in Divers voyages touchinge the discoverie of America *(1582), sig. A1–A2v., retranslated by H. P. Biggar,* Precursors of Jacques Cartier, *pp. 7–10, J. A. Williamson,* The Cabot Voyages, *pp. 204–205.*

For John Cabot and His Sons

The King, to all whom, etc. Greeting: Be it known and made manifest that we have given and granted as by these presents we give and grant, for us and our heirs, to our well-beloved John Cabot, citizen of Venice, and to Lewis, Sebastian and Sancio, sons of the said John, and to the heirs and deputies of them, and of any one of them, full and free authority, faculty and power to sail to all parts, regions and coasts of the eastern, western and northern sea, under our banners, flags and ensigns, with five ships or vessels of whatsoever burden and quality they may be, and with so many and with such mariners and men as they may wish to take with them in the said ships, at their own proper costs and charges, to find, discover and investigate whatsoever islands, countries, regions or provinces of heathens and infidels, in whatsoever part of the world placed, which before this time were unknown to all Christians. We have also granted to them and to any of them, and to the heirs and deputies of them and any one of them, and have given licence to set up our aforesaid banners and ensigns in any town, city, castle, island or mainland whatsoever, newly found by them. And that the beforementioned John and his sons or their heirs and deputies may conquer, occupy and possess whatsoever such towns, castles, cities and islands by them thus discovered that they may be able to conquer, occupy and possess, as our vassals and governors lieutenants and deputies therein, acquiring for us the dominion, title and jurisdiction of the same towns, castles, cities, islands and mainlands so discovered: in such a way nevertheless that of all the fruits, profits, emoluments, commodities, gains and revenues accruing from this voyage, the said John and sons and their heirs and deputies shall be bounden and under obligation for every their voyage, as often as they shall arrive at our port of Bristol, at which they are bound and holden only to arrive, all necessary charges and expenses incurred by them having been deducted, to pay us, either in goods or money, the fifth part of the whole capital gained, we giving and granting to them and to their heirs and deputies, that they shall be free and exempt from all payment of customs on all and singular the goods and merchandise that they may bring back with them from those places thus newly discovered.

And further we have given and granted to them and to their heirs and deputies, that all mainlands, islands, towns, cities, castles and other places whatsoever discovered by them, however numerous they may happen to be, may not be frequented or visited by any other subjects of ours whosoever without the licence of the aforesaid John and his sons and of their deputies, on pain of the loss as well of the ships or vessels daring to sail to these places discovered, as of all goods whatsoever. Willing and strictly commanding all singular our subjects as well by land as by sea, that they shall render good assistance to the aforesaid John and his sons and deputies, and that they shall give them all their favour and help as well in fitting out the ships or vessels as in buying stores and provisions with their money and in providing the other things which they must take with them on the said voyage.

In witness whereof, etc. Witness ourself at Westminster on the fifth day of March. By the King himself, etc.

52. March 28, 1496. Ferdinand and Isabella to Rodrigo González de la Puebla.

A.G., Simancas, Estado Inglaterra 52, fol. 16, translated in H. P. Biggar, Precursors of Jacques Cartier, *pp. 10–11; J. A. Williamson,* The Cabot Voyages, *p. 203.*

In regard to what you say of the arrival there of one like Columbus for the purpose of inducing the King of England to enter upon another undertaking like that of the Indies, without prejudice to Spain or to Portugal, if he [the king] aids him as he has us, the Indies will be well rid of the man. We are of opinion that this is a scheme of the French King's to persuade the King of England to undertake this so that he will give up other affairs. Take care that you prevent the King of England from

towne of Bristowe, and to John Fernandus, Fraunces Fernandus and John Gunsalus, Squyers borne in the Isle of Surrys [Azores] under the obeisaunce of the kyng of Portingale, your gracious Letters patentis under your greate seale, in due forme to be made accordyng to the tenour hereafter ensuying, and that this byll, signyd with your gracious hand, may be to the Reverend Fader in God, Henry, bysshop of Salesbury, keper of your gret seale, sufficient and immediate warrant for the making, sealying, accomplysshyng of your seyd Letters patentes; and they shall duryng ther lyves pray to God for the prosperous contynuaunce of your most noble and ryall astate.

71. March 19, 1501. Letters patent for Richarde Warde, Thomas Asshehurst, John Thomas, João Fernandes, Francisco Fernandes, and João Gonsalves.

P.R.O., Patent Roll, 16 Henry VII, pt. 1, C66/587 memb. 20–21; Printed with translation in H. P. Biggar, Precursors of Jacques Cartier, *pp. 41–59; J. A. Williamson,* The Cabot Voyages, *pp. 236–247.*

Conceded to Richard Warde and others

The King to all and singular to whom our present letters patent shall come, Greeting: Be it known to you and made manifest that we, for certain considerations us moving, by the advice of our Council, have granted and given licence, as by these presents we grant and give licence for us and our heirs, as far as in us lies, to our well-beloved subjects Richard Warde, Thomas Asshehurst and John Thomas, merchants of our town of Bristol, and to our well-beloved John Fernandez, Francis Fernandez and John Gonzales, Esquires, of the Islands of the Azores in the dominions of the King of Portugal, and to any one of them, and to the heirs, attorneys, factors or deputies of any one of them, and to them and any one of them we grant full and unrestricted authority, faculty and power to sail and transport themselves to all parts, regions and territories of the eastern, western, southern, arctic and northern seas, under our banners and ensigns, with so many and so large and such ships or vessels as may be agreeable to them and may be necessary, of whatsoever burthen any ship or vessel may be, with masters, mates, mariners, pages and other men competent, requisite and necessary for the piloting, safeguard and defence of the aforesaid ships and vessels, at the cost and charges of the said Richard and of the others aforesaid, and at such salaries, wages and pay as they may agree upon among themselves, to find, recover, discover and search out whatsoever islands, countries, regions or provinces of heathens and infidels, in whatever part of the world they may lie, which before this time were and at present are unknown to all Christians, and to set up our banners and ensigns in any town, city, castle, island or mainland by them thus newly found, and to enter and seize these same towns, and as our vassals and governors, lieutenants and deputies to occupy, possess and subdue these, the property, title, dignity and suzerainty of the same being always reserved to us. And furthermore whenever henceforth islands, countries, lands and provinces shall be acquired, recovered and found by the aforesaid Richard and the others before-named, then we will and by these presents grant, that all and singular as well men and women of this our kingdom and the rest of our subjects, wishing and desiring to visit these lands and islands thus newly found, and to inhabit the same, shall be allowed and have power to go freely and in safety to the same countries, islands and places with their ships, men and servants, and all their goods and chattels, and to dwell in and inhabit the same under the protection and government of the said Richard and of the others aforesaid, and to acquire and keep the riches, fruits and profits of the lands, countries and places aforesaid; giving furthermore and granting to the aforesaid Richard, Thomas and John, John, Francis and John, and to any one of them, by the tenour of these presents full power and authority to rule and govern all and singular the men, sailors and other persons removing and making their way for the aforesaid purpose to the islands, countries, provinces, mainlands and places beforementioned, as well in the company of the said Richard and of the others aforesaid, as in the company of people happening afterwards to be-

severall benefites that the Soyles and the Rivers yeelde, with all the discomodities and wantes that the same places have, and if our Countrie men fortune the rather to be awaked out of their heavy sleepe wherein they have long lien, and the rather hereby be occasioned to shunne bestiall ignoraunce, and with other nations rather late than never to make themselves shine with the brightnesse of knowledge, let them give Sir Humfrey Gilbert the thankes, for whose sake I translated the same. And thus committing your worship to the greate Neptune, the greate God of the Christians that ruleth lande and Sea, I leave you to your voyage, and to the government of that mightie God, who never planted in any man so his courage, with so much desire to greate attempts, but to some greate end, as heretofore in many hath bene seeene, and as the sequele in your happie successes no doubt shall be founde, as England and the whole world shall out of question witnesse. From London the xiiij. of May. 1578.

Your worships at commaundement

[signed:] John Frampton

370. June 11, 1578. Patent granted to Sir Humphrey Gilbert by Elizabeth I.

The letters patent are evidence that the queen and her advisers were impressed by the ability of Gilbert to organize a voyage for discovery and by his plans for establishing a colonial settlement. The terms of the patent could be said to embody the fruits of all his thinking and practical experience of the previous ten years, but they were cast in a form that was already conventional. Like the much earlier patent of 1496 to John Cabot, no precise location was specified but it was generally taken to refer to North America alone. All of Gilbert's subsequent actions were based on the assumption that it covered the whole of the eastern coastline of North America, north of Spanish Florida, and overlapped the northwest area over which the Muscovy Company considered itself to have prior rights. It was subsequently regarded as the basic charter for English enterprise in North America and from it was derived, with little alteration, that granted to Walter Ralegh in 1584 after Gilbert's death. Gilbert's patent was valid for six years and covered both the 1578 and 1583 voyages.

From P.R.O., Patent Roll, 21 Elizabeth I, part 4, m.8–9. C66/1178; printed in Hakluyt, Principall navigations *(1589), pp. 677–679. and in* Principal navigations, *III (1600), 135–137, VIII (1904), 17–23; D. B. Quinn,* Gilbert, *I (1940), 188–194.*

The Letters Patents graunted by her Majestie to Sir Humfrey Gilbert knight, for the inhabiting and planting of our people in America.

Elizabeth by the grace of God Queene of England, &c. To all people to whom these presents shall come, greeting. Know ye that of our especiall grace, certaine science and meere motion, we have given and granted, and by these presents for us, our heires and successours, doe give and graunt to our trustie and welbeloved servaunt Sir Humfrey Gilbert of Compton, in our Countie of Devonshire knight, and to his heires and assignes for ever, free libertie and licence from time to time and at all times for ever hereafter, to discover, finde, search out, and view such remote, heathen and barbarous lands, countreys and territories not actually possessed of any Christian prince or people, as to him, his heires & assignes, and to every or any of them, shall seeme good: and the same to have, hold, occupie and enjoy to him, his heires and assignes for ever, with all commodities, jurisdictions and royalties both by sea and land: and the sayd sir Humfrey and all such as from time to time by licence of us, our heires and successours, shall goe and travell thither, to inhabite or remaine there, to build and fortifie at the discretion of the sayde sir Humfrey, and of his heires and assignes, the statutes or actes of Parliament made against Fugitives, or against such as shall depart, remaine, or continue out of our Realme of England without licence, or any other acte, statute, lawe, or matter whatsoever to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding. And wee doe likewise by these presents, for us, our heires and successours, give full authoritie and power to the saide Sir Humfrey, his heires and assignes, and every of them, that hee and they, and every, or any of them, shall and may at all and every time

and times hereafter, have, take, and lead in the same voyages, to travell thitherward, and to inhabite there with him, and every or any of them, such and so many of our subjects as shall willingly accompany him and them, and every or any of them, with sufficient shipping, and furniture for their transportations, so that none of the same persons, nor any of them be such as hereafter shall be specially restrained by us, our heires and successors. And further, that he the said Humfrey, his heires and assignes, and every or any of them shall have, hold, occupy & enjoy to him, his heires or assignes, and every of them for ever, all the soyle of all such lands, countries, & territories so to be discovered or possessed as aforesaid, and of all Cities, Castles, Townes and Villages, and places in the same, with the rites, royalties and jurisdictions, as well marine as other, within the sayd lands or countreys of the seas thereunto adjoyning, to be had or used with ful power to dispose thereof, & of every part thereof in fee simple or otherwise, according to the order of the laws of England, as nere as the same conveniently may be, at his, and their will & pleasure, to any person then being, or that shall remaine within the allegiance of us, our heires and successours, paying unto us for all services, dueties and demaunds, the fift part of all the oare of gold and silver, that from time to time, and at all times after such discoverie, subduing and possessing shall be there gotten: all which lands, countreys and territories, shall for ever bee holden by the sayd Sir Humfrey, his heires and assignes of us, our heires and successours by homage, and by the sayd payment of the sayd fift part before reserved onely for all services.

And moreover, we doe by these presents for us, our heires and successours, give and graunt licence to the sayde Sir Humfrey Gilbert, his heires or assignes, and to every of them, that hee and they, and every or any of them shall, and may from time to time, and all times for ever hereafter, for his and their defence, encounter, expulse, repell, and resist, as well by Sea as by land, and by all other wayes whatsoever, all, and every such person and persons whatsoever, as without the speciall licence and liking of the sayd sir Humfrey, and of his heires and assignes, shall attempt to inhabite within the sayd countreys, or any of them, or within the space of two hundreth leagues neere to the place or places within such countreys as aforesayd, if they shall not bee before planted or inhabited within the limites aforesayd, with the subjects of any Christian prince, being in amitie with her Majesty, where the said sir Humfrey, his heires or assignes, or any of them, or his or their, or any of their associates or companies, shall within sixe yeeres next ensuing, make their dwellings and abidings, or that shall enterprise or attempt at any time hereafter unlawfully to annoy either by Sea or land, the said sir Humfrey, his heires or assignes, or any of them, or his or their, or any of their companies: giving and graunting by these presents, further power and authoritie to the sayd sir Humfrey, his heires and assignes, and every of them from time to time, and at all times for ever hereafter to take and surprise by all maner of meanes whatsoever, all and every person and persons, with their shippes, vessels, and other goods and furniture, which without the licence of the sayd sir Humfrey, or his heires or assignes as aforesayd, shall bee found traffiquing into any harborough or harboroughs, creeke or creekes within the limites aforesayde, (the subjects of our Realmes and dominions, and all other persons in amitie with us, being driven by force of tempest or shipwracke onely excepted) and those persons and every of them with their ships, vessels, goods, and furniture, to detaine and possesse, as of good and lawfull prize, according to the discretion of him the sayd sir Humfrey, his heires and assignes, and of every or any of them. And for uniting in more perfect league and amitie of such countreys, landes and territories so to bee possessed and inhabited as aforesayde, with our Realmes of England and Ireland, and for the better encouragement of men to this enterprise: wee doe by these presents graunt, and declare, that all such countreys so hereafter to bee possessed and inhabited as aforesayd, from thencefoorth shall bee of the allegiance of us, our heires, and successours. And wee doe graunt to the sayd sir Humfrey, his heires and assignes, and to all and every of them, and to all and every other person and persons, being of our allegiance, whose names shall be noted or entred in some of our courts of Record, within this our Realme of England, and that with the assent of the sayd sir Humfrey, his heires or assignes, shall nowe in this journey for discoverie, or in the second journey our heires or successours: and that upon such

for conquest hereafter, travel to such lands, countries and territories as aforesaid, and to their and every of their heires: that they and every or any of them being either borne within our sayd Realmes of England or Ireland, or within any other place within our allegiance, and which hereafter shall be inhabiting within any the lands, countreys and territories, with such licence as aforesayd, shall, and may have, and enjoy all the privileges of free denizens and persons native of England, and within our allegiance: any law, custome, or usage to the contrary notwithstanding.

