prepared by Calvert and signed last by him, then sent it to Rome. When the bishop heard of their action against him, he resigned.<sup>64</sup> The Jesuits in England had found an able and fearless advocate in Lord Baltimore.

It was during this controversy that George Calvert made two trips to his Avalon colony. The first trip in 1627 was very brief, for he returned to England the same year. But his second trip, the following summer of 1628, he had meant to stay. He brought along his second wife and several members of his family. Also forty colonists, including three other Jesuits who were to assist the Jesuits already sent there earlier. Calvert suffered terribly that year as a typical miserable cold harsh and long Newfoundland winter set in. He fell ill along with many of his other colonists, they all being sick at the same time. Ten died from the experience.

Broken in health, and with a considerable loss of fortune, it thoroughly convinced him that Newfoundland's severe climate was no place to establish his colony. In fact, he wrote the king that he was tempted to give up further plans of colonization altogether. But an 'underlying' motive spurred him on. For in the same letter, before he had even seen Virginia, he was requesting the king to grant him a piece of its land. As soon as the weather permitted, Calvert set his sails again. This time for Virginia; and taking his family and Jesuits with him, he went to take a look.

The spirits of George Calvert revived considerably as his ship sailed into the magnificently beautiful Chesapeake Bay, that October 1629 day. A bay so large at its mouth that Calvert could not see one lush green shore from the other. Anchoring at Jamestown, the Virginians soon made it apparent, after he refused to take the oath of supremacy, that they did not wish to have Lord Baltimore for a neighbor. But before departing for England, he took a voyage northward up the Chesapeake Bay in quest of unoccupied territory. Viewing both shores, east and west, he beheld for the first and only time the meadowland and hills of the future colony of Maryland. Like Moses of old looking into the promised land, Calvert would never set his foot upon it. Returning to England, he would seek a grant from the king.<sup>65</sup>

Much has been said already concerning the events surrounding the colony of Maryland in chapter eight. The history of Maryland is extremely important and significant here because it was through the colony of Maryland that the Catholic Church and its Jesuits gained entry to the English New World. When Lord Baltimore George Calvert was requesting his grant for Maryland from King Charles I, there were at that time only two English colonies in existence; Virginia and the Plymouth Colony. And both were very Protestant. As the events unfolded, and take particular notice: that no matter how 'Protestant' Virginia, the Plymouth Colony, or any other colony that followed wanted to declare themselves, whether their government was good or bad, or how rigidly they enforced their laws to exclude the Catholic religion, it was doomed to be sidestepped. Protestantism is basically the common mans' religion. In the end, Catholic kings and the Catholic super rich nobility always have their way. This is a fact and reality that Protestantism is powerless to fight against.

When Lord Baltimore returned from Virginia in 1630, he only had two more years in which to live. He sat down to draft his Maryland charter for the colony that King Charles I, who was now on the English throne, had granted him. Calvert, like so many Englishmen of his day, saw exploration and colonization as paths to substantial profit, and his mercantile interests were well established. As early as 1609 he was admitted as a member of the East India Company with the considerable investment of £1000 and increased this to £1600 in 1616. Also in 1609 he became a member of the second Virginia Company, and the New England Company by 1622. His later interests extended to such distinct affairs as the silk trade and a plantation in Ireland.<sup>66</sup> George Calvert was an enterprising business man and as a former Secretary of State he had had experience with treaties, charters and charter drafting, and so he knew what he was doing. But this little project had a religious flavor, and the stiff opposition of the Parliamentary party and the Virginians made it necessary that most of the planning be carried on in semi-secrecy.

The Jesuit influences behind Lord Baltimore's project of American colonization can not be overlooked. It must be remembered that from 1623, when Calvert first purchased his



Newfoundland plantation till 1633, the date the Ark and Dove sailed to found the Maryland colony, was also approaching the very time when it was reported to Rome that there were three hundred and sixty-four Jesuits in England.<sup>67</sup> So though it was subdued, it was also a time for expansion and zealous activity. And it is well established that four Jesuit names in particular had a leading role in counseling Lord Baltimore; even before, and definitely through the time of his colonization project. They were Jesuits Henry More, the great-grandson of the Chancellor, Sir Thomas More, author of "Utopia", Richard Blount, Andrew White and Sir Tobias Matthew.

