

modeled in part upon the County Palatine of Durham with its *jura regalia*. As a matter of policy, Charles Calvert had sought to keep the inhabitants ignorant of the charter provisions, to maintain the lower house of Assembly in a subservient position and to concentrate all the important offices in the hands of relatives or co-religionists. Thus the profits of power, as well as its exercise, were united in the proprietor and those closely connected with him. The political impact of this policy was sharpened by economic factors. The low price of tobacco had depressed the economy of the province while attempts to control overproduction inevitably led to friction. In some respects this concentration of power also gave rise to conflicts with the increasing imperial control exercised over the plantations in the reign of Charles II.<sup>1</sup>

The dissatisfaction with proprietary rule deepened when Calvert returned to England in 1684 to answer charges before the Lords of Trade and Plantations and to defend the Maryland boundaries against the claims of William Penn. Upon his departure he turned the government of the province over to the Council, the members acting as deputy governors. Shortly thereafter George Talbot, a nephew of the proprietor and the head councillor, was forced to flee the province after murdering Christopher Rousby, a royal collector of customs, leaving the governing body somewhat at loose ends. Although the King in Council, as part of the general move to bring the chartered colonies into closer dependence on the crown, ordered *quo warranto* proceedings against the Maryland charter in 1687, Calvert took no steps to strengthen the provincial government until 1688 when one William Joseph was sent over from England to serve as president of the Council. Tactless, incompetent and with no experience in colonial administration, Joseph soon proceeded to arouse further opposition with his "high notions of prerogative." That Calvert should have sent over such an advocate, in view of the unrest already prevailing in the colony, indicates an uncompromising adherence to the prerogative rights of the proprietor as defined in the charter.<sup>2</sup>

The first news of the revolutionary events in England gave rise to wild rumors (whether deliberately planted by anti-proprietary elements is not clear) that the Catholic element controlling the colony was planning to declare for James II and with the assistance of the Catholic French and the Indians to massacre any opposing Protestants. These rumors were effectively quieted, largely by Colonel William Darnell, a Catholic deputy governor and alleged leader of the "Jacobite party", but the continued failure of Lord Baltimore or his Council to issue a proclamation recognizing the new rulers, whether due to neglect or a break-down of communications, and the proroguing of the assembly until October 1689 provided the needed pretext for revolution.<sup>3</sup>

In July and August of 1689 a group of Protestant malcontents, largely drawn from St. Marys, Charles and Calvert Counties, and headed by John Coode, Kenelm Cheseldyn, Henry Jowles and Nehemiah Blackiston, in a swift and bloodless coup seized the capital at St. Marys and the fortified residence of the proprietor at Mat-

1. Accounts of the government of Charles Calvert appear in 3 Osgood, *The American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, c. XVI (1907); 2 Andrews, *The Colonial Period of American History*, c. VIII (1936); M. P. Andrews, *The Founding of Maryland*, c. XIV-XV (1933); Kammen, *The Causes of the Maryland Revolution of 1689*, 55 *MHM* 293 (1960). The charter is set forth in 3 Thorpe, *Federal and State Constitutions 1677* (1909).

2. 3 Osgood, *op. cit. supra*, 486-90; 2 Andrews, *op. cit. supra*, 356-71; M. P. Andrews, *op. cit. supra*, 311-14; Steiner, *The Protestant Revolution in Maryland*, Annual Rep. Amer. Hist. Asso. (1897) 281, 282-89.

3. Steiner, *op. cit. supra*, 290-98; 3 Osgood, *op. cit. supra*, 490-95; 2 Andrews, *op. cit. supra*, 371-75.