And forasmuch, as upon the finding out, discovering and inhabiting of such remote lands, countreys and territories, as aforesayd, it shall be necessarie for the safetie of all men that shall adventure themselves in those journeys or voiages, to determine to live together in Christian peace and civill quietnesse each with other, whereby every one may with more pleasure and profit, enjoy that whereunto they shall attaine with great paine and perill: wee for us, our heires and successours are likewise pleased and contented, and by these presents doe give and graunt to the sayd Sir Humfrey and his heires and assignes for ever, that he and they, and every or any of them, shall and may from time to time for ever hereafter within the sayd mentioned remote lands and countreys, and in the way by the Seas thither, and from thence, have full and meere power and authoritie to correct, punish, pardon, governe and rule by their, and every or any of their good discretions and pollicies, as well in causes capitall or criminall, as civill, both marine and other, all such our subjects and others, as shall from time to time hereafter adventure themselves in the sayd journeys or voyages habitative or possessive, or that shall at any time hereafter inhabite any such lands, countreys or territories as aforesayd, or that shall abide within two hundred leagues of any the sayd place or places, where the sayd sir Humfrey or his heires, or assignes, or any of them, or any of his or their associats or companies, shall inhabite within sixe yeeres next ensuing the date hereof, according to such statutes, lawes and ordinances, as shall be by him the said sir Humfrey, his heires and assignes, or every, or any of them devised or established for the better governement of the said people as aforesayd: so alwayes that the sayd statutes, lawes and ordinances may be as neere as conveniently may, agreeable to the forme of the lawes & pollicy of England: and also, that they be not against the true Christian faith or religion now professed in the church of England, nor in any wise to withdraw any of the subjects or people of those lands or places from the allegiance of us, our heires or successours, as their immediate Soveraignes under God. And further we doe by these presents for us, our heires and successours, give and graunt full power and authority to our trustie and welbeloved counseller, sir William Cecill knight, lord Burleigh, our high treasurer of England, and to the lord treasurer of England of us, for the time being, and to the privie counsell of us, our heires and successours, or any foure of them for the time being, that he, they, or any foure of them, shall, and may from time to time and at all times hereafter, under his or their handes or seales by vertue of these presents, authorize and licence the sayd sir Humfrey Gilbert, his heires and assignes, and every or any of them by him and themselves, or by their or any of their sufficient atturneys, deputies officers, ministers, factors and servants, to imbarke and transport out of our Realmes of England and Ireland, all, or any of his or their goods, and all or any the goods of his or their associates and companies, and every or any of them, with such other necessaries and commodities of any our Realmes, as to the said lord treasurer or foure of the privie counsell of us, our heires, or successours for the time being, as aforesayd, shall be from time to time by his or their wisedoms or discretions thought meete and convenient for the better reliefe and supportation of him the sayd sir Humfrey, his heires and assignes, and every or any of them, and his and their, and every or any of their said associates and companies, any act, statute, lawe, or other thing to the contrary in any wise notwithstanding.

Provided alwayes, and our will and pleasure is, and wee doe hereby declare to all Christian Kings, princes and states, that if the said Sir Humfrey, his heires or assignes, or any of them, or any other by their licence or appointment, shall at any time or times hereafter robbe or spoile by Sea or by land, or doe any act of unjust and unlawfull hostilitie to any of the Subjects of us, our heires, or successours, or any of the Subjects of any King, prince, ruler, governour or state being then in perfect league and amitie with us,

injurie, or upon just complaint of any such prince, ruler, governour or state, or their subjects, wee our heires or successors shall make open proclamation within any the portes of our Realme of England commodious, that the said Sir Humfrey, his heires or assignes, or any other to whom these our Letters patents may extend, shall within the terme to be limited by such proclamations, make full restitution and satisfaction of all such injuries done, so as both we and the saide Princes, or others so complayning, may holde us and themselves fully contended: And that if the saide Sir Humfrey, his heires and assignes, shall not make or cause to bee made satisfaction accordingly, within such time so to be limited: that then it shall bee lawfull to us, our heires and successors, to put the said Sir Humfrey, his heires and assignes, and adherents, and all the inhabitants of the said places to be discovered as is aforesaide, or any of them out of our allegiance and protection, and that from and after such time of putting out of protection the saide Sir Humfrey, and his heires, assignes, adherents and others so to be put out, and the said places within their habitation, possession and rule, shal be out of our protection and allegiance, and free for all Princes and others to pursue with hostilitie as being not our Subjects, nor by us any way to bee advowed, maintained or defended, nor to be holden as any of ours, nor to our protection, dominion or allegiance any way belonging, for that expresse mention, &c. In witnesse whereof, &c. Witnesse our selfe at Westminster the 11. day of June, the twentieth yeere of our raigne. Anno Dom. 1578.

Per ipsam Reginam, &c.

371. September 23, 1578. Letter from Sir Humphrey Gilbert to Sir Francis Walsingham.

Sir Francis Walsingham was secretary of state from 1573 until his death in 1590. He was an ardent Protestant, concerned with foreign affairs, and took an active interest in voyages of discovery and attempts to establish colonies on the North American mainland, undertaken partly as a means to limit the power of Spain. As this letter shows he was a patron of Gilbert, an interest that was transferred to Walter Ralegh after Gilbert's death. His official position enabled him to give considerable help to Richard Hakluyt in his preparation of the first edition of Principall navigations, *which Hakluyt dedicated to him.*

P.R.O., State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth I, SP 12/125,70; printed in D. B. Quinn, Gilbert, *I, 199–200.*

Sir knowinge you to be my principall patron aswell in furtheringe and procuringe me her majestes favor and lycence for performaunce of this my sea voyage and also manye other wayes having fownd you my good and honorable frend. I thoughte it my duyty to signefye unto your honor the state and tyme of my present departure from this porte of Dartmowthe which was on the xxiiith of this instante September beinge accompanied with xi sayle well victualed for a yere and furnished with 500 choyse souldiers and saylers. our staye so longe in these partes proceeded by reason of my London shippin[g] not comminge downe, which throughe contrarye windes arryved not here till the 25 of Auguste—Howbeyt our longe taryinge I truste shalbe noe impeachement to our enterprises, the tyme and season of the yere servinge yet verie fyt for our travell. I have nothinge els whereof to advertise your honor, but to assure you that I am and wilbe ever redye to doe you anye service that shall lye in my power, prayinge your honor not onlye to contynue your favor towardes me. But also as occasion shall serve, to make me partaker of your good speeches to her majesty for the better supportacion of my poore credyt with her highnes, And so I commyt your honor to god, Grenewaye the xxiiith of September 1578

Your honors moste humble to commaund

[signed:] H. Gylberte

Addressed:—To the righte honorble Sir Fraunciss Walsingham knighte her majestes principall Secretory

Endorsed in other hand:—23 Novemb 1578 From Sir H: Gylbert

The tyme and nomber of shippes men &c, that departed with him from Dartmouth. To keepe him in hir Majesties good favour and Creditt.

packed chickadee and Pacific winter wren. The Upper Austral zone is divided into an eastern humid (or Carolinian) area and a western arid (or Upper Sonoran) area. The Carolinian area extends from southern Michigan to northern Georgia and from the Atlantic coast to western Kansas, comprising Delaware, all of Maryland except the mountainous western portion, all of Ohio except the north-east corner, nearly the whole of Indiana, Illinois, Iowa and Missouri, eastern Nebraska and Kansas, south-eastern South Dakota, western Central Oklahoma, northern Arkansas, middle and eastern Kentucky, middle Tennessee and the Tennessee valley in eastern Tennessee, middle Virginia and North Carolina, western West Virginia, north-eastern Alabama, northern Georgia, western South Carolina, the Connecticut valley in Connecticut, the lower Hudson valley and the Erie basin in New York, and narrow belts along the southern and western borders of the lower peninsula of Michigan. It is the northernmost home of the opossum, grey fox, fox squirrel, cardinal bird, Carolina wren, tufted tit, gnat catcher, summer tanager and yellow-breasted chat. The Upper Sonoran life-zone comprises south-eastern Montana, central, eastern and north-eastern Wyoming, a portion of south-western South Dakota, western Nebraska and Kansas, the western extremity of Oklahoma, north-western Texas, eastern Colorado, south-eastern New Mexico, the Snake plains in Idaho, the Columbia plains in Washington, the Malheur and Harney plains in Oregon, the Great Salt Lake and Sevier deserts in Utah, and narrow belts in California, Nevada and Arizona. Among its characteristic mammals and birds are the sage cotton-tail, black-tailed jack-rabbit, Idaho rabbit, Oregon, Utah and Townsend's ground squirrels, sage chipmunk, five-toed kangaroo rats, pocket mice, grasshopper mice, burrowing owl, Brewer's sparrow, Nevada sage sparrow, lazuli finch, sage thrasher, Nuttall's poor-will, Bullock's oriole and rough-winged swallow. The Lower Austral zone occupies the greater part of the Southern States, and is divided near the 98th meridian into an eastern humid or Austroriparian area and a western arid or Lower Sonoran area. The Austroriparian zone comprises nearly all the Gulf States as far west as the mouth of the Rio Grande, the greater part of Georgia, eastern South Carolina, North Carolina and Virginia, and extends up the lowlands of the Mississippi valley across western Tennessee and Kentucky into southern Illinois and Indiana and across eastern and southern Arkansas and eastern Oklahoma into south-eastern Missouri and Kansas. It is the home of the southern fox-squirrel, cotton rat, ricefield rat, wood rat, free-tailed bat, mocking bird, painted bunting, prothonotary warbler, red-cockaded woodpecker, chuckwill's-widow, and the swallow-tailed and Mississippi kites. A southern portion of this zone, comprising a narrow strip along the Gulf Coast from Texas to Florida and up the Atlantic coast to South Carolina, is semi-tropical, and is the northernmost habitation of several small mammals, the alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*), the ground dove, white-tailed kite, Florida screech owl and Chapman's night-hawk. The Lower Sonoran zone comprises the most arid parts of the United States: south-western Texas south-western Arizona and a portion of northern Arizona, southern Nevada and a large part of southern California. Some of its characteristic mammals and birds are the long-eared desert fox, four-toed kangaroo rats, Sonoran pocket mice, big-eared and tiny white-haired bats, road runner, cactus wren, canyon wren, desert thrashers, hooded oriole, black-throated desert sparrow, Texas night-hawk and Gambel's quail. It is the northernmost home of the armadillo, ocelot, jaguar, red and grey cats, and the spiny pocket mouse, and in southern Texas especially it is visited by several species of tropical birds. There is some resemblance to the Tropical life-zone at the south-eastern extremity of Texas, but this zone in the United States is properly restricted to southern Florida and the lower valley of the Colorado along the border of California and Arizona, and the knowledge of the latter is very imperfect. The area in Florida is too small for characteristic tropical mammals, but it has the true crocodile (*Crocodilus americanus*) and is the home of a few tropical birds. Most of the larger American mammals are not restricted to any one faunal zone. The bison, although now nearly extinct, formerly roamed over nearly the entire region between the Appalachian and the Rocky Mountains. The black bear and beaver were also widely distributed. The Virginia deer still ranges from Maine to the Gulf States and from the Atlantic coast to the Rocky Mountains. The grizzly bear, cougar, coyote, prairie dog and antelope are still found in several of the western states, and the grey wolf is common in the West and in northern Minnesota, Wisconsin and Michigan.

The Alpine flora, which is found in the United States only on the tops of those mountains which rise above the limit of trees, consists principally of a variety of plants which bloom as soon as the snow melts and for a short season make a brilliant display of colours. The flora of the Hudsonian and the Canadian zone consists largely of white and black spruce, tamarack, canoe-birch, balsam-poplar, balsam-fir, aspen and grey pine. In the Alleghanian Transition zone the chestnut, walnut, oaks and hickories of the South are interspersed among the beech, birch, hemlock and sugar maple of the North. In the Western Arid Transition zone the flora consists largely of the true sage brush (*Artemisia tridentata*), but some tracts are covered with forests of yellow or bull pine (*Pinus ponderosa*). The Pacific coast Transition zone is noted for its forests of giant conifers, principally Douglas fir, Sitka spruce, Pacific cedar and Western hemlock. Here, too, mosses and ferns grow in profusion, and the *sadal* (*Gaultheria shallon*), thimble berry (*Rubus nootkamus*), salmon berry (*Rubus spectabilis*) and devil's club (*Fatsia horrida*) are characteristic shrubs. In the Carolinian zone the tulip tree, sycamore, sweet gum, rose magnolia, short-leaf pine and sassafras find their northernmost limit. Sage brush is common to both the Western Arid Transition zone and the Upper Sonoran zone, but in suitable soils of the latter several greasewoods (*Artiplex confertifolia, A. canescens, A. nuttalli, Tetradymia canescens, Sarcobatus vermiculatus* and *Grayia spinosa*) are characteristic species, and on the mountain slopes are some nut pines (*piñon*) and junipers. The Austroriparian zone has the long-leaf and loblolly pines, magnolia and live oak on the uplands, and the bald cypress, tupelo and cane in the swamps; and in the semi-tropical Gulf strip are the cabbage palmetto and Cuban pine; here, too, Sea Island cotton and tropical fruits are successfully cultivated. The Lower Sonoran zone is noted for its cactuses, of which there is a great variety, and some of them grow to the height of trees; the mesquite is also very large, and the creosote bush, acacias, yuccas and agaves are common. The Tropical belt of southern Florida has the royal palm, coco-nut palm, banana, Jamaica dogwood, manchineel and mangrove; the Tropical belt in the lower valley of the Colorado has giant cactuses, desert acacias, palo-verdes and the Washington or fan-leaf palm. Almost all of the United States east of the 98th meridian is naturally a forest region, and forests cover the greater part of the Rocky Mountains, the Cascades, the Sierra Nevadas and the Coast Range, but throughout the belt of plains, basins and deserts west of the Rocky Mountains and on the Great Plains east of the Rocky Mountains there are few trees except along the watercourses, and the prevailing type of vegetation ranges from bunch grass to sage brush and cactuses according to the degree of aridity and the temperature. In the eastern forest region the number of species decreases somewhat from south to north, but the entire region differs from the densely forested region of the Pacific Coast Transition zone in that it is essentially a region of deciduous or hardwood forests, while the latter is essentially one of coniferous trees; it differs from the forested region of the Rocky Mountains in that the latter is not only essentially a region of coniferous trees, but one where the forests do not by any means occupy the whole area, neither do they approach in density or economic importance those of the eastern division of the country. Again, the forests of most of the eastern region embrace a variety of species, which, as a rule, are very much intermingled, and do not, unless quite exceptionally, occupy areas chiefly devoted to one species; while, on the other hand, the forests of the west—including both Rocky Mountain and Pacific coast divisions—exhibit a small number of species, considering the vast area embraced in the region; and these species, in a number of instances, are extraordinarily limited in their range, although there are cases in which one or two species have almost exclusive possession of extensive areas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.—C. H. Merriam, *Life Zones and Crop Zones of the United States*, Bulletin No. 10 of the United States Department of Agriculture, Division of Biological Survey (Washington, 1898); I. C. Russell, *North America* (New York, 1904); W. T. Hornaday, *American Natural History* (New York, 1904); W. Stone and W. E. Cram, *American Animals* (New York, 1902); E. Coues, *Key to North American Birds* (Boston, 1896); Florence M. Bailey, *Handbook of Birds of the Western United States* (Boston, 1902); E. D. Cope, "The Crocodilians, Lizards and Snakes of North America," in the *Report of the United States National Museum* for the year 1898 (Washington, 1900); L. Stegneger, "The Poisonous Snakes of North America," ibid., 1893 (Washington, 1895). (N. D. M.)