During those years that George Calvert worked in the service of King James I, hidden influences were molding his thinking; so much so, that many suspected him to have been a Catholic at heart for quite some time. But being highly esteemed in the king's favor, who had the courage to point a finger? But of those who were swaying his thoughts was Count Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, with whom he had formed a close relationship during the Spanish marriage negotiations, and was accused of showing undue favoritism toward. There was also his very close family friend, Lord Thomas Arundel, Baron of Wardour, a wealthy Catholic nobleman who had been interested in a colonization venture fifteen years earlier. George Calvert's oldest son, Cecilius, and second Lord Baltimore, married Thomas Arundel's daughter, Lady Anne Arundel, in 1628. And there was Sir Tobias Matthew, who as a Jesuit under cover agent, acted at James I's court to promote the marriage of Prince Charles with the Spanish Infanta. For his efforts, 20 October 1623, James I knighted him.<sup>68</sup>

### **GEORGE CALVERT, THE JESUITS, AND THE MARYLAND COLONY CONSPIRACY**

It was the Spanish marriage failure though, that seems to have jolted everything in George Calvert's head into making a firm decision. For it was at this time that he openly declared himself to be Roman Catholic and turned in his resignation to the king. It was also at this time we find him going to the north of England, in the company of arch-Jesuit, Sir Tobias Matthew, to be received into the Catholic Church. Sir Tobias Matthew himself was ordained into the priesthood, 20 May 1614, by the

notorious Jesuit, Cardinal Bellarmine. Written about the events during that time and taken from the book, "The History of the Society of Jesus in North America", by Thomas Hughes, S.J., Text, volume 2, pages 7&8, in reference to the Aspinwall Papers from the Massachusetts Historical Society Collections. It says...

"Sir George became not only a Catholic, but a Catholic of Matthew's own brotherhood, a Jesuit; and so, of course, became his son and heir (Cecil) after him". An additional comment relating to Calvert and Matthew says..." They were both acting in concert and pursuing one common purpose, that of establishing a firm foothold for the Catholic religion in two adjoining colonies (Virginia and Maryland), which would be likely to support and protect each other, and to counterbalance the growing Protestant influence of the more northern portions of the New World, which had recently been abundantly and exclusively favoured by the Council of New England".

George Calvert had opened himself up to Jesuit influence and ambitions of the purest kind, that flowed right from the hierarchy's top.

This brief summary of Maryland's history is not meant to give a misleading impression so to over simplify all the events shaping its colonization period and after. To be sure, many Catholic heads were brought together, and some of them violently bumped, to get their covert plan underway. So even though nothing goes exactly according to plan, understand perfectly, there definitely was a 'Plan'. And should a fuller picture of some of the complexities be desired, just from a Jesuit viewpoint at least, the reader is recommended to read, if it can be acquired, the book written in 1907-1917 by Thomas Hughes S.J., and quoted from above. It has four volumes; two, volume I, part I and II, are documents and letters, some written in Latin. The other two volumes are I and II, texts, and are written in English.

The simple fact was, the 'Plan' was subject to some very serious pitfalls. First, the laws of England prohibited any such Catholic immigration venture going to the English New World.

To proceed contrary, George Calvert and both Kings, James I and his son Charles I, and all those involved, knew they were breaking the law. But this was where kings and Parliament clashed. Kings claimed to rule by 'divine right', regardless of the law, and Parliament claimed kings reigned by the sovereignty of its people. But the greatest pitfall to overcome was a Parliament that upheld those laws; that vigorously and vehemently protested against their plans. But they need not to have worried. Kings had ways of getting around such trifles. Lord Baltimore George and his son Cecil Calvert received their charter grants. And even though we'll never know exactly what went on behind closed doors, yet if the lady steps out pregnant and later gives birth, you sure have a pretty good idea. The 'baby' was born, though quite illegitimate, and heartily thrived and grew, and later even challenged its own mother.

Rome was exceedingly interested in a English Catholic colonization project, especially with George Calvert being the Jesuits' front man. And there could not have been a more suitable or qualified person in all of England for them to have worked quietly behind. His relationship with both kings, his influence at court and his great wealth, fit their order just perfect. But try now to project yourself into their time frame; to grasp fully the seriousness of the business these men were about to engage themselves into. All England was in an uproar; everywhere the air was charged with voices of protests and civil war, and becoming stronger day by day. The king's life itself was destined to be in jeopardy. So under these very real and pressing conditions, how would anyone, with even a speck of intelligence, conduct themselves to meet the problems? To Lord Baltimore, King James I and his son, Charles I, and all their powerful Catholic friends, it was not a question 'if' it could be done, but rather 'how', with the least amount of opposition.<sup>69</sup> The 'how' department was left up to Lords Baltimore, first and second, and the Jesuits; who got approval from their General and the pope.

