

that accompanied it, and he had emerged in firm control of a rapidly developing province. In England he had found allies among Protestant tobacco merchants to defend his charter; in Maryland he had found Protestants willing to cooperate with Catholics to maintain his rule. Without judicious balancing of interests and willingness to make concessions to his colonists, he would never have retained—at some points regained—control. Between them, father and son, the first and second Lords Baltimore had created an English colony, a family investment, a viable social experiment—in short, the province of Maryland.²⁰

Epilogue

Unfortunately the story does not end here. Cecil Calvert's son Charles, the third Lord Baltimore, proved to be a less flexible and inventive leader. He lost governing rights to Maryland in 1689 after a group of Maryland Protestants staged a rebellion. A crown governor ruled until 1715, when the fourth Lord Baltimore—a Protestant—inherited the Maryland patent. During the period of royal control, the Anglican Church was established and Catholics were deprived of political rights.

Yet the charter itself survived this crisis. During the years of royal government, Lord Baltimore never lost his title to Maryland and he retained all rights to profits from the land. When governing rights were restored, his charter was not rewritten. Apart from church establishment and its drastic consequences for Catholics, little had changed internally that can be ascribed to the overthrow of proprietary government. Maryland was already following the general path of colonial development.