V.—Population and Social Conditions

Geographical Growth of the Nation.—The achievement of independence found the people of the United States owning the entire country between the Gulf and the Great Lakes, excepting only Florida, as far to the west as the Mississippi; but the actual settlements were, with a few minor exceptions, confined to a strip of territory along the Atlantic shore. The depth of settlement, from the coast inland, varied greatly, ranging from what would be involved in the mere occupation of the shore for fishing purposes to a body of agricultural occupation extending back to the base of the great Atlantic chain, and averaged some 250 m.[1]

Westward, beyond the general line of continuous settlement,

[1] In the *Statistical Atlas* volume of the census of 1900 the reader will find for each decennial census since 1790 a map showing the distribution of population, with indication of the density of settlement, and an elaborate explanatory text. In Orin Grant Libby's *Geographical Distribution of the Vote of the Thirteen States on the Federal Constitution, 1787–1788* (University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1894), along with a valuable map interesting facts are given regarding the social and economic characteristics of different sections.

were four extensions of population through as many gaps in the Appalachian barrier, constituting the four main paths along which migration westward first took place: the Mohawk valley in New York, the upper Potomac, the Appalachian valley, and around the southern base of the Appalachian system. Four outlying groups beyond the mountains, with perhaps a twentieth part of the total population of the nation, —one about Pittsburg, one in West Virginia, another in northern Kentucky, and the last in Tennessee: all determined in situation by river highways—bore witness to the qualities of strength and courage of the American pioneer. Finally, there were in 1790 about a score of small trading or military posts, mainly of French origin, scattered over the then almost unbroken wilderness of the upper Mississippi valley and region of the Great Lakes.

Twelve decennial censuses taken since that time (1800–1910) have revealed the extraordinary growth of the people spreading out from these outlying centres (see CENSUS: *United States*). The large percentage of the population, particularly of the great urban centres, that is established to-day in the river lowlands, reflects the rôle that water highways have played in the peopling of the country. The dwindlings and growths of Nevada down to the present day, and to not a slight degree the general history of the settlement of the states of the Rocky Mountain region, are a commentary on the fate of mining industries. The initial settlement of the Pacific coast following the discovery of gold in California in 1848, and of the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains after the discovery of gold in 1859, illustrates the same factor. The Mormons settled Utah to insure social isolation, for the security of their theological system. A large part of the Great Plains to the east of the Rockies was taken up as farms in the decade 1880–1890; abandoned afterwards, because of its aridity, to stock grazing; and reconverted from ranches into farms when a system of dry farming had proved its tillage practicable. The negro more or less consciously moves, individually, closer into the areas whose climate and crops most nearly meet his desires and capabilities as a farmer; and his race as a whole unconsciously is adjusting its habitat to the boundaries of the Austroriparian life zone. The country's centre of population in 110 years moved more than 500 m. westward, almost exactly along the 39th parallel of latitude: 9·5 degrees of longitude, with an extreme variation of less than 19 minutes of latitude.

Growth of the Nation in Population.—If the 19th century was remarkable with respect to national and urban growth the world over, it was particularly so in the growth of the United States. Malthus expressed the opinion that only in such a land of unlimited means of living could population freely increase. The total population increased from 1800 to 1900 about fourteen fold (1331·6 %).[1] The rate of growth indicated in 1900 was still double the average rate of western Europe.[2] In the whole world Argentina alone (1869–1895) showed equal (and greater) growth. At the opening of the century not only all the great European powers of to-day but also even Spain and Turkey exceeded the United States in numbers; at its close only Russia. At the census of 1910, while the continental United States population (excluding Alaska) was 91,972,266, the total, including Alaska, Hawaii and Porto Rico, but excluding the Philippine Islands, Guam, Samoa and the Canal Zone, was 93,402,151.

Census Years.	Continental United States, exclusive of Alaska.												
	Population enumerated.				Number of foreign immigrants entering in preceding decade.	Areas (excluding water), in square miles.							
			Total population.			Total area.		Settled area.					
	Population within area of 1790	Population within added area.	Number.	Decennial increase per cent.		Total.	Area acquired in preceding decade.	Area with not less than two persons per sq. m.	Total area covered by census.		Density of population.		
									Estimated area of isolated settlements beyond the general frontier.	Total.	Of area with not less than two persons per sq. m.	Of entire census area.	
												Area of 1790.	Added area.	Whole area.
1790	3,929,625	—	3,929,214	—	—	819,466	—	239,935	13,850	417,170	16·4	9·4	—	9·6
1800	5,247,355	61,128	5,308,483	35·1	—	819,466	—	305,708	33,800	434,670	17·4	12·6	0·2	12·2
1810	6,779,308	460,573	7,239,881	36·4	—	1,698,107	878,641 §	407,945	25,100	556,010	17·7	16·3	0·8	13·0
1820	8,293,869	1,344,584	9,638,453	33·1	250,000†	1,752,347	54,240 ‖	508,717	4,200	688,670	18·9	19·9	2·4	13·9
1830	10,240,232	2,625,788	12,860,702*	33·5	143,439	1,752,347	—	632,717	4,700	877,170	20·3	24·5	4·3	14·5
1840	11,781,231	5,288,222	17,063,353*	32·7	599,125	1,752,347	—	807,292	2,150	1,183,870	21·1	28·2	7·1	14·4
1850	14,569,584	8,622,292	23,191,876	35·9	1,713,251	2,939,021	1,186,674 ¶	979,249	38,375	1,519,170	23·7	34·9	5·3	15·2
1860	17,326,157	14,117,164	31,443,321	35·6	2,598,214	2,970,038	31,017 **	1,194,754	107,375	1,951,520	26·3	41·5	5·7	16·1
1870	19,687,504	18,870,867	38,558,371	22·6	2,314,824	2,970,038	—	1,272,239	131,910	2,126,290	30·3	47·2	7·6	13·4
1880	23,925,639	26,263,570	50,155,783	30·1	2,812,191	2,970,038	—	1,509,565	260,025	2,727,454	32·0	57·4	10·6	18·4
1890	28,188,321	34,791,445	62,947,714	24·9	5,246,613	2,970,038	—	1,947,280	—	2,974,159	32·2	67·6	13·6	19·2
1900	33,533,630	42,749,757	75,994,575*	20·7	3,844,420	2,970,138	100	1,925,590	—	2,974,159	39·5	80·4	16·7	25·5
1910	—	—	91,972,266	21·0	7,753,816‡	—	—	—	—	2,974,159	—	—	—	30·9

* Excludes persons of the military and naval service stationed abroad (5318 in 1830; 6100 in 1840; 91,219 in 1900).
† Estimates of total up to 1820.
‡ Total, 27,604,509, exclusive of at least some hundreds of thousands of Canadians and Mexicans.
§ Louisiana purchase from France.
‖ Florida purchase from Spain; population counted first, 1830.
¶ Annexation of Texas (385,926 sq. m.); peace cession from Mexico (520,068 sq. m.); extinction of British claims to Oregon (280,680 sq. m.).
** Gadsden purchase from Mexico.

In 1790 there were about 600,000 white families in the United States. Speaking broadly, there were few very rich and few very poor. Food was abundant. Both social traditions and the religious beliefs of the people encouraged fecundity. The country enjoyed domestic tranquillity. All this time, too, the land was but partially settled. Mechanical labour was scarce, and even upon the farm it was difficult to command hired service, almost the only farm labourers down to 1850, in the north, being young men who went out to work for a few years to get a little money to marry upon. A change was probably inevitable and came, apparently, between 1840 and 1850.

The accessions in that decade from Ireland and Germany were enormous, the total immigration rising to 1,713,251 against 599,125 during the decade preceding, and against only 143,439 from 1820 to 1830. These people came in condition to breed with unprecedented rapidity, under the stimulus of an abundance,

[1] According to Lavasseur and Bodio, 14·5 % from 1860 to 1880; 21·2 % from 1880 to 1900; from 1886–1900, 11·0 %.
[2] Unless otherwise explicitly stated, by "United States" is to be understood continental United States exclusive of Alaska.

in regard to food, shelter and clothing, such as the most fortunate of them had never known. Yet in spite of these accessions, the population of the country realized a slightly smaller proportion of gain than when the foreign arrivals were almost insignificant.

For a time the retardation of the normal rate of increase among the native population was concealed from view by the extraordinary immigration. In the decade 1850–1860 it was seen that almost a seventh of the population of the country consisted of persons born abroad. From 1840 to 1860 there came more than four million immigrants, of whom probably three and a half million, with probably as many children born in America, were living at the latter date.

The ten years from 1860 to 1870 witnessed the introduction of a new force operating to bring down the rate of national increase, namely the Civil War. The superintendent of the Ninth Census, 1870, presented a computation of the effects of this cause—first, through direct losses, by wounds or disease, either in actual service of the army or navy, or in a brief term following discharge; secondly, through the retardation of the rate of increase in the coloured element, due to the privations, exposures and excesses attendant upon emancipation; thirdly, through the check given to immigration by the existence of war, the fear of conscription, and the apprehension abroad of results prejudicial to the national welfare. The aggregate effect of all these causes was estimated as a loss to the population of 1870 of 1,765,000. Finally, the temporary reduction of the birth-rate, consequent upon the withdrawal of perhaps one-fourth of the national militia (males of 18 to 44 years) during two-fifths of the decade, may be estimated at perhaps 750,000.

The Tenth Census put it beyond doubt that economic and social forces had been at work, reducing the rate of multiplication. Yet no war had intervened; the industries of the land had flourished; the advance in accumulated wealth had been beyond all precedent; and immigration had increased.

It is an interesting question what has been the contribution of the foreign elements of the country's population in the growth of the aggregate. This question is closely connected with a still more important one: namely, what effect, if any, has foreign immigration had upon the birth-rate of the native stock. In 1850 the foreign-born whites (2,244,602 in number) were about two-thirds of the coloured element and one-eighth of the native-white element; in 1870 the foreign-born whites (5,567,229) and the native whites of foreign parentage (5,324,786) each exceeded the coloured. In 1900 the two foreign elements constituted one-third of the total population. The absolute numbers of the four elements were: native whites of native parents, 40,949,362; natives of foreign parents, 15,646,017; foreign-born whites, 10,213,817; coloured, 8,833,994.

Separating from the total population of the country in 1900 the non-Caucasians (9,185,379), all white persons having both parents foreign (20,803,800), and one-half (2,541,365) of the number of persons having only one parent foreign, the remaining 43,555,250 "native" inhabitants comprised the descendants of the Americans of 1790, plus those of the few inhabitants of annexed territories, plus those in the third and higher generations of the foreigners who entered the country after 1790 (or for practical purposes, after 1800). The second element may be disregarded. For the exact determination of the last element the census affords no precise data, but affords material for various approximations, based either upon the elimination of the probable progeny of immigrants since 1790; on the known increase of the whites of the South, where the foreign element has always been relatively insignificant; on the percentage of natives having native grandfathers in Massachusetts in 1905; or upon the assumed continuance through the 19th century of the rate of native growth (one-third decennially) known to have prevailed down at least to 1820. The last is the roughest approximation and would indicate a native mass of 50,000,000 in 1900, or a foreign contribution of approximately half. The results of computations by the first two methods yield estimates of the contribution of foreign stock to the "native" element of 1900 varying among themselves by only 1·8 %. The average by the three methods gives 8,539,626 as such contribution, making 31,884,791 the total number of whites of foreign origin in 1900; and this leaves 35,015,624 as the progeny of the original stock of 1790.[1] Adding to the true native whites of 1900 (35,015,634) the native negroes (8,813,658), the increase of the native stock, white and black, since 1790 would thus be about 1091 %, and of the whites of 1790 (3,172,006) alone about 1104 %. It is evident that had the fecundity of the American stock of 1790 been equal only to that of Belgium (the most fertile population of western Europe in the 19th century) then the additions of foreign elements to the American people would have been by 1900 in heavy preponderance over the original, mainly British, elements. A study of the family names appearing on the census rolls of two prosperous and typical American counties, one distinctively urban and the other rural, in 1790 and 1900, has confirmed the popular impression that the British element is growing little, and that the fastest reproducers to-day are the foreign elements that have become large in the immigration current in very recent decades. In applying to the total population of 1790 the rate of growth shown since 1790 by the white people of the South, this rate, for the purpose of the above computations, is taken in its entirety only up to 1870, and thereafter—in view of the notorious lesser birth-rate since that year in the North and West—only one half of the rate is used. If, however, application be made of the rate in its entirety from 1790 to 1900, the result would be a theoretical pure native stock in 1900 equal to the then actually existing native and foreign stock combined.

In 1900 more than half of every 100 whites in New England and the middle states (from New York to Maryland) were of foreign parentage (*i.e.* had one or both parents foreign), and in both sections the proportion is increasing with great rapidity. The southern states, on the other hand, have shown a diminishing relative foreign element since 1870, and had in 1900 only 79 of foreign parentage in 1000 whites. Relatively to their share of the country's aggregate population the North Atlantic states, and those upon the Great Lakes—the manufacturing and urbanized states of the Union—hold much the heaviest share of immigrant population.

The shares of different nationalities in the aggregate mass of foreigners have varied greatly. The family names on the registers of the first census show that more than 90 % of the white population was then of British stock, and more than 80 was English. The Germans were already near 6 %. The entry of the Irish began on a great scale after 1840, and in 1850 they formed nearly half of all the foreign-born. In that year 85·6 % of this total was made up by natives of Great Britain and Germany. The latter took first place in 1880. In 1900 these two countries represented of the total only 52·7 %; add the Dutch, the Danes, Swedes, Norwegians and Swiss to the latter and the share was 65·1 %. A great majority of all of these elements except the British are settled in the states added to the original Union—the Scandinavians being the most typically agricultural element; while almost all the other nationalities are in excess, most of them heavily so, in the original states of 1790, where they land, and where they are absorbed into the lower grades of the industrial organization. Since 1880 Italians, Russians, Poles, Austrians, Bohemians and Hungarians have enormously increased in the immigrant population. Germans, Irish, British, Canadians, Scandinavians, Slavs and Italians were the leading elements in 1900.

In 1790 the negroes were 19·3 % of the country's inhabitants; in 1900 only 11·6 %. While the growth of the country's aggregate population from 1790 to 1900 was 1833·9 %, that of the whites was 2005·9 %, and of the negroes only 1066·7 %.

Certain generalizations respecting the "South" and the "North," the "East" and the "West" are essential to an understanding of parts of the history of the past, and of social conditions in the present. For the basis of such comparisons the country is divided by the census into five groups of states: (1) the North Atlantic division—down to New Jersey and Pennsylvania; (2) the South Atlantic division—from Delaware to Florida (including West Virginia); (3) the North Central division—including the states within a triangle tipped by Ohio, Kansas and North Dakota; (4) the South Central division—covering a triangle tipped by Kentucky, Alabama and Texas; and (5) the Western division—including the Rocky Mountains and Pacific states. The first and third lead to-day in manufacturing interests; the third in agricultural; the fifth in mining.

Groups 1 and 3 (with the western boundary somewhat indefinite) are colloquially known as the "North" and 2 and 4 as the "South." The two sections started out with population growths in the decade 1790–1800 very nearly equal (36·5 and 33·7 %); but in every succeeding decade before the Civil War the growth of the North was greater, and that of the South less, than its increment in the initial decade. In the two twenty-year periods after 1860 the increases of the North were 61·9 and 48·7 %; of the South, 48·4 and 48·5 %. In 1790 the two sections were of almost equal population; in 1890 (and in 1900) the population of the North was practically double that of the South. In the decade 1890–1900 the increase of the South exceeded slightly that of the North for the first time owing to the rapid development in recent years of the southern states west of the Mississippi, which only the Western group has exceeded since 1870.[2] In general the increase of the two sections

[1] W. S. Rossiter, *A Century of Population Growth* (Bureau of the Census, Washington, 1909), pp. 85 seq.

[2] The number of inhabitants of the North at each census for every 1000 in the South was as follows from 1790 to 1900: 1004; 1025; 1092; 1181; 1253; 1455; 1562; 1769; 2057; 1930; 2005; 1932.

since 1880 has been nearly equal. But while this growth was relatively uniform over the South, in the North there was a low (often a decreasing) rate of rural and a high rate of urban growth. Throughout the 19th century the rates of growth of the North Central division and that of the eastern half of the South Central division steadily decreased. It is notable that that of the South Atlantic group has grown faster since 1860 than ever before, despite the Civil War and the conditions of an old settled region: a fact possibly due to the effects of the emancipation of the slaves.