There is no question that King James I and his son, Charles I, and both Lords Baltimore and the Jesuits were all deeply involved in the American colonization project, particularly the Maryland colony after Newfoundland had failed. Just the acquisition of the Maryland colony land alone, was blatantly

obvious that some very powerful strings were being pulled.<sup>70</sup> But the Maryland charter too was a piece of work. All anti-Catholic restrictions and disabilities were kept out. In addition, the subtle wording of the fourth section, a topic of much discussion, was cleverly connived by the king and Calvert to hoodwink the English people.

During that time of religious and political ferment, terms could mean one thing today and another tomorrow. For example, the wording read pertaining to the Church, "according to the ecclesiastical laws of our kingdom of England". Now if Protestants were in power that could have meant either the Church of England or the Puritans; which was only for Protestant window dressing. But suppose the pendulum swung in the opposite direction? — Which was the designers burning desire and ultimate goal, as seen by every condition extended to Calvert — then it would mean the Roman Catholic Church. Indeed, the term was not more explicit purposely, to leave the exact meaning in doubt. But add to the charter's crafty maneuvers, the provision in article twenty, that no burden of taxation was ever to be laid upon them, along with giving the Proprietor the incredible sweeping powers of an absolute monarch, the Charter of Maryland then, the only one of its kind written in Latin, becomes the most ample and sovereign that ever emanated from the British Crown.<sup>71</sup>

### **TOLERANCE — A GOOD ROMANIST'S LURE**

There is not a history of Maryland written by a Catholic author that does not go on and on and continually stress, time after time after time, that Maryland is the land of toleration; that both Lords Baltimore, first and second, were men of great religious vision, benevolent, and so far ahead of their time. Maryland, a refuge for all Christians regardless, whatsoever, their particular belief. "Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary", actually the title for one of their history books. How could the Puritans have been so cruel to wrest the colony from Lord Baltimore when he had so kindly offered them a refuge after the Anglicans had cast them out of Virginia? Maryland, the land to worship free, in "Maryland, the Free State", the slogan it carries to this day. Maryland, the pioneer of religious liberty. For whose consumption is all this tainted propaganda directed?

After awhile, the sugar gets so sweet, it tends to make you sick.

So that it is not thought to be an over exaggeration, let's quote from the above mentioned book titled, "Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary" by Rev. William T. Russell, 1907. This book has the exquisite honor, and is therefore sanctioned, by having its introductory preface given by his Eminence, James Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore, Maryland at that time. The following quote is taken from the very first words of the book, chapter one, paragraph one, page one...

"To Maryland belongs the peerless distinction of being in modern times "The Land of Sanctuary." Here the persecuted for conscience' sake of every creed might find an end of persecution and a peaceful home. The Prelatist excluded from the haven of Plymouth Rock by the Pilgrims of the Mayflower, the Puritan self-righteous, but self-denying, driven from England and Virginia, the Quaker, peaceful yet fanatical, hounded from every spot where he would build a cabin he might call his home, as well as the Jew, rejected by all, found in Maryland a welcome and an abode of peace. The landing at St. Clement's Island, on the 25th of March, 1634, of the little band of Pilgrims, who later founded the settlement of St. Mary's, marks a distinct era in the religious history of the world, for then and there religious liberty gained its first foothold among the nations of the earth."

Understand: these sugary words reflect the sentiments of an organization that has a track record of being a maniacal serial killer and butcher unsurpassed by any other in the history of our world. And with taking the keenest delight and pleasures in mutilating its untold amount of defenseless victims. — But now in the face of one worthy of protecting itself, resorts to portraying to the whole world, like a true bully trying to save its own hide and gain advantage, a disposition of character that would almost fit a saint. But let's take a look at another quote from the same book, pages 6&7, to show exactly how this organization feels about true religious toleration...Because some religions may claim for their beliefs such as polygamy, the

sacrifice of human victims, or some other degrading moral practice, the principle of 'absolute' religious liberty cannot be admitted by any civil government. And rightly so, but the author goes on to say...

