

conflict for a hundred years in England. How were they to live peaceably together in Maryland?

To solve this problem Cecil Calvert built on ideas current among Catholics in early seventeenth-century England. There was no longer hope that England would ever again be a Catholic country. English Catholics, it was argued, should accept a position as a dissenting sect and work to obtain toleration for all dissenters from the Church of England. A person's religion should be his private affair. The role of the state should be to preserve civil order, not to enforce religious uniformity. Lord Baltimore adapted these ideas to the circumstances of his new colony. People of any religion were to be welcome in Maryland, and anyone otherwise qualified was to be allowed to vote and hold office, regardless of religious beliefs. No one was to criticize another for his religious practices or to proselytize for his own. Most important of all—disastrously so, as it turned out—no public taxation was to support any religious institution. Church and state were to be totally separate.

These were new approaches to ending religious strife, but they arose from practical political realities, not from clearly articulated points of view. The Calverts could not foresee the difficulties inherent in adopting a policy of toleration. If conflicts were to be avoided, both Catholics and Protestants had to accept the idea that toleration was a principal of merit rather than an expedient of the moment. Nor did the Calverts foresee that in the absence of taxation for the support of churches and ministers there would be very few of either for the Protestants in Maryland. In the seventeenth-century world, the absence of religious leadership and houses of worship was not acceptable. But, with a few lapses tolera-