Comparing now the population of the regions east and west of the Mississippi, we find that the population of the first had grown from 3,929,214 in 1790 to 55,023,513 in 1900; and that of the second from 97,401 in 1870 to 20,971,062 in 1900. From 1860 to 1890 the one increased its numbers decennially by one half, and the other by under one fifth; but from 1890 to 1900 the difference in growth was slight, owing to a tremendous falling off in the rate of growth of much of the western and the western states of the North Central division. Only an eighth of the country's total population lived in 1900 east of the 96th meridian, which divides the country into two nearly equal parts. Although, as already stated, the population of the original area of 1790 was passed in 1880 by that of the added area, the natives of the former were still in excess in 1900.

Urban and Rural Population.—The five cities of the country that had 8000 or more inhabitants in 1790 had multiplied to 231 in 1900. Only one of the original six (Charleston) was in the true South, which was distinctly rural. The three leading colonial cities, Philadelphia, New York and Boston, grew six-fold in the 18th century, and fifty-fold in the next. The proportion of the population living in cities seems to have been practically constant throughout the 18th century and up to 1820. The great growth of urban centres has been a result of industrial expansion since that time. This growth has been irregular, but was at a maximum about the middle of the century. On an average throughout the 110 years, the population in cities of 8000 considerably more than doubled every twenty years.[1] The rate of rural growth, on the other hand, fell very slowly down to 1860,[2] and since then (disregarding the figures of the inaccurate census of 1870) has been steady at about half the former rate. In Rhode Island, in 1900, eight out of every ten persons lived in cities of 8000 or more inhabitants; in Massachusetts, seven in ten. In New York, New Jersey and Connecticut the city element also exceeded half of the population. At the other extreme, Mississippi had only 3 % of urban citizens. If the limit be drawn at a population of 2500 (a truer division) the urban element of Rhode Island becomes 95·0 %; of Massachusetts, 91·5; of Mississippi, 7·7. All the southern states are still relatively rural, as well to-day as a hundred years ago. Eight states of the Union had a density in 1900 exceeding 100 persons to the square mile: Ohio (102·0), Maryland (120·5), Pennsylvania (140·1), New York (152·6), Connecticut (187·5), New Jersey (250·3) Massachusetts (348·9) and Rhode Island (407·0).

There are abundant statistical indications that the line (be the influence that draws it economic or social) between urban centres of only 2500 inhabitants and rural districts is much sharper to-day than was that between the country and cities of 8000 inhabitants (the largest had five times that number) in 1790. The lower limit is therefore a truer division line to-day. Classifying, then, as urban centres all of above 2500 inhabitants, three-tenths of the total population lived in the latter centres in 1880 and four-tenths (30,583,411) in 1900; their population doubled in these twenty years. If one regards the larger units, they held naturally a little more of the total population of the country—just a third (33·1 %; ten times their proportion of the country's total in 1790); and they grew a little faster. The same years, however, made apparent a rapid fall, general and marked, yet possibly only temporary, in the rate at which such urban centres, as well as larger ones, had been gaining upon the rural districts; this reaction being most pronounced in the South and least so in the North Atlantic states, whose manufacturing industries are concentrated in dense centres of population.

Interstate migration is an interesting element in American national life. A fifth of the total population of 1900 were living in other states than those of birth; and this does not take account of temporary nor of multiple migration. Every state numbers among its residents natives of nearly every other state. This movement is complicated by that of foreign immigration. In 1900 the percentage of resident natives varied from 92·7 % in South Carolina to 15 % in Oklahoma; almost all of the southern states having high percentages.

Sexes.—The percentages of males and females, of all ages, in the aggregate population of 1900, were 51·0 and 49·0 respectively. The corresponding figures for the main elements of the population were as follows: for native whites, 50·7 and 49·3; foreign whites, 54·0 and 46·0; negroes, 49·6 and 50·4. The absolute excess of males in the aggregate population has been progressively greater at every successive census since 1820, save that of 1870—which followed the Civil War, and closed a decade of lessened immigration. The relative excess of males in each unit of population has not constantly progressed, but has been continuous. In densely settled regions females generally predominate; and males in thinly settled regions. In every 1000 urban inhabitants there were, in 1900, 23 (in 1890 only 19) more females than in 1000 rural inhabitants. In the rural districts, so far as there is any excess of females, it is almost solely in the southern cotton belt, where negro women are largely employed as farm hands.

Vital Statistics, 1900.—The median age of the aggregate population of 1900—that is, the age that divides the population into halves—was 22·85 years. In 1800 it was 15·97 years. A falling birth-rate, a falling death-rate, and the increase in the number of adult immigrants, are presumably the chief causes of this difference. The median age of the foreign-born in 1900 was 38·42 years. The median age of the population of cities of 25,000 or more inhabitants was 3·55 years greater than that of the inhabitants of smaller urban centres and rural districts, owing probably in the main to the movement of middle-aged native and foreign adults to urban centres, and the higher birth-rate of the rural districts. The median age of the aggregate population is highest in New England and the Pacific states, lowest in the South, and in the North Central about equal to the country's average. The average age of the country's population in 1900 was 26·2 years. The United States had a larger proportion (59·1 %) within the "productive" age limits of 15 and 60 years than most European countries; this being due to the immigration of foreign adults (corresponding figure 80·3 %), the productive group among the native whites (55·8 %) being smaller than in every country of Europe. The same is true, however, of the population over 60 years of age.

The death-rate of the United States, though incapable of exact determination, was probably between 16 and 17 per 1000 in 1900; and therefore less than in most foreign countries. **Death-rate.** The following statement of the leading causes of death during the eleven years 1890–1900 in 83 cities of above 25,000 population, is given by Dr J. S. Billings:—

Average Annual Death-rate per 100,000 Population for the Cities of the Sections Indicated.	Consumption.	Pneumonia.	Typhoid Fever.	Diphtheria and Croup.
New England . .	244	220	30	77
Middle states . .	259	268	32	101
Lake states . .	156	159	48	79
Southern states .	277	189	50	54
West North Central	183	142	38	61

Among the statistics of conjugal condition the most striking facts are that among the foreign-born the married are more than twice as numerous as the single, owing to the predominance of adults among the immigrants; and the native whites of foreign parents marry late and in much smaller proportion than do the native whites of native parentage—the **Marriage.** explanation of which is probably to be found in the reaction of the first American generation caused on one hand by the high American standard of living, and on the other by the relative economic independence of women. In 1900 1·0 % of the males and 10·9 % of the females from 15 to 19 years of age were married; from 20 to 24 years, 21·6 % and 46·5 % respectively. Of females above 15 years of age 31·2 % were single, 56·9 married, 11·2 widowed, 0·5 divorced; many of the last class undoubtedly reporting themselves as of the others. The corresponding figures for males were: 40·2, 54·5, 4·6 and 0·3 %. In 1850 there were 5·6 persons (excluding the slave population) in an average American family; fifty years later there were only 4·7—a decline, which was constant, of 16·1 %. In 1790, 5 persons was also the normal family—*i.e.* the greatest proportion (14 %) of the total were of this size; but in **Families.** 1900 the model family was that of 3 persons by a more decisive proportion (18 %). The minimum state average of 1790, which was 5·4 in Georgia, was greater than the maximum of 1900. Within the area of 1790 there were twice as many families in 1900 as in 1790 consisting of 2 persons, and barely half as many consisting of 7 and upward; New England having shown the greatest and the South the least decrease. In 1790 about a third and in 1900 more than one half of all families had less than 5 members.

The data gathered by the Federal census have never made possible a satisfactory and trustworthy calculation of the birth-rate, and state and local agencies possess no such data for any considerable area. But the evidence is on the **Birth-rate.** whole cumulative and convincing that there was a remarkable falling off in the birth-rate during the 19th century. And it may be noted, because of its bearing upon the theory of General Francis A. Walker, that the Old South of 1790, practically unaided by immigration, maintained a rate of increase at least approximating that attained by other sections of the country by native and foreign stock combined.

Not a state of the Union as it existed in 1850 showed an increase, during the half-century following, in the ratio of children. Within this period the ratio declined for the whole country from 1600 to 1100; and it has fallen for the census area of 1790 from 1900 in that year to 1400 in 1850 and 1100 in 1900. On the other hand, elaborate colonial censuses for New York in 1703 and 1812 show

[1] Average 62·2 % decennially. [2] Average 31·9 % decennially.

Sections of the Country.[1]	Whites under 16 Years per 1000 of Total Population.				
	1790.	1820.	1850.	1880.	1900.
Area of 1790	490	489	431	390	356
New England	470	443	358	309	291
Middle states	494	485	405	358	326
Old South	502	508	464	431	402
Added area	——	526	463	406	368

ratios of 1900 and 2000, and reinforce the suggestions of various other facts that the social, as well as the economic, conditions in colonial times were practically constant.

The decline in the proportion of children since 1860 has been decidedly less in the South (Southern Atlantic and South Central states as defined below) than in the North and West, but in the most recent decades the last section has apparently fast followed New England in having a progressively lesser proportion of children. In the North there was little difference in 1900 in the ratios shown by city and country districts, but in the South the ratio in the latter was almost twice that reported for the former.

The decades 1840–1850, 1880–1890 and 1860–1870 have shown much the greater decreases in the percentage of children; and some have attributed this to the alleged heavier immigration of foreigners (largely adults) in the case of the two former decades, and the effects of the Civil War in the third. So also the three decades immediately succeeding the above showed minimum decreases; and this has been attributed to a supposed greater birth-rate among the immigrants.

These uncertainties raise a greater one of much significance, viz. what has been the cause of the reduction in the national birth-rate indicated by the census figures? The question has been very differently judged. In the opinion of General Francis A. Walker, superintendent of the censuses of 1870 and 1880, the remarkable fact that such reduction coincided with a cause that was regarded as certain to quicken the increase of population, viz. the introduction of a vast body of fresh peasant blood from Europe, afforded proof that in this matter of population moral are far more potent than physical causes. The change, wrote General Walker, which produced this falling off from the traditional rate of increase of about 3 % per annum, was that from the simplicity of the early times to comparative luxury; involving a rise in the standard of living, the multiplication of artificial necessities the extension of a paid domestic service, the introduction of women into factory labour.[2] In his opinion the decline in the birth-rate coincidently with the increase of immigration, and chiefly in those regions where immigration was greatest, was no mere coincidence; nor was such immigrant invasion due to a weakening native increase, or economic defence; but the decline of the natives was the effect of the increase of the foreigners, which was "a shock to the principle of population among the native element." Immigration therefore, according to this theory, had "amounted not to a reinforcement of our population, but to a replacement of native by foreign stock. That if the foreigners had not come, the native element would long have filled the places the foreigners usurped, I entertain"—says General Walker—"not a doubt."

It is evident that the characteristics of the "factory age" to which reference is made above would have acted upon native British as upon any other stock; and that it has universally so acted there is abundant statistical evidence, in Europe and even in a land of such youth and ample opportunities as Australia. The assumption explicitly made by General Walker that among the immigrants no influence was yet excited in restriction of population, is also not only gratuitous, but inherently weak; the European peasant who landed (where the great majority have stayed) in the eastern industrial states was thrown suddenly under the influence of the forces just referred to; forces possibly of stronger influence upon him than upon native classes, which are in general economically and socially more stable. On the whole, the better opinion is probably that of a later authority on the vital statistics of the country, Dr John Shaw Billings,[3] that though the characteristics of modern life doubtless influence the birth-rate somewhat, by raising the average age of marriage, lessening unions, and increasing divorce and prostitution, their great influence is through the transmutation into necessities of the luxuries of simpler times; not automatically, but in the direction of an increased resort to means for the prevention of child-bearing.

Education.—In the article EDUCATION (*United States*), and in the articles on the several states, details are given generally of the conditions of American education. Here the statistics of literacy need only be considered.

In 1900 illiterates (that is, persons unable to write, the majority of these being also unable to read) constituted nearly one-ninth (10·7 %) of the population of at least ten years of age; but the greatest part of this illiteracy is due to the negroes and the foreign immigrants. Since 1880 the proportion of illiteracy has steadily declined for all classes, save the foreign-born between 1880 and 1890, owing to the beginning in these years, on a large scale, of immigration from southern Europe. Illiteracy is less among young persons of all classes than in the older age-groups, in which the foreign-born largely fall. This is due to the extension of primary education during the last half of the 19th century. The older negroes (who were slaves) naturally, when compared with the younger, afford the most striking illustration of this truth. On the other hand, a notable exception is afforded by the native whites of native parents, particularly in the South, where child illiteracy (and child labour) is highest; the declining proportion of illiterates shown by the age groups of this class up to 24 years is apparently due to a will to learn late in life.

The classification of the illiterate population (above 10 years of age) by races shows that the Indians (56·2 %), negroes (44·5 %), Chinese (29·0 %), Japanese (18·3 %), foreign white (13·0 %), native white of native parentage (5·7 %), and native whites of foreign parents (1·6 %), are progressively more literate. The advantage of the last as compared with native whites of native parentage is apparently owing to the lesser concentration of these in cities. The percentages of illiterate children for different classes in 1900 were as follows: negroes, 30·1; foreign whites, 5·6; native whites of foreign parentage, 0·9; native whites of native parentage, 4·4. There is a greater difference in the North than in the South between the child illiteracy of the Caucasian and non Caucasian elements; also a ranking of the different sections of the country according to the child illiteracy of one and the other race shows that the negroes of the South stand relatively as high as do its whites. All differences are lessened if the comparison be limited to children, and still further lessened if also limited to cities. Thus, the illiteracy of non-Caucasians was 44·5 %, of their children 30·1 %, and of such in cities of 25,000 inhabitants, 7·7 %.

In the total population of 10 years of age and over the female sex is more illiterate than the male, but within the age-group 10 to 24 years the reverse is true. In 1890 females preponderated among illiterates only in the age-group 10 to 19 years. The excess of female illiteracy in the total population also decreased within the same period, from 20·3 to 10·8 illiterates in a thousand. The tendency is therefore clearly toward an ultimate higher literacy for females; a natural result where the two sexes enjoy equal facilities of schooling, and the females greater leisure. Among the whites attending school there was still in 1900 a slight excess of males; among the negro pupils females were very decidedly in excess. In all races there has been since 1890, throughout the country, a large increase in the proportion of girls among the pupils of each age-group; and this is particularly true of the group of 15 years and upward—that is of the grammar school and high school age, in which girls were in 1900 decidedly preponderant. A similar tendency is marked in college education.

Religious Bodies.—According to the national census of religious bodies taken in 1906 there were then in the country 186 denominations represented by 212,230 organizations, 92·2 % of which represented 164 bodies which in history and general character are identified more or less closely with the Protestant Reformation or its subsequent development. The Roman Catholic Church contributed 5·9 % of the organizations. Among other denominations the Jewish congregations and the Latter Day Saints were the largest. The immigrant movement brings with it many new sects, as, for example, the Eastern Orthodox churches (Russian, Servian, Syrian and Greek), which had practically no existence in 1890, the year of the last preceding census of religious bodies. But the growth of independent churches is most remarkable, having been sixfold since 1890.