"The utmost that is consistent with the very existence of civil government is a 'limited' religious liberty. Nor can we agree with those who seem to hold that a multiplicity of warring religious beliefs is the ideal of social perfection. The conditions that necessitate even a limited toleration of all beliefs will ever prove more or less dangerous to the welfare of the people according as religious convictions are more or less strong, or according as they are maintained by men more or less ignorant and narrow. When it is needlessly proclaimed it is an invitation to sectarianism, with its inevitable disunions and discussions; it is perilous to the peace of a community. The closer the union between the civil and religious authority, as long as each aids the other, and neither encroaches upon the domain of the other, the better it will be for both and the more secure will be the peace of the people."

"But when religious liberty has been inevitably produced by the force of circumstances, and has been established by treaties or legislation, the law and the treaties should be respected. A Catholic ruler is justified in granting a limited religious liberty, as aboved explained, in two cases for the welfare of the people. The first occurs, when to refuse religious liberty would be more injurious than to grant it; and the second, when the grant would be accompanied by greater good than refusal."

What course then, under these most perilous circumstances, would any sensible, level headed and intelligent business man, who had just invested the extraordinary sum of more than £40,000 in his Maryland venture, have taken?? Rest assured: religious tolerance has never been offered by Rome out of

benevolence, but is only stubbornly squeezed out strictly as a policy of sheer expediency. Give George and Cecil Calvert a little intellectual credit. Their course of action surely did not come from a love for their fellow Protestant colonists, but the hard cold fact that they were compelled to walk that narrow line of tolerance because it would have been totally stupid and foolhardy to have chosen any other path. — That is, if they didn't want their venture to be ship wrecked — no matter what kind of saintly picture the legend makers want to paint of the Calverts. And this role of tolerance and low profile became a governing factor that was adopted and rigidly adhered to (again, for 'expedency' sake) by the Calverts and the top hierarchy of the Jesuits, even up until today.

### **JESUITS AND THE MARYLAND COLONY**

"While Lord Baltimore George Calvert was planning his Maryland colony, Henry More was among the most prominent Jesuits in England. At this time the relations between the Lords Baltimore and the Jesuits were most friendly; in fact, the latter seem to have played a very important part in planning and projecting the Maryland venture, as well as in acting as the spiritual advisers of the Proprietaries. We may well believe that Jesuit More, who soon after became the provincial in England, was one of the chief councillors of Lords Baltimore in a project which was of deep interest to the Jesuits at that time."

From the book, "Maryland, the Land of Sanctuary", pages 25 & 26. It was he as George Calvert's chief advisor and councilor, that guided him in the preparation of the Maryland charter.

Another Jesuit that was quite conspicuous in his close association and affairs of Lords Baltimore George and Cecil Calvert in their plans for the Maryland colony was Andrew White; who has also been called in Maryland history, "The Apostle of Maryland." As far back as the year 1605, when he was twenty-six, he was engaged in the ministry in the English mission field, though not yet a Jesuit. He applied for admission,

was accepted, and entered the novitiate. Twelve years later, about 1620, and because he had previous theological education he was not required the entire seventeen, he took his final Jesuit vows of profession. It was while Andrew White was in the English mission that he met Lord Baltimore and became acquainted with the plans for the American colony. There is record that while Lord Baltimore was in Newfoundland he wrote to White. Upon returning from Virginia and receiving his Maryland grant, it was then that Jesuit Andrew White applied for the Maryland mission.<sup>72</sup>

The amount of historical letters and documents that have been preserved and are available, leaves no room for doubt about the activities of the leading participants involved in the Maryland colony. The Jesuit Mutius Vilelleschi was General from 1615 till his death, 1645. There are several related letters from him to the English provincial, Jesuit Richard Blount, who held that office from 1623 till 1635, and then was succeeded by Henry More.<sup>73</sup> Both of these men have previously been mentioned. Lord Baltimore George Calvert was completely captivated by the Jesuit Order. They had wooed him, and he in return had successfully bailed them out of a troubled spot. He had the utmost confidence in their purpose, their schools, intellect and methods. He respected and requested their help in drafting the Avalon and Maryland charters. He was sending three of his younger sons across the channel, against the English law, to receive a Jesuit education. Now he was requesting Jesuit missionaries to be sent to his Maryland colony. As an interesting note taken from the book, "History of the Society of Jesus in North America" by Thomas Hughes S.J., Text, volume I, chapter III, page 206...