The statistics of communicants or members are defective, and because of the different organization in this respect of different bodies, notably of the Protestants and Roman Catholics, comparisons are more or less misleading. Disregarding, however, such incomparability, but excluding from the number of Roman Catholics children under 9 years of age, the total number of church members was 32,936,445, of whom 61·6 % were Protestants, 36·7 % Roman Catholics and 1·7 % members of other churches. The corresponding figures in 1890 were 68·0, 30·3 and 1·7 %. For the reasons just given these figures do not accurately indicate the religious affiliations of the population of the United States. In this particular they very largely understate the number of Hebrews, whose

[1] Table from Rossiter, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

[2] See his *Discussions in Economics and Statistics*, ii. 422, "Immigration and Degradation."

[3] See the *Forum* (June, 1893), xv. 467.

communicants (0·3 %) are heads of families only, and largely of the Protestants; whereas they represent practically the total Roman Catholic population above 10 years of age. In comparing the figures of 1890 with those of 1906 these cautions are not of force, since both census counts were taken by the same methods. The membership of the Protestant bodies increased in the interval 44·8 %, while that of the Roman Catholic Church increased 93·5 %. The immigration from Catholic countries could easily account for (though this does not prove that in fact it is the only cause of) this great increase of the Roman Catholic body.

Among the Protestants, the Methodists with 17·5 % of the total membership, the Baptists with 17·2, the Lutherans with 6·4, the Presbyterians with 5·6 and the Disciples or Christians with 3·5—each of these bodies comprising more than a million members—together include one-half of the total church membership of the country, and four-fifths (81·3 %) of all Protestant members.

The Methodists and Baptists are much stronger in the South, relatively to other bodies, than elsewhere; the former constituting in the South Atlantic states 43·9 % of all church members, and in the South Central states 39·5 %. Adding in the Methodists these proportions become 76·3 and 65·3 %. The Lutherans are relatively strongest in the North Central division of the country (13·2 %; the Presbyterians in the North Atlantic and Western divisions (6·0 %); and the Disciples in the South Central division (6·1 %). The Roman Catholics are strongest in the Western division and the North Atlantic division, with 49·2 % in the former and 56·6 % in the latter of all church members; their share in the North Central division is 36·9 %. Thus the numerical superiority of the Baptists and Methodists in the two southern divisions is complementary to that of the Roman Catholics in the other three divisions of the country. New York, Rhode Island, Massachusetts and New Hampshire in the eastern part of the country, Louisiana in the south, and New Mexico, Arizona, California and Montana in the western part are distinctively Roman Catholic states, with not less than 63 % of these in the total church body. Racial elements are for the most part the explanation. So also the immigration of French Canadians and of Irish explains the fact that in every state of one-time Puritan New England the Roman Catholics were a majority over Protestants and all other churches. This was true in 1890 of 12 states, while in one other the Roman Catholics held a plurality; in 1906 the corresponding figures were 16 and 20. The Protestant bodies are more widely and evenly distributed throughout the country than are the Roman Catholics.

The total value of church property (almost in its entirety exempt from taxation) reported in 1906 was $1,257,575,867, of which $935,942,578 was reported for Protestant bodies, $292,638,786 for Roman Catholic bodies, and $28,994,502 for all other bodies.

Occupations.—29,073,233 persons 10 years or more of age—nearly two-fifths (38·3 %) of the country's total population—were engaged in gainful occupations in 1900. Occupations were reported first for free males in 1850, and since 1860 women workers have been separately reported. Five main occupation groups are covered by the census: (1) agriculture, (2) professional service, (3) domestic and personal service, (4) trade and transportation, (5) manufacture and mechanical pursuits. The percentage of all wage-earners engaged in these groups in 1900 was 35·7, 4·3, 19·2, 16·4, and 24·4 respectively. Outside of these are the groups of mining and fishing.

Although manufactures have increased tremendously of recent years—their products representing in 1905 a gross total of $14,802,147,087 as compared with $6,309,000,000 for those of farms (according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture)—agriculture is still the predominant industry of the United States, employing nearly half of the workers, and probably giving subsistence to considerably more than half of the people of the country.

Turning to the factor of sex, it may be stated that the total number of the gainfully employed in 1900 above given included 80·0 of all the men and boys, and 18·8 % of all the women and girls in the country. The corresponding figures in 1880 were 78·7 and 14·7 %. The proportion of women workers is greatest in the North Atlantic group of states (22·1 %) where they are engaged in manufacturing, and in the South (23·8) where negro women are engaged in agricultural operations. The percentage of such wage-earners is therefore increasing much more rapidly in the former region. But in all other parts of the country the increase is faster than in the South; since aside from agriculture, which has long been in a relatively stable condition, there is not by any means so strong a movement of women into professional services in city districts. The increase is universal. There is not a state that does not show it. The greatest increase for any section between 1880 and 1900 was that of the North Central division from 8·8 to 14·3 %. Here too both factors—farm-life, as in North Dakota, and manufacturing, as in Illinois—showed their plain influence.

9·4 % of all agricultural labourers were females in 1900 (7·7 in 1880); but in the South the proportion was much greater—16·5 in the South Atlantic and 14·9 in the South Central division. In professional service 34·2 % (in 1880, 29·4) were females; the two northern sections showing the highest proportions. In the occupations of musicians and teachers of music, and of school-teachers and professors (which together account for seven-eighths of professional women) women preponderate. The same sex constituted only 37·5 % (34·6 % in 1880) of the wage-earners of the third group; the South also showing here, as is natural in view of its coloured class, much the highest and the western division of states much the lowest percentage. Women are in excess in the occupations of boarding and lodging house keepers, housekeepers, launderers, nurses and midwives, and servants and waiters. These account for almost all women in this group; servants and waitresses make up two-thirds of the total. Finally, in the fourth and fifth groups the percentage of women was 10·6 (3·4 in 1880) and 18·5 (16·7 in 1880). In manufactures the South Atlantic states show a higher percentage than the North Central, owing to the element of child-labour already indicated. In the third group women greatly preponderate in the occupation of stenographers and type-writers; and in those of book-keepers and accountants, clerks and copyists, packers and shippers, saleswomen (which is the largest class), and telegraph and telephone operators they have a large representation (13 to 34 %). A great variation exists in the proportion of the sexes employed in different manufacturing industries. Of dress-makers, milliners, seamstresses (which together make up near half of the total in this occupation group) more than 96 % are women. Of the makers of paper boxes, of shirts, collars and cuffs, of hosiery and knitting mill operatives, of glove-makers, silk mill operatives and book-binders they are more than half; so also of other textile workers, excluding wool and cotton mill operatives (these last the second largest group of women workers in manufactures), in which occupations males are in a slight excess. The distribution of women wage-earners in 1900 among the great occupation groups was as follows: in agriculture, 18·4 %; professional service, 8·1 %; domestic and personal service, 39·4 %; trade and transportation, 9·4 %; manufacturing and mechanical pursuits, 24·7 %.

The proportion which children 10 to 15 years of age engaged in gainful occupations bore to the whole number of such children was in 1880 24·4 % for males, and 9·0 % for females. Twenty years later the corresponding figures were 26·1 and 10·2 %. In the North Atlantic and North Central states, notwithstanding their manufacturing industries, the proportions were much lower (17·1 and 17·0 in 1900), and they increased very little in the period mentioned. In the Western group the increase was even less, and the total (10·9 % in 1900) also. But in the South Atlantic and the South Central states—where agriculture, mining and manufacturing have in recent decades become important—although the increase was very slight, the proportions were far above those of the other sections, both in 1880 and in 1900. In the former year the ratios were 40·2 and 41·5, in the latter 41·6 and 42·7 %. In Alabama (70·8 % in 1880), North and South Carolina, and Arkansas the ratio exceeded 50 % in 1900.

National Wealth.—Mulhall has estimated the aggregate wealth of the United States in 1790 at $620,000,000, assigning of this value $479,000,000 to lands and $141,000,000 to buildings and improvements. It is probable that this estimate is generous according to the values of that time. But even supposing $1,000,000,000 to be a juster estimate according to present-day values, it is probable that the increase of this since 1790 has been more than a hundredfold and since 1850 (since when such data have been gathered by the census) about fifteenfold. The value of farm property increased from $3,967,343,580 in 1850 to $20,439,901,164 in 1900. The gross value of manufactures rose in the same interval from $1,019,106,616 to $13,010,036,514; of farm products, from $2,212,540,927 in 1880 to $6,309,000,000 in 1900. The census estimate of the true value of "property" constituting the national wealth was limited in an enumeration of 1850 to taxable realty and privately held personalty; in 1900 it covered also exempt realty, government land, and corporation and public personalty. The estimate of the national wealth of 1850 was $7,135,780,228; in 1904 (made by the census office), $107,104,192,410. It may be added that the net ordinary revenue of the government was in 1850 $43,592,889, and in 1909 $662,324,445; that the value of imports rose from $7·48 *per capita* in 1850 to $10·88 and to $19·56 in 1909; and of exports from $6·23 to $18·56. The public debt in 1909, less cash in the Treasury, was $1,023,861,532. (F. S. P.)

VI.—Industries and Commerce

Manufactures.—In the colonial period there were beginnings in some lines of manufacturing, but the policy of the British government was generally hostile and the increase was insignificant. In the first decades after the establishment of independence the resources and energies of the nation were absorbed in the task of occupying the vacant spaces of a continent, and subduing it to agriculture; and so long as land was so abundant

civil divisions. Differences in the land area figures over time are due primarily to the more accurate determination of the outer limits of the United States, improvements in mapping and map measuring techniques, omission of certain bodies of water included in the earlier measurements, and increases in the area of artificial reservoirs. For total figures (land, water, and gross area) in square miles, 1790–1970, and sources of data, see series J 2.

Collection of land utilization statistics began with the census of 1850, when farmland was enumerated as "improved land" or "unimproved land." In 1890 and later census years, these inquiries were expanded and revised. After the turn of the century, collection of various land utilization statistics was begun by branches of the Department of Agriculture, while other contributions to the literature on this subject were made by numerous agencies, State universities, and individuals.

The census of agriculture is the primary source of data concerning land in farms in census years. Statistics concerning land not in farms are less complete, except for forest land, and have been collected by various interested agencies for individual items and for local areas by Federal, State, and private agencies and individuals. During the 1930's, studies by the National Resources Planning Board and assisting agencies contributed greatly to the available statistics on total land utilization. Since 1920, the Department of Agriculture's Economic Research Service and its predecessor agencies have prepared periodic inventories of land use.

Data on the utilization of farmland refer to the land use in preceding years except for 1954, 1959, 1964, and 1969. For 1850–1925, the data are chiefly estimates made by the former Bureau of Agricultural Economics based on the censuses of agriculture conducted by the Bureau of the Census. The estimates for 1930–1969 are from the census of agriculture, except for an adjustment made by the Economic Research Service in cropland harvested and other land in farms for 1950 through 1969. This adjustment was made to compensate for normal underenumeration of cropland and to obtain greater conformity with the total acreage of crops harvested as reported by the Department of Agriculture's Statistical Reporting Service and its predecessor agencies.

Acreages of nonfarm uses of land were estimated by the Economic Research Service and predecessor agencies from records and reports of State and Federal agencies concerned with management of public land, conservation of land, public services, and assessment of land for taxation.

Changes in total farmland for 1850–1969 represent in part changes in agricultural activity and in part more complete census enumeration and changes in census definition of *land in farms*. Land uses not reported by the Bureau of the Census and additions to census data for 1930–1969 are based largely on agricultural statistics assembled by the Department of Agriculture. Forest land inventories and grazing land studies during this period are believed to have improved the reliability of the estimates of these items for this period as contrasted with earlier years. Estimates for 1925 and prior census years for land not in farms are based on more limited evidence, such as available charts, maps, records, and reports on land areas and uses.

J 50–65. Land utilization, by type, 1850–1969.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1850–1900, *Major Uses of Land in the United States: Summary for 1954*, Agriculture Information Bulletin No. 168, 1957, pp. 36 and 37; 1910–1968, *Agricultural Statistics, 1972*, p. 506; 1969, *Major Uses of Land in the United States, Summary for 1969*, Agricultural Economics Report No. 247.

These data are based on estimates from Department of Agriculture publications as follows: *Major Uses of Land and Water in the United States, Summary for 1964*, Agricultural Economics Report 149, 1968; *Major Uses of Land and Water in the United States: Summary for 1959*, Agricultural Economics Report No. 13, 1962; *Major Uses of Land in the United States*, Technical Bulletin No. 1082, and Supplement, *Basic Land Use Statistics, 1950; Inventory of Major Land Uses, United States, 1945*, Miscellaneous publication 663, 1948; *Pasture Land on Farms in the United States*, Bulletin No. 626, 1918; *Agricultural Yearbook, 1923*, 1924; and National Resources Board, *A Report on National Planning and Public Works . . ., 1934*.

Total land area, as defined by the Census Bureau in 1940 and subsequent years includes "dry land and land temporarily or partially covered by water, such as marshland, swamps and river flood plains . . . (except tidal flats) . . . streams, sloughs, estuaries, and canals less than 1/8 of a statute mile in width; and lakes, reservoirs, and ponds having less than 40 acres of area."

See also U.S. Bureau of the Census reports, *U.S. Census of Population*, vol. I, for 1920, 1930, 1940, 1950, and 1960; *Areas of the United States, 1940;* and *Area Measurement Reports* (for individual States, 1960 area), Series GE-20, 1964–1967.

Cropland used for crops includes cropland harvested, crop failure, and cultivated summer fallow. *Cropland idle or in cover crops* includes temporarily idle land as well as some poorer cropland abandoned for crop purposes and soil-improvement crops not harvested and not pastured. *Grassland pasture* includes cropland used only for pasture in the year indicated and all other nonforested pasture in farms. *Farm woodland* includes grazed or ungrazed farm wood lots or timber tracts, natural or planted, and cutover land with young growth, which has or will have value as wood or timber. Chaparral and woody shrubs are omitted. *Special uses in farms* includes farmsteads, farm roads, and farm lanes. *Other land in farms* includes miscellaneous unclassified uses and wasteland.

Nonfarm grazing land comprises the open grassland and shrub grazing lands and the woodland and forest area grazed. *Nonfarm forest land not used for grazing* excludes forested areas in parks, wildlife refuges, military areas, recreation sites, and arid woodland, brushland, and forest land used for grazing. *Special uses not in farms* includes urban areas, highways and roads, railroads, airports, parks and related recreational areas, wildlife refuges, and military reservations. *Other nonfarm land* includes various unclassified uses and unused areas such as desert, rock, swamp, and tundra.

J 66–80. Private and public land ownership, by major uses, 1920–1969.

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service. 1920, unpublished data; 1930–1954, *Major Uses of Land in the United States: Summary for 1954*, Agricultural Information Bulletin 168, 1957; 1959, *Major Uses of Land and Water in the United States: Summary for 1959*, Agricultural Economics Report 13, 1962; 1964, *Major Uses of Land and Water in the United States: Summary for 1964*, Agricultural Economics Report 149, 1968; 1969, see source for series J 50–65.

The figures were compiled from a number of Federal and State reports and records which reflect varying degrees of reliability. The figures used are applicable for different dates. All of them were assembled for some other purpose than that for which they are used here. The areas of all unsurveyed lands are estimated, and the areas of many lands based on surveys are subject to correction. Some of the data are not complete and are used merely for comparison. Therefore, although they are the best available, the figures given here are not strictly accurate, often not complete, and are not comparable among themselves. Nevertheless, they give some idea of the major features of land use and control for the country as a whole.

Private land is land held or owned by private individuals, groups, and corporations, and is generally used for private purposes. Indian lands held in trust and administered by the Federal Government for the benefit and use of groups or tribes of the Indian people are included in private land, as more than three-fourths of this land is used directly for farming and grazing by Indian farmers and stockmen. Much of the rest is leased for farming and grazing to other farmers and ranchers and the proceeds are received by the Indian owners.

Public land as used here is land owned or administered by Federal, State, county, municipal, or other governments for common or public purposes (e.g., highways, airports, national defense, flood control, water supply, forests, and parks). Public land frequently is used

for farming and grazing by private parties under a system of permits or leases. However, most of it is dry, rough, rocky, swampy, or otherwise unsuited for farming. When used by individuals, public land is sometimes included in reporting statistics on acreages in farms. More often, when public land is used in common by several persons, it is not reported as in farms.

See also text for series J 50–65.

J 81–91. Agricultural land drainage and irrigation, 1890–1969.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. **Series J 81–84,** 1920–1969, 1969 Census of Agriculture, vol. VI, *Drainage of Agricultural Lands, 1969,* p. X. **Series J 85–91,** 1890–1954, *Irrigation of Agricultural Lands, 1950,* and *1959*; 1959–1969, 1969 Census of Agriculture, vol. IV, *Irrigation,* p. 2.

Drainage and irrigation are the two major reclamation means by which additional land can be brought under cultivation. Land that is drained greatly exceeds land that is irrigated in terms of acreage already developed. Drainage activities are concentrated in the North Central States and lower Mississippi Valley. Other highly drained areas are the Gulf Coast area of Texas, Southern Florida, and the Sacramento and San Joaquin River areas of California. Irrigation is practiced predominantly in the arid and semi-arid areas of the West. In recent years the acreage of irrigated land has stabilized in the Southwest and California because of the full utilization of existing water supplies whereas rapid expansion has occurred in Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Florida. In irrigated areas, particularly areas where water is applied by flooding or by furrows and ditches, drainage is necessary to carry away excess water.

The Bureau of the Census has collected drainage and irrigation statistics by means of three censuses: (1) The censuses of agriculture which represent a direct enumeration of farms; (2) the special censuses of drainage projects; and (3) the special censuses of irrigation organizations. The censuses of agriculture have collected statistics on drainage on farms for 1920, 1930, and 1969, and statistics on irrigation on farms since 1890. The special censuses of drainage projects were taken decennially from 1920 to 1960 and collected information in only those States where projects existed. Changes in the method for collecting drainage statistics shifted the census year from 1970 to 1972 for the most recent census of drainage projects. The special censuses of irrigation organizations have been taken decennially since 1910 and collect information from irrigation organizations in those States where organizations exist. In addition, a special census of irrigation was taken in 1902; the statistics were published in 1904 in *Bulletin 16* of the Census Bureau.

Drainage on farms. Statistics were collected from all farms in the 48 States and the District of Columbia in the censuses of agriculture for 1920 and 1930. For 1969, statistics were collected from all 50 States for farms with sales of $2,500 and over.

Drainage projects. The date of each special census of drainage projects was January 1, of the census year. The number of States covered in the five censuses of drainage projects taken between 1920 and 1960 has varied from census to census. The New England States, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia have never been included. The number of States included in each census are: 1920, 34 States; 1930, 35 States; 1940, 38 States; 1950, 40 States; and 1960, 39 States.

The special census of drainage projects has always been primarily a census of community or public drainage undertakings and of the larger private drainage undertakings. Variation in the methods employed and the scope of the census have had most effect on the number of projects covered but have not greatly affected the comparability of other items. The major changes have been, beginning with 1950, (1) the exclusion of projects of under 500 acres, (2) elimination in the enumeration of numerous projects which had been taken over by a later project, and (3) the consolidation into a single report of undertakings under common management; and in 1960, the elimination of drainage undertakings required solely because of the irrigation of the land.

Irrigation. For reasons of comparability, the irrigation data presented here are from the censuses of agriculture.

The States included for series J 87–89 are: Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

For series J 90–91, the 31 States included prior to 1959 are: Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

J 92–103. Estimated water use, 1900–1960.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Business and Defense Services Administration, *Water Use in the United States, 1900–1980,* March 1960, and Bureau of Domestic Commerce, unpublished data.

These estimates of water use are based on estimates developed initially in 1948 but revised on the basis of information available from Federal surveys and censuses in 1954 and later years. The source publication (cited above) includes estimates of future requirements for 1965, 1970, 1975, and 1980.

The year 1954 was used as a benchmark because of the availability of detailed data on water use during that year, such as the 1954 censuses of manufactures and mineral industries; Inventory of Major Public Water Utilities; Survey of Water Use in Steam Generation of Electric Power by Public Electric Utilities; and Survey of Water Use by the Department of Defense. Adjustments were also made after comparison with surveys of water use by the U.S. Geological Survey in 1950 and 1955, and studies of projections of water requirements by several river basin committees and State water survey commissions.

Related data resulting from later studies have been published by the U.S. Water Resources Council in *The Nation's Water Resources,* 1968, and by the U.S. Geological Survey in a series of quinquennial reports, *Estimated Use of Water in the United States* (circulars 115, 398, 456, 556, and 676) covering the years 1950 through 1970.

J 104–109. Water wells in use, 1900–1962.

Source: U.S. Bureau of Domestic Commerce (formerly Business and Defense Services Administration), unpublished data. (Estimates for 1900–1955 are shown in chart form in Walter L. Picton, "The Water Picture Today," *Water Well Journal,* April 1956.)

In the formulation of these estimates, due consideration has been given to growth in population, the population served by public water supplies, the rural-farm and nonfarm self-served population, and the relative essential water facility requirements to serve them. In addition to population growth, the increase in per capita domestic water use, irrigation requirements, and industrial demands have been considered.

In the absence of measurable data, the level of activity in the field has been gauged by the process of deduction, utilizing the populations of rural and other areas not serviced by public water supplies.

Series J 1–2. Territorial Expansion and Land and Water Area of the United States: 1790 to 1970

[In square miles]

Accession	Territorial expansion: Date	Territorial expansion: Gross area (land and water) [1]	Year	Area: Gross area [2]	Area: Land [2a]	Area: Water [2b]
Total	1970	3,628,066	UNITED STATES			
United States		3,615,122	1970 (Apr. 1)	3,615,122	3,536,855	78,267
Territory in 1790 [3]		888,685	1960 (Apr. 1)	3,615,123	3,540,911	74,212
Louisiana Purchase	1803	827,192	1950 (Apr. 1)	3,615,211	3,552,206	63,005
By treaty with Spain:						
Florida	1819	58,560	CONTERMINOUS U.S. [4]			
Other areas	1819	13,443				
			1960 (Apr. 1)	3,002,261	2,968,054	54,207
Texas	1845	390,143	1950 (Apr. 1)	3,022,387	2,974,726	47,661
Oregon	1846	285,580	1940 (Apr. 1)	3,022,387	2,977,128	45,259
Mexican Cession	1848	529,017	1930 (Apr. 1)	3,022,387	2,977,128	45,259
Gadsden Purchase	1853	29,640	1920 (Jan. 1)	3,022,387	2,969,451	52,936
Alaska	1867	586,412	1910 (Apr. 15)	3,022,387	2,969,565	52,822
Hawaii	1898	6,450				
			1900 (June 1)	3,002,387	2,969,834	52,553
Other areas:			1890 (June 1)	3,022,387	2,969,640	52,747
The Philippines [2]	1898	115,600	1880 (June 1)	3,022,387	2,969,640	52,747
Puerto Rico	1899	3,435	1870 (June 1)	3,022,387	2,969,640	52,747
Guam	1899	212	1860 (June 1)	3,022,387	2,969,640	52,747
American Samoa	1900	76	1850 (June 1)	2,992,747	2,940,042	52,705
Canal Zone [3]	1904	553				
Corn Islands [4]	1914	4	1840 (June 1)	1,788,006	1,749,462	38,544
Virgin Islands of the U.S.	1917	133	1830 (June 1)	1,788,006	1,749,462	38,544
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands [5]	1947	8,489	1820 (Aug. 7)	1,788,006	1,749,462	38,544
All other		42	1810 (Aug. 6)	1,716,003	1,681,828	34,175
			1800 (Aug. 4)	888,811	864,746	24,065
			1790 (Aug. 2)	888,811	864,746	24,065

[1] Includes that part of drainage basin of Red River of the North, south of 49th parallel, sometimes considered part of Louisiana Purchase. [2] Not included in total. Ceded by Spain in 1898, the Philippines constituted a territorial possession of the United States until 1946. Granted independence July 4, 1946. [3] Under jurisdiction of United States in accordance with treaty of Nov. 18, 1903, with Republic of Panama. [4] Included in total for 1970. Leased (1914) from Republic of Nicaragua for 99 years, but returned April 25, 1971. [5] Under trusteeship with the United States as administering authority. See *Trusteeship Agreement for the Former Japanese Mandated Islands (Documentary Supplement No. 1)* of the Security Council of the United Nations which became effective on July 18, 1947. [6] Excludes Alaska and Hawaii.

Series J 3–7. Area and Acquisition of the Public Domain, United States: 1781 to 1970

[Area in thousands of acres. All areas except Alaska are as computed in 1912 and have not been adjusted for subsequent recomputation of the area of the United States]

Year	Public domain plus acquired land [3]	Year	Public domain plus acquired land [3]	Year and acquisition	Area: Total [4]	Area: Land [5]	Area: Inland water [6]	Cost ($1,000) [7]
1970	761,301	1960 [1]	771,512	Aggregate	1,837,763	1,807,682	30,081	85,079
1969	762,514	1959 [2]	768,640					
1968	755,345	1958	408,553	1867, Alaska Purchase	375,296	365,482	9,814	7,200
1967	760,364	1955	407,896	1853, Gadsden Purchase	18,989	18,962	27	10,000
1966	764,762	1950	[3] 412,000	1850, Purchase from Texas	78,927	78,843	84	15,496
				1848, Mexican Cession [4]	338,681	334,479	4,202	16,295
1965	765,797	1946	[3] 413,000	1846, Oregon Compromise	183,386	180,644	2,742	
1964	770,514	1912	[3] 600,000	1819, Cession from Spain	46,145	43,343	[3] 2,802	6,674
1963	769,903	1880	[3] 900,000	Red River Basin [8]	29,602	29,067	535	
1962	770,797	1850	[3] 1,200,000	1803, Louisiana Purchase [4]	529,912	523,446	6,465	23,214
1961	767,766	1802	[3] 200,000	1781–1802 State cessions	236,826	233,416	3,410	[7] 6,200

[1] Beginning 1960, includes acquired land in Hawaii. [2] Beginning 1959, includes Alaska. [3] Estimated from limited data available. [4] Data for Louisiana Purchase exclude areas eliminated by Treaty of 1819 with Spain. Such areas are included in figures for Mexican Cession. [5] Includes 33,920 acres subsequently recognized as part of State of Texas which is not a public-domain State. [6] Represents drainage basin of Red River of the North, south of 49th parallel. Authorities differ as to method and exact date of its acquisition. Some hold it as part of Louisiana Purchase; others maintain it was acquired from Great Britain. [7] See text.

Series J 8–15. Vacant Lands and Disposal of Public Lands: 1802 to 1970

Year	Vacant public lands [8]	Land granted to States [9]	All entries, selections, patents, etc. [1]: All original entries and selections [2] [10]	All entries, selections, patents, etc. [1]: All final entries [11]	All entries, selections, patents, etc. [1]: Patents and certifications [12]	Homestead entries [3]: Original entries: Number [13]	Homestead entries [3]: Original entries: Acreage [14]	Homestead entries [3]: Final entries [4] [15]
	Million acres	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*Number*	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*
1970	159		124	298	582	13	2	6
1969	417		319	264	821	26	4	8
1968	425		1,171	405	906	33	4	10
1967	426		474	942	1,622	51	7	23
1966	427		1,787	214	3,407	115	16	33
1965	428		2,403	220	768	182	22	30
1964	434		5,696	507	1,224	291	31	63
1963	437		880	254	835	383	46	57
1962	439		2,453	622	756	674	83	51
1961	441		2,211	451	482	615	77	57
1960	438		1,295	270	512	1,077	148	45
1959	438	104,569	303	280	850	1,181	147	42
1958	168		146	257	915	524	70	43
1957	169		180	279	561	662	79	66
1956	170		151	267	629	455	57	42

See footnotes at end of table.

Series J 8–15. Vacant Lands and Disposal of Public Lands: 1802 to 1970—Con.