"The Baron of Baltimore went off to Newfoundland. He abandoned it in the autumn of the following year, 1629. Then we find that on the 24th of November, 1629, "ten boys, three of them being sons of the Lord Baron of Baltimore," were in the English Channel, crossing over to St. Omer's College, under the charge of Jesuits. The little vessel was overhauled and attacked by Netherlanders. An exciting scene followed. Nobody was killed; but the convoy of harmless



passengers was robbed of everything; and then landed in safety on the 28th of the same month at Nieuport, whence they reached St. Omer's on December 6."

Within the Catholic hierarchy, the participants involved in the Maryland mission had to work out all their plans, objectives, and stratagems and then submit a report to their superiors — first the Jesuit in the mission field to his provincial, then to their General, and finally to the pope — for approval, and then returned. Many of these correspondences are on record and still can be read today. Andrew White and two other men were approved for the Maryland mission. After Lord Baltimore's return from Virginia in 1630, there is much evidence to show that for those two years till his death, Andrew White was in close touch with him and had an active part in the plans for the new colony. It is a well established fact that he wrote the famous 'Declaratio Coloniae', outlining the purposes of the colony and the terms and conditions offered to the settlers, which was published, with copies in English circulated in England to attract colonists, while copies in Latin were sent to his superiors.<sup>74</sup>

Also, as part of their stratagem to be able to answer their critics, a literal question and answer situation was written up covering the various objections that could have been raised, along with their deflecting and neutralizing effect answers.<sup>75</sup> This paper is strongly believed to have been written also by Jesuit Andrew White; but whoever actually prepared it, it bore the stamp of approval of the English Province and Jesuit Blount. It validly proves that the Provincial of the Jesuits considered the charter of Maryland, that the Society of Jesus undertook to further and extend the planting of the colony, and with the full knowledge that the 'pretense' of religious toleration was to be adopted as one of the fundamental institutions of the province. — So that by necessity, toleration for Roman Catholics carried with it toleration for all Christians. Therefore the design and integrity behind the Maryland project had the cooperation and approval of the Roman Catholic hierarchy — Jesuits Andrew White and Richard Blount, the English Provincial, the General of the Society of Jesus, and the Pope. It is remarkable that "The Roman Catholic Church", which never changes, changes often when it is to her advantage.

George Calvert died 15 April 1632 and his son, Cecilius Calvert, became the second Lord Baltimore. He was only twenty-six years of age when his father's mantle suddenly fell upon his young shoulders; thrusting upon him full responsibility for carrying on the plans for the new colony. But he rose to the occasion superbly. He knew of his father's plans and had been taught well Rome's procedure of conquest whenever she was in the minority. First, she begs for tolerance. Then when tolerance has been granted, she begs for equality. After equality has been enjoyed then Rome steps forth in her true colors and arrogantly and ruthlessly dictates her supremacy. So Cecil Calvert was determined to adopt and maintain 'toleration' in the colony of Maryland as a design and first step towards achieving Catholic superiority. — And either with or without the zealous Jesuits in the Maryland mission field, who had problems seeing the full strategic picture.

## **SECOND LORD BALTIMORE CECILIUS CALVERT AND HIS CONTROVERSY WITH JESUITS**

The relationship and admiration that bonded George Calvert to the Jesuits came from their wooing him and his first hand experience working with them throughout his life's career. His son Cecil lacked that personal Jesuit touch, and even though he understood all too well and respected their great capabilities, it was more from a distance. When the great dispute arose between Cecil Calvert and the Jesuits, caused by some of their demands and actions in the Maryland colony, his letters then are quite revealing. He certainly expressed himself quite frankly to his brother, Governor Leonard Calvert. First, he severely upbraids his brother for failing to follow his instructions. It is he that gives the directions, and not his brother's place to question why. The Maryland colony and his own life was on the line and so accuses the Jesuits of being his bitter enemies. Other clergymen can very well replace the Jesuits, but for Catholicism's sake, and of course his investments, the Maryland colony must survive to fulfill its destiny.

The following is an excerpt taken from a letter in: Letters of Cecilius Calvert to Leonard Calvert, November 21-23, 1642, 'Calvert Papers', pp. 216-18...