Year	Vacant public lands	Land granted to States	All entries, selections, patents, etc. [1]			Homestead entries [2]			Year	Land granted to States	All original entries and selections [1] [2]	Homestead entries [2]	
			All original entries and selections [3]	All final entries	Patents and certifications	Original entries		Final entries [4]				Original entries	Final entries [4]
						Number	Acreage						
	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15		9	10	13	15
	Million acres	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*Number*	*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*		*1,000 acres*	*1,000 acres*	*Number*	*1,000 acres*
1955	170	----	251	250	539	482	60	37	1880	(Z)	9,152	47,293	1,938
1954	171	----	306	239	416	474	60	43	1879	----	8,724	41,605	2,071
1953	171	----	310	177	364	482	61	39	1878	----	7,210	35,630	2,663
1852	172	----	113	165	374	458	59	38	1877	----	3,495	18,675	2,408
1951	174	----	121	198	388	363	49	63	1876	----	4,292	25,104	2,591
1950	170	----	142	150	492	523	73	46	1875	3,842	3,792	20,668	2,069
1949	170	----	134	116	390	681	82	40	1874	----	4,784	29,126	1,586
1948	171	----	117	56	287	635	78	18	1873	----	6,386	31,561	1,225
1947	170	----	76	53	403	474	55	26	1872	----	7,248	38,742	707
1946	170	----	27	61	154	143	18	29	1871	----	7,119	39,768	629
1945	170	----	40	61	217	182	22	35	1870	----	6,663	33,972	520
1944	168	----	91	85	402	157	20	51	1869	----	6,678	25,628	504
1943	169	----	63	168	637	211	29	102	1868	----	----	23,746	355
1942	174	----	135	252	1,055	283	37	188	1867	4	----	16,957	----
1941	172	----	76	491	1,039	400	51	390	1866	226	----	15,355	----
1940	(NA)	----	54	756	1,904	349	46	652	1865	----	----	8,924	----
1939	(NA)	----	302	1,198	1,982	378	66	1,089	1864	4,955	----	9,405	----
1938	(NA)	2	131	1,478	1,944	447	78	1,362	1863	----	----	8,223	----
1937	(NA)	1	125	2,026	2,184	561	111	1,915	1862	9,420	----	----	----
1936	(NA)	200	426	1,938	1,359	1,209	357	1,765	1861	3,052	----	----	----
1935	(NA)	(Z)	1,759	1,772	1,610	3,297	1,166	1,640	1859	3,498	----	----	----
1934	166	3	3,585	1,225	1,362	7,507	2,787	1,124	1857	2,974	----	----	----
1933	172	193	3,118	980	1,866	7,527	2,642	907					
1932	173	77	4,552	1,333	2,013	10,639	3,914	1,210	1855	46	----	----	----
1931	177	2	5,219	1,537	2,126	12,640	4,757	1,353	1853	5,587	----	----	----
									1850	55,401	----	----	----
1930	179	1	5,435	1,577	2,253	12,708	4,723	1,371	1849	9,491	----	----	----
1929	190	100	4,613	2,030	2,648	11,598	4,178	1,701	1846	1,081	----	----	----
1928	194	252	3,726	2,168	2,519	10,429	3,367	1,816					
1927	194	55	3,595	3,011	4,586	10,500	3,237	2,584	1845	2,076	----	----	----
1926	[5] 196	----	3,243	3,962	4,600	10,354	2,875	3,451	1841	7,807	----	----	----
									1836	2,146	----	----	----
1925	185	1	3,641	4,489	5,627	11,010	3,041	4,049	1832	24	----	----	----
1924	187	(Z)	4,564	5,229	9,082	13,886	3,873	4,791	1831	6	----	----	----
1923	186	----	6,415	6,201	10,352	18,942	5,524	5,594					
1922	183	----	10,367	8,074	13,761	29,263	8,980	7,307	1827	46	----	----	----
1921	190	(Z)	15,632	8,772	10,930	43,813	13,662	7,727	1826	25	----	----	----
1920	200	----	16,437	9,778	13,327	48,532	13,511	8,373	1823	92	----	----	----
1919	213	----	11,871	----	----	39,341	10,204	6,525	1820	1,317	----	----	----
1918	222	----	10,147	----	----	35,875	7,420	8,236					
1917	231	(Z)	16,202	----	----	58,896	12,021	8,497	1819	986	----	----	----
1916	255	4	18,708	----	----	65,282	13,628	7,278	1818	1,186	----	----	----
									1817	824	----	----	----
1915	280	2	16,861	----	----	62,360	12,440	7,181	1816	740	----	----	----
1914	291	----	16,523	----	----	62,229	12,117	9,291					
1913	298	----	15,867	----	----	57,800	11,222	10,009	1812	807	----	----	----
1912	315	(*)	14,575	----	----	52,991	13,624	4,306	1803	793	----	----	----
1911	327	----	19,211	----	----	70,720	17,639	4,620	1802	24	----	----	----
1910	344	17,150	26,391	----	----	98,598	18,329	3,796					
1909	363	(Z)	19,893	----	----	75,445	12,302	3,699					
1908	387	16	19,090	----	----	87,057	13,586	4,243					
1907	406	(Z)	20,998	----	----	93,957	14,755	3,741					
1906	424	3,114	19,431	----	----	89,600	13,975	3,527					
1905	449	(Z)	17,057	----	----	70,344	12,896	3,419					
1904	474	20	16,332	----	----	69,175	10,171	3,233					
1903	----	----	22,824	----	----	80,188	11,193	3,577					
1902	----	(Z)	19,372	----	----	98,829	14,033	4,343					
1901	----	----	15,453	----	----	68,648	9,497	5,241					
1900	----	8	13,391	----	----	61,270	8,478	3,478					
1899	----	50	9,091	----	----	45,776	6,178	3,134					
1898	----	5,600	8,422	----	----	44,980	6,207	3,095					
1897	----	(Z)	7,754	----	----	33,250	4,452	2,778					
1896	----	----	13,174	----	----	36,548	4,831	2,790					
1895	----	69	8,364	----	----	37,336	5,009	2,981					
1894	----	8,470	10,377	----	----	56,632	8,047	2,930					
1893	----	----	11,802	----	----	48,436	6,809	3,477					
1892	----	8	13,567	----	----	55,113	7,716	3,260					
1891	----	(Z)	10,357	----	----	37,602	5,040	3,955					
1890	----	7,678	12,666	----	----	40,244	5,532	4,061					
1889	----	15,367	17,026	----	----	42,183	6,029	3,682					
1888	----	(Z)	24,161	----	----	46,236	6,677	3,175					
1887	----	----	25,111	----	----	52,028	7,594	2,749					
1886	----	----	20,992	----	----	61,638	9,145	2,664					
1885	----	----	20,114	----	----	60,877	7,416	3,033					
1884	----	46	26,834	----	----	54,982	7,832	2,946					
1883	----	----	19,031	----	----	56,565	8,172	2,504					
1882	----	----	13,999	----	----	45,331	6,348	2,219					
1881	----	276	10,763	----	----	36,999	5,028	1,928					

NA Not available. Z Less than 1,000 acres. [1] Includes homesteads. [2] Previous to 1911 the data included, in addition to original entries and selections, some classes of final entries and patents. [3] Except on ceded Indian lands. [4] Exclusive of commuted homesteads. [5] The increase in area over 1925 was reported as the result of a "special check" of field office records which was "used as a basis for a complete revision of the vacant land statistics." [6] Grants of unsurveyed lands to Wisconsin for forestry purposes; area not determined.

Series J 16–19. Lands Under Jurisdiction of Bureau of Indian Affairs: 1881 to 1970

[In thousands of acres]

Year	Total	Indian		Government owned
		Trust allotted	Tribal	
	16	17	18	19
1970	55,408	10,698	39,642	5,068
1969	55,351	10,757	39,641	4,952
1968	55,427	10,894	39,586	4,947
1967	55,413	11,019	39,443	4,951
1966	55,294	11,121	39,251	4,922
1965	55,319	11,287	39,097	4,935
1964	55,134	11,450	38,975	4,709
1963	55,196	11,607	38,877	4,713
1962	55,247	11,763	38,814	4,669
1961	57,107	11,958	40,538	4,612
1960	58,080	12,235	41,226	4,618
1959	56,870	12,560	39,676	4,634
1958	57,023	12,896	42,304	1,823
1957	53,331	13,223	39,549	558
1956	53,376	13,328	39,465	583
1955	53,771	13,662	39,487	622
1954	54,108	13,652	39,882	574
1953	55,406	14,251	40,178	977
1949	56,005	16,534	38,608	863
1946	56,567	17,143	37,524	1,901
1945	55,363	16,796	37,251	1,317
1944	56,577	17,474	37,233	1,869
1943	55,657	17,441	36,957	1,258
1942	55,410	17,503	36,602	1,305
1941	55,392	17,762	36,276	1,354
1940	55,406	17,574	36,047	1,786
1939	54,839	17,594	35,402	1,842
1937	34,620		34,620	
1936	51,057		51,057	
1935	50,696		50,696	
1934	49,388		49,388	
1933	52,651		47,398	
1932	46,795		46,795	
1930	32,097		32,097	
1929	32,015		32,015	
1928	30,262		30,262	
1927	31,420		31,420	
1926	31,791		31,791	
1925	31,582		31,582	
1924	34,948		34,948	
1923	34,988		34,988	
1922	34,979		34,979	
1921	35,502		35,502	
1920	72,661	37,159	35,502	
1919	72,546	36,986	35,560	
1918	71,094	36,861	34,233	
1917	71,306	35,740	35,566	
1916	71,978	35,565	36,413	
1915	68,103	34,768	33,334	
1914	69,900	34,072	35,828	
1913	72,147	33,571	38,576	
1912	71,917	32,414	39,503	
1911	72,535	32,272	40,263	
1910	72,146	31,094	41,052	
1909	49,566		49,566	
1908	52,013		52,013	
1907	53,549		53,549	
1906	55,831		55,831	
1905	58,202		58,202	
1904	72,392		72,392	
1903	83,426	8,823	74,603	
1902	75,149		75,149	
1901	76,117			
1900	84,602	6,737	77,865	
1897	82,770		82,770	
1896	83,405		83,405	
1895	84,571		84,571	
1894	85,581		85,581	
1893	85,873		85,873	
1892	92,478		92,478	
1891	91,146		91,146	
1890	104,314		104,314	
1889	116,386		116,386	
1888	118,484		118,484	
1887	136,395		136,395	
1886	135,978		135,978	
1885	137,725		137,725	
1884	137,767		137,767	
1882	143,526		143,526	
1881	155,632		155,632	

Series J 20. Public Land Sales: 1800 to 1860

[In thousands]

Year	Acres	Year	Acres	Year	Acres	Year	Acres	Year	Acres
	20		20		20		20		20
1860	2,543.4	1847	2,521.3	1835	12,564.5	1822	710.0	1810	285.8
1859	4,011.7	1846	2,263.7	1834	4,658.2	1821	782.5	1809	275.0
1858	3,663.6			1833	3,856.2			1808	209.2
1857	4,220.1	1845	1,843.5	1832	2,462.3	1820	814.0	1807	320.9
1856	5,247.0	1844	1,754.8	1831	2,777.9	1819	2,968.4	1806	506.0
		1843	1,605.3			1818	3,491.0		
1855	11,959.8	1842	1,129.2	1830	1,929.7	1817	1,886.2	1805	582.0
1854	12,823.0	1841	1,164.8	1829	1,244.9	1816	1,742.5	1804	398.2
1853	3,787.1			1828	965.6			1803	174.2
1852	894.8	1840	2,236.9	1827	926.7	1815	1,306.4	1802	271.1
1851	2,055.9	1839	4,976.4	1826	848.1	1814	1,176.1	1801	497.9
		1838	3,414.9			1813	505.6		
1850	1,405.8	1837	5,601.1	1825	999.0	1812	386.1	1800	67.8
1849	1,329.9	1836	20,074.9	1824	737.0	1811	575.1		
1848	1,887.6			1823	652.1				

Series J 21–25. Public Land Grants by United States to Aid in Construction of Railroads, Wagon Roads, Canals, etc.: 1823 to 1871

[In thousands of acres]

Year	Total grants	Purpose				Year	Total grants	Purpose			
		Railroads	Wagon roads	Canals	River improvements			Railroads	Wagon roads	Canals	River improvements
	21	22	23	24	25		21	22	23	24	25
1871	3,253	3,253				1853	3,379	2,629		750	
1870	129	129				1852	1,773	1,773			
1869	105		105			1851	3,752	3,752			
1867	25,173	23,535	1,538	100							
1866	200			200		1847	1,845	840			1,005
1865	42,794	41,452	941	401		1838	139			139	
1864	2,349	2,349									
1863	31,401	30,877	524			1828	1,338			938	400
1857	6,689	6,689				1827	2,273		202	2,071	
1856	14,085	14,085				1823	49		49		

Series J 26–32. Revenues From Public-Domain, Revested, and Acquired Land: 1785 to 1970

[In millions of dollars. For years ending June 30]

Period	Total	Sales of public domain	Fees and commissions	Timber sales [1] (O & C, and public domain)	Mineral leases [2]	Outer Continental Shelf leases	Miscellaneous [3]
	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
Total	7,033.2	253.5	109.1	703.1	1,976.6	3,352.5	638.5
1970	407.4	2.1	4.5	65.4	127.1	186.9	21.4
1969	651.1	1.8	4.9	69.7	123.3	428.3	23.1
1968	1,158.9	2.5	3.9	56.2	113.8	961.3	21.3
1967	821.5	2.6	3.3	47.1	110.2	637.3	21.1
1966	433.7	2.3	3.9	47.6	108.0	248.3	23.6
1965	234.4	3.1	3.8	44.9	107.3	53.5	21.9
1964	199.1	3.2	3.7	47.2	107.1	16.5	21.4
1963	530.7	3.4	3.0	33.6	102.6	366.8	21.3
1962	173.5	3.6	2.8	34.7	105.2	11.6	15.6
1961	159.2	4.3	2.5	32.1	89.2	7.3	23.9
1960	371.1	5.1	1.8	36.4	84.1	229.5	14.3
1959	136.7	4.2	1.3	31.8	83.5	3.4	12.5
1958	127.4	3.0	1.2	24.6	81.4	3.5	13.7
1957	112.1	3.4	1.0	21.4	72.3	2.2	11.7
1956	154.8	2.3	.8	24.9	61.6	53.8	11.4
1955	239.5	1.9	.7	25.0	60.0	142.4	9.6
1954	77.5	1.2	.6	13.4	52.5	----------	9.8
1953	66.8	1.0	.4	13.8	43.5	----------	8.0
1952	64.5	.7	.8	9.6	41.9	----------	11.6
1951	49.1	.5	.4	7.8	35.0	----------	5.5
1950	36.2	.5	.4	4.3	27.0	----------	4.1
1949	37.1	.5	.3	3.9	29.0	----------	3.5
1948	33.3	.3	.2	4.7	24.4	----------	3.9
1947	21.0	.1	.1	3.0	15.1	----------	2.6
1946	13.8	.1	.1	----------	10.0	----------	3.6
1945	14.1	.2	.1	----------	10.1	----------	3.9
1944	15.2	.1	.1	----------	10.9	----------	4.2
1943	10.5	.1	(Z)	----------	7.2	----------	3.2
1942	9.9	.1	(Z)	----------	6.9	----------	2.8
1941	8.7	.2	.1	----------	5.7	----------	2.8
1940	7.5	.1	.1	----------	5.2	----------	2.2
1939	7.8	.2	.1	----------	5.7	----------	1.7
1938	8.4	.1	.1	----------	6.5	----------	1.7
1937	7.4	.1	.1	----------	5.6	----------	1.6
1936	5.2	.1	.1	----------	4.4	----------	.6
1935	4.8	.1	.2	----------	3.9	----------	.6
1934	4.0	.1	.3	----------	3.2	----------	.5
1933	3.9	.1	.3	----------	3.3	----------	.2
1932	4.1	.2	.3	----------	3.2	----------	.4
1931	4.8	.3	.4	----------	3.5	----------	.6
1930	6.8	.4	.4	----------	4.7	----------	1.2
1929	6.2	.3	.5	----------	3.9	----------	1.5
1928	6.7	.4	.4	----------	4.7	----------	1.2
1927	9.2	.6	.5	----------	6.7	----------	1.4
1926	11.4	.7	.4	----------	8.4	----------	1.9
1925	10.8	0.6	0.6	----------	8.3	----------	1.3
1924	16.4	.6	.7	----------	13.6	----------	1.5
1923	10.7	.6	.8	----------	7.6	----------	1.6
1922	11.8	.9	1.1	----------	8.8	----------	1.0
1921	14.5	2.0	1.7	----------	9.7	----------	1.5
1920	6.1	2.0	1.6	----------	----------	----------	2.6
1919	4.3	1.5	1.2	----------	----------	----------	1.6
1918	5.4	2.1	1.2	----------	----------	----------	2.2
1917	6.1	1.9	1.6	----------	----------	----------	2.6
1916	5.4	1.8	1.7	----------	----------	----------	2.0
1915	5.4	2.2	1.6	----------	----------	----------	1.6
1914	6.1	2.6	1.7	----------	----------	----------	1.9
1913	7.0	2.7	1.5	----------	----------	----------	2.7
1912	10.0	5.4	1.2	----------	----------	----------	3.3
1911	11.1	5.8	1.5	----------	----------	----------	3.8
1910	11.5	6.3	2.0	----------	----------	----------	3.1
1909	12.2	7.7	1.5	----------	----------	----------	3.0
1908	12.7	9.8	1.7	----------	----------	----------	1.2
1907	11.6	7.7	1.8	----------	----------	----------	2.0
1906	7.6	4.9	1.6	----------	----------	----------	1.1
1905	7.0	4.8	1.3	----------	----------	----------	.9
1904	9.3	7.4	1.3	----------	----------	----------	.5
1903	11.0	9.0	1.6	----------	----------	----------	.5
1902	6.3	4.1	1.7	----------	----------	----------	.4
1901	5.0	3.0	1.3	----------	----------	----------	.7
1900	4.4	2.9	1.2	----------	----------	----------	.3
1899	3.1	1.7	.9	----------	----------	----------	.5
1898	2.3	1.3	.9	----------	----------	----------	.1
1897	2.1	.9	.7	----------	----------	----------	.5
1896	2.1	1.1	.8	----------	----------	----------	.3
1895	2.0	1.1	.8	----------	----------	----------	.2
1894	2.8	1.7	1.0	----------	----------	----------	.1
1893	4.5	3.2	1.0	----------	----------	----------	.3
1892	4.9	3.3	1.1	----------	----------	----------	.5
1891	5.4	4.2	.9	----------	----------	----------	.3
1890	7.8	6.3	1.1	----------	----------	----------	.3
1889	9.7	8.0	1.3	----------	----------	----------	.4
1888	13.5	11.2	1.5	----------	----------	----------	.8
1887	12.3	9.2	1.5	----------	----------	----------	1.5
1886	9.0	5.8	1.7	----------	----------	----------	1.6
1885	8.6	6.2	1.5	----------	----------	----------	.9
1884	12.8	10.3	1.5	----------	----------	----------	.9
1883	11.7	9.7	1.4	----------	----------	----------	.6
1882	8.4	6.6	1.1	----------	----------	----------	.6
1881	5.4	3.5	.9	----------	----------	----------	1.0
May 20, 1785 to June 30, 1880	208.1	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	208.1

Z Less than $50,000.