“For whatsoever you may conceive of them who have no reason upon my knowledge to love them very much if you knew as much as I do concerning their speeches and actions here towards you. I am (upon very good reason) satisfied in my judgment that they do design my destruction and have too good cause to suspect, that if they cannot make or maintain a party among the English to bring their ends about, they will endeavor to do it by the Indians within a very short time by arming them against all those that shall oppose them, and all under presence of God’s honor and the Propagation of the Christian Faith, which shall be the mask and vizard to hide their other designs withall.”

“If all things that Clergymen should do upon these pretences should be accounted just and to proceed from God, laymen were the basest slaves and the most wretched creatures upon the earth. And if the greatest saint upon earth should intrude himself into my house against my will, and in despite of me, with the intention to save the souls of all my family, but withall give me just cause to suspect that he likewise designs my temporal destruction, or that being already in my house doth actually practice it, though withall he do perhaps many spiritual goods, — yet certainly I may and ought to preserve myself by the expulsion of such an enemy, and by providing others to preform the spiritual goods as he did, who shall not have any intention of mischief towards me. For the law of nature teacheth this, that it is lawful for every man in his own just defense, *vim vi repellere* — those that will be imprudent, must be as imprudently dealt withall.”<sup>76</sup>

It is very interesting how Catholic authors and historians try to patch up and smooth over this most glaringly bitter and sharp controversy between Cecil Calvert and the Jesuits. Cecil Calvert was fighting for his very life and substance, yet the

Jesuits in Maryland could have cared less about his personal predicament, — but like a true Jesuit or programmed robot, their only concern was to ramrod their sacred policies through, regardless of the cost. Exasperated, Cecil appealed to the General of the Jesuits. Only then, after the problems were fully reviewed and the General decided in Lord Baltimore's favor, did he get any relief or satisfaction from the Jesuits in Maryland to obey his requests, though hostilely complied with. But through their folly, he lost his Maryland charter anyhow, and was lucky that that was all. It seems that, though the Jesuit's General, Cecil Calvert, and the Jesuits in the Maryland mission field were all striving for the same common goal, only the General and Cecil understood the preplanned course of action that had to be rigidly followed if they were going to successfully reach that goal. So by an order from the General, the course of those in the mission field was altered. From then on, even though the Jesuit influence was subduedly felt among the English North Americans, it came later through another channel too.

It's a pretty sad situation when Jesuits stealthily use religion as a means to gain sympathizers and to infatuate so many under their spell; who, for those fortunate enough to wake up, will find themselves in a one-way love affair, being used only as a disposable tool to achieve a Jesuit end. The resentment is not so much that the Roman Church is in total gross error according to the Scriptures, who haughtily claims to be the sole possessor of religious truth, while scorning and branding those that disagree as heretics, which is bad enough, — and for many, in spite of all this, would still agree to live in peace with her. But the fierce resentment comes from Rome righteously wanting to jamb her garbage down others' throats, with either accept it or be eliminated ultimatum. And though she may be hiding her true colors for the moment, don't be fooled, they will definitely soon appear.

In spite of twice having his colony wrenched from him due to his Catholic religion, Cecil Calvert surprisingly regained it and lived almost twenty years after to see it flourish, grow and prosper until his death. This has to say much about a couple of points when considering that England had just ended a civil war that swirled around just such Protestant-Catholic issues. First, that the Puritan government and Oliver Cromwell were

not quite as tyrannical and intolerant as has been painted by the Catholic hierarchy. Or second, it strongly proves that regardless of being in the stronghold of Protestantism 'supreme', the Catholic elite still had persuasive powers and influence to jockey things their way — if a little discretion was used. Discretely driving a Catholic wedge whenever there was a relaxed opportune time could gain for Rome by increments what a frontal attack would surely lose. This was the policy of Lord Baltimore Cecil Calvert. Actually, driving a Catholic wedge among the English was the purpose of all those involved. It was just the timing that caused such a bitter disagreement.

### **THIRD LORD BALTIMORE CHARLES CALVERT AND HIS MARYLAND COLONY LOST**

His son Charles however, who was now governor of Maryland and became the third Lord Baltimore at his father's death, never seemed to understand the principles of discretion or toleration. He certainly never fit that 'sweet tolerant' Catholic picture purposely painted by Romanists designed to rock dumb Protestants to sleep. He was a true stereotype son of Rome, spurred on by his vicious hatred for anything Protestant and urged on by the regrouped Maryland Jesuits. His policies jolted Protestants wide awake, and for the third time the Calverts lost their Maryland colony. But for those more sober minds plotting Rome's ultimate supremacy, failure burned ever deeper into their consciousness — that to pretend benevolence and toleration seemed a more practical path to final victory.

The partiality shown to Catholics by the third Lord Baltimore Charles, was such an abrupt change of policy from his father's, and so obnoxiously anti-Protestant that complaints began to pour in to the authorities in England, to such an extent, that Charles felt he had better go to England personally and get things straightened out. He sailed in 1684, eight years after his father's death, and was never allowed to return. King James II ascended the English throne the next year, 1685, and Charles Calvert seeking and expecting compassionate support from his very Catholic King got the shock of his life. With pitiful whining and groveling he plead that his administration had always been in strict conformity with the royal charter and that there was no just cause for declaration of a forfeiture. But James II turned

a deaf ear to his appeals and responded to the urgings of his Jesuit confessors and Baltimore's enemies instead. The King promptly ordered the writ issued against the Charter in April, 1687. But only because the King himself had to flee for his life was Baltimore's charter spared a little time longer.

If Lord Baltimore Charles had a way of shaking Protestants out of their sleep in Maryland, King James II's shenanigans literally startled Protestants in England like a thunder clap. In fact, they were willing to risk another bloody civil war rather than be under the bondage of Rome. But James II thought more of his head than to stick around and fight. Thus declaring herself forever Protestant, England began her "Glorious Revolution". The Stuart dynasty went into bitter exile rallying and plotting for the next sixty years to gain their restoration. And in Maryland, bitter resentment was expressed in another way to show how they keenly felt. No sooner did the news reach Maryland that the Catholic 'hope' in England had been put to flight, than false rumors began to reverberate throughout the colony, stirred up to the highest pitch of excitement, that the Maryland Catholic government, upheld by Catholics, had joined themselves with the Indians for the murder of all the Protestants in Maryland. These tales of terror and bloodshed, said to be inflicted by natives and Catholics, of burning houses, with women and children carried off, left Protestant settlers panic-stricken.

Catholic historians delight in placing these false rumors on Protestants. As for Lord Baltimore's representatives in Maryland, they found themselves set at defiance by an intangible but seemingly ubiquitous enemy. The immediate effect was chaos and the fast giving away of the Maryland government foundations. But who had counseled King James II two years earlier to forfeit the Maryland Charter but his Jesuit confessors? Had not even Cecil Calvert wrote to his brother governor of his belief that Jesuit intentions, if pressed, would employ armed Indians to further their designs? At the time of the Revolution in England, 1688, there were six Jesuit Priests and two Franciscans in Maryland; surely enough to fan a rumor if they had a mind to. As to who started the rumors, most likely it will always remain a mystery. But the fierce Catholic hatred and revenge felt towards England's Glorious Revolution and

its humiliating dismissal of James II is not. In its wake, Charles Calvert was shorn of his proprietary rights and Maryland was made a royal colony. It has been lamented, as the harsh penal laws aimed at Catholics set in, that Maryland, the land of religious liberty, (liberty for Romanism) began the darkest era of its history.

At this juncture, England's Glorious Revolution permanently formed and molded attitudes and passions that would affect world events far into the future. To the mind of the Catholic aristocratic elite: proud, wealthy, powerful, educated and influential, attributes better used to dominate rather than to be naturally submissive, the Glorious Revolution that had subjugated and humiliated them far beyond their noble dignity, might be seethingly tolerated, but never ever would it be accepted. It was Protestant! the common man's revolution and his religion. How could they? But to the Protestant's mind after victory? What else was there but complacency. Yet, nothing kept Europe in such a state of ferment and intrigue as the Jacobite partisans of James II exiled in France. Their passion to get revenge seemed to consume their very mind and soul. Secret conclaves sprung up like mushrooms in order to plot and scheme their invasions of England and develop their Catholic brand of Freemasonry. After several attempts to subject England to Romanism by force, only after the 1745 invasion attempt did it bring home to bear the futility of using force. But in the North American English colonies, particularly Maryland, there was a more kinder gentler Plan being worked out.