[1] Excludes revenues of earlier years totaling $21.4 million, which are included under "Miscellaneous." Annual data for years prior to 1947 are not available separately; cumulative totals are as follows (in millions): 1941–46, $8.8; 1931–40, $4.3; 1921–30, $7.5; and 1911–20, $0.8.

[2] Act of Feb. 25, 1920.

[3] Represents sales of Indian lands, grazing revenues, rental of land, mineral leasing under special laws, and other miscellaneous revenues. Also includes sales of timber for years prior to 1947 (see note 1).

Series J 33–34. Livestock Permitted to Graze on National Forest System Lands: 1905–1970

[In thousands. Excludes animals under 6 months of age. Data are for fiscal years prior to 1921, calendar years thereafter]

Year	Cattle, horses, and swine	Sheep and goats	Year	Cattle, horses, and swine	Sheep and goats	Year	Cattle, horses, and swine	Sheep and goats	Year	Cattle, horses, and swine	Sheep and goats	Year	Cattle, horses, and swine	Sheep and goats
	33	34		33	34		33	34		33	34		33	34
1970	1,340	1,775	1956	1,340	2,821	1943	1,212	4,539	1930	1,358	6,714	1917	2,054	7,636
1969	1,338	1,861				1942	1,191	4,758	1929	1,399	6,964	1916	1,861	7,886
1968	1,330	1,904	1955	1,350	2,916	1941	1,176	4,787	1928	1,415	6,784			
1967	1,313	1,969	1954	1,356	3,011				1927	1,486	6,704	1915	1,727	7,284
1966	1,301	2,061	1953	1,108	2,964	1940	1,177	4,949	1926	1,559	6,503	1914	1,620	7,619
			1952	1,096	3,000	1939	1,209	5,132				1913	1,557	7,868
1965	1,280	2,102	1951	1,088	3,013	1938	1,250	5,307	1925	1,621	6,432	1912	1,503	7,552
1964	1,268	2,196				1937	1,284	5,485	1924	1,753	6,597	1911	1,448	7,449
1963	1,243	2,270	1950	1,092	3,006	1936	1,311	5,645	1923	1,864	6,712			
1962	1,239	2,357	1949	1,126	3,092				1922	1,987	6,892	1910	1,498	7,649
1961	1,219	2,479	1948	1,153	3,322	1935	1,345	5,691	1921	2,080	6,980	1909	1,586	7,820
			1947	1,162	3,403	1934	1,419	6,161				1908	1,382	7,087
1960	1,241	2,567	1946	1,203	3,713	1933	1,399	6,162	1920	2,217	7,881	1907	1,200	6,657
1959	1,238	2,614				1932	1,397	6,321	1919	2,234	7,996	1906	1,015	5,762
1958	1,296	2,689	1945	1,206	3,889	1931	1,376	6,608	1918	2,243	8,512			
1957	1,304	2,703	1944	1,225	4,280							1905	692	1,710

Series J 35–40. Grazing on Public-Domain Lands: 1935 to 1970

[In thousands. Data are for fiscal years except as noted]

Year	Receipts			Animal-unit-months of use [2]			Year	Receipts			Animal-unit-months of use		
	Total [1]	In grazing districts	Outside grazing districts	Total	Cattle and horses	Sheep and goats		Total [1]	In grazing districts	Outside grazing districts	Total	Cattle and horses	Sheep and goats
	35	36	37	38	39	40		35	36	37	38	39	40
1970	$5,380	$4,647	$733	10,981	8,626	2,354	1952	$1,985	$1,658	$322	15,403	10,157	5,246
1969	5,257	4,663	594	11,238	8,821	2,416	1951	1,694	1,382	306	14,331	9,211	5,120
1968	4,326	3,788	538	11,665	9,060	2,605							
1967	4,287	3,718	569	11,635	8,948	2,686	1950	1,534	1,146	383	14,461	9,205	5,256
1966	4,371	3,817	554	11,801	9,064	2,738	1949	1,239	1,060	173	14,522	9,117	5,405
							1948	1,415	1,165	244	14,726	9,078	5,648
1965	3,990	3,467	523	11,773	8,830	2,943	1947	1,046	819	221	14,993	9,195	5,798
1964	4,142	3,611	531	11,861	8,713	3,148	1946	964	736	228	15,254		
1963	3,772	3,355	418	12,051	8,710	3,341							
1962	2,780	2,190	590	12,000	8,557	3,443	1945	996	765	231	15,572		
1961	2,982	2,311	671	12,097	8,478	3,619	1944	1,015	813	202	15,745		
							1943	979	785	194	15,061		
1960	3,488	2,729	759	12,454	8,738	3,716	1942	1,095	900	195	15,271		
1959	3,228	2,713	515	14,750	9,898	4,852	1941	1,113	922	191	15,369		
1958	2,763	2,388	376	14,797	9,919	4,878							
1957	2,286	1,902	384	14,661	9,725	4,936	1940	747	595	152	13,832		
1956	2,386	2,050	355	15,301	10,223	5,078	1939	1,038	886	152	13,789		
							1938	850	800	49	13,376		
1955	2,219	1,879	339	15,367	10,186	5,181	1937	488	415	73	14,383		
1954	2,039	1,678	359	15,686	10,371	5,315	1936	48	48		11,106		
1953	2,095	1,764	328	15,780	10,483	5,297	1935	1	1		6,507		

[1] Includes minor receipts from grazing on privately owned lands within grazing districts (Pierce Act) which were administered by Bureau of Land Management.

[2] Beginning 1960, data are for calendar years.

Series J 41–49. Oil and Gas Leases of Public-Domain Lands—Acreage, Receipts, and Output: 1920 to 1970

[Excludes acquired lands, military and naval oil reserves, and submerged lands. Data are for fiscal years, except as noted]

Year or period	Number in effect	Acreage under lease	Receipts			Volume of output [2]			
			Total	Rentals [1]	Royalties [2]	Total petroleum equivalent [2]	Petroleum	Natural gas	Gasoline and butane
	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49
	1,000	*Mil. acres*	*Mil. dol.*	*Mil. dol.*	*Mil. dol.*	*Mil. bbl.*	*Mil. bbl.*	*Bil. cu. ft.*	*Mil. gal.*
1970	99.0	63.0	124.5	34.0	90.5	364.6	196	934	542
1969	97.4	61.8	122.3	32.9	89.4	363.7	201	903	513
1968	93.0	56.4	111.5	25.7	85.8	369.2	201	942	470
1967	91.3	53.9	109.8	26.8	83.0	372.6	193	976	712
1966	98.2	61.3	108.2	30.4	77.8	333.3	187	807	493
1965	100.3	64.1	109.3	34.9	74.4	310.0	181	711	438
1964	104.5	67.4	109.8	36.6	73.2	301.7	180	665	457
1963	114.0	75.5	107.4	35.9	71.5	285.9	178	588	414
1962	129.9	93.3	107.2	39.8	67.4	267.7	171	518	436
1961	132.8	101.7	101.5	32.9	68.6	268.4	169	539	401
1960	139.5	113.7	85.9	25.4	60.5	249.7	156	513	344
1959 [4]	132.0	107.1	84.3	26.5	57.8	231.0	147	460	304
1958	110.0	73.7	78.9	24.3	54.6	213.3	137	418	280
1957	104.1	72.0	72.5	17.6	54.9	209.9	135	418	218
1956	98.5	70.3	62.3	15.9	46.4	184.2	127	313	211
1955	95.9	71.7	59.7	18.2	41.5	168.5	118	274	203
1954	86.6	64.2	53.4	14.2	39.2	159.5	111	261	211
1953	78.0	58.5	43.4	8.3	35.1	146.9	105	223	197
1952	63.0	48.4	46.7	18.0	28.7	127.2	94	173	184
1951	42.5	32.9	34.3	6.8	27.5	121.6	92	152	179
1950	28.9	23.6	26.7	2.8	23.9	107.6	84	121	142
1949	21.3	19.0	28.4	5.8	22.6	98.2	74	125	141
1948	13.4	10.7	24.1	−.5	24.6	102.5	78	125	156
1947	12.5	7.9	14.5	−1.4	15.9	89.2	70	95	142
1946	8.8	6.0	9.3	−.6	9.9	78.4	62	81	120
1945	7.0	4.6	9.4	1.8	7.6	75.7	58	88	126
1944	5.3	3.1	10.3	3.3	7.0	71.4	54	92	85
1943	4.5	2.8	6.6		6.6	69.7	53	88	87
1942	4.3	3.3	6.3	.8	5.5	62.1	45	91	82
1941	5.3	5.5	5.3	−.1	5.4	62.0	46	87	61
1931–1940					44.4	462.4	328	698	759
1920–1930					61.1	302.3	260	198	390

[1] Includes bonuses. Rentals are estimates derived by deducting royalties from total receipts.

[2] Calendar year data.

[3] Includes gasoline and butane on an equal basis with petroleum (42 gallons per barrel), and 6,000 cubic feet of natural gas equal to 1 barrel of petroleum.

[4] Beginning 1959, includes Alaska.

Series J 50–65. Land Utilization, by Type: 1850 to 1969

[In millions of acres]

Year	Total land area	Land in farms									Land not in farms				
		Total	Cropland			Grassland pasture	Farm woodland			Special uses	Other	Total	Grazing land	Forest land not used for grazing	Special uses	Other
			Total	Used for crops	Idle or in cover crops		Total	Pastured	Not pastured							
	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65
1969	2,264	1,064	384	333	51	540	112	62	50	9	19	1,200	288	475	169	268
1964	2,266	1,110	387	335	52	547	146	82	64	9	21	1,156	293	443	158	262
1959 *	2,271	1,124	392	359	33	532	163	93	70	10	27	1,147	319	438	141	249
1954	1,904	1,158	399	380	19	526	197	121	76	13	23	746	353	238	87	68
1950	1,904	1,159	409	387	22	485	220	135	85	21	24	745	400	201	81	63
1945	1,905	1,142	403	379	24	529	166	95	71	20	24	763	428	186	76	73
1940	1,905	1,061	399	363	36	461	157	100	57	44		844	504	203	137	
1935	1,903	1,055	416	375	41	410	185	108	77	44		848	533	184	131	
1930	1,903	987	413	379	34	379	150	85	65	21	24	916	578	208	53	77
1925	1,903	924	391	365	26	331	144	77	67	58		979	646	203	130	
1920	1,903	956	402	374	28	328	168	77	91	58		947	661	160	126	
1910	1,903	879	347	324	23	284	191	98	93	57		1,024	739	162	123	
1900	1,903	839	319	----	----	276	191	87	103	54		1,064	768	175	121	
1890	1,903	623	248	----	----	144	190	----	----	41		1,280	818	344	118	
1880	1,903	536	188	----	----	122	190	----	----	36		1,367	883	368	116	
1870	1,903	408	189	----	----	----	219	----	----	----	----	1,495	----	----	----	----
1860	1,903	407	163	----	----	----	244	----	----	----	----	1,496	----	----	----	----
1850	1,884	294	113	----	----	----	181	----	----	----	----	1,590	----	----	----	----

* Denotes first year for which figures include Alaska and Hawaii.

Series J 66–80. Private and Public Land Ownership, by Major Uses: 1920 to 1969

[In millions of acres]

Year	Total land area					Private land					Public land [1]				
	All land	Cropland	Pasture and grazing land	Forest and woodland not grazed	Other land	Total	Cropland	Pasture and grazing land	Forest and woodland not grazed	Other land	Total	Cropland	Pasture and grazing land	Forest and woodland not grazed	Other land
	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80
1969	2,264	384	890	525	465	1,367	381	621	271	94	897	3	269	254	371
1964	2,266	387	922	507	450	1,378	384	660	253	81	888	3	262	254	369
1959*	2,271	392	944	501	434	1,385	389	659	255	82	886	3	285	246	352
1954	1,904	399	1,000	314	191	1,399	396	704	211	88	505	3	296	103	103
1950	1,904	409	1,020	286	189	1,399	405	724	184	86	505	4	296	102	103
1945	1,905	403	1,052	265	185	1,396	401	748	156	91	509	2	304	109	94
1940	1,905	399	1,065	260	181	1,404	398	766	150	90	501	1	299	110	91
1930	1,903	413	1,042	273	175	1,409	411	745	168	85	494	2	297	105	90
1920	1,903	402	1,066	251	184	1,404	401	766	145	92	499	1	300	106	92

* Denotes first year for which figures include Alaska and Hawaii.

[1] Includes land owned by State, county, municipal, or other local governments as well as Federal lands.

Series J 81–91. Agricultural Land Drainage and Irrigation: 1890 to 1969

[In thousands of acres, except number of farms and projects]

Year	Drainage				Irrigation						
	Drainage on farms [1]		Drainage projects [2]		Total		17 Western States			All other States [3]	
	Number of farms with artificial drainage	Acreage drained	Number of projects	Acreage in drainage projects	Number of farms with irrigated land	Acreage irrigated	Number of farms with irrigated land	Land in irrigated farms	Total acreage irrigated	Number of farms with irrigated land	Total acreage irrigated
	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91
1969	[4] 338,696	59,551	([5])	([5])	257,147	39,122	205,848	216,189	34,786	51,299	4,336
1964	----	----	----	----	297,387	37,056	233,040	226,334	33,208	64,347	3,848
1959	----	----	[6] 8,461	[6] 101,870	307,783	33,163	262,614	211,564	30,738	45,169	2,425
1954	----	----	----	----	320,236	29,552	279,896	188,898	26,971	40,340	2,581
1950	----	----	14,533	[7] 102,688	305,061	25,787	281,476	166,074	24,271	23,585	1,516
1945	----	----	----	----	288,195	20,539	270,629	----	19,431	17,566	1,108
1940	----	----	39,597	86,967	299,604	17,983	283,089	110,942	17,243	16,515	740
1930	651,172	44,524	67,927	84,408	----	14,689	258,463	77,083	14,086	----	603
1920	924,810	53,025	56,949	65,495	----	14,482	215,152	----	[8] 13,883	----	599
1910	----	----	----	----	----	11,667	159,801	----	[8] 11,259	----	408
1900	----	----	----	----	----	7,789	109,298	----	7,543	----	246
1890	----	----	----	----	----	3,717	54,136	----	3,632	----	85

[1] Data are from the censuses of agriculture, which represent direct enumeration of farms. Acreage drained figures in series J 82 are largely duplicated in series J 84.

[2] Data are from the special censuses of drainage projects.

[3] For 1910, 1920, and 1930, Arkansas and Louisiana only. For 1940, 1945, and 1950, 31 States and D.C. For 1954, 31 States. For 1959, 32 States including Hawaii. For 1964 and 1969, 33 States including Alaska and Hawaii.

[4] Data are for farms with sales of $2,500 and over (Classes 1–5).

[5] Recent changes in census procedures for collecting drainage project statistics have shifted the census year from 1969 to 1971 and limited the projects enumerated to publicly organized projects.

[6] Census date for Census of Drainage Projects is January 1, 1960.

[7] Includes 4,110,000 acres reported drained by irrigation organizations.

[8] Data interpolated from the special censuses of irrigation organizations for 1910 and 1920.

Series J 92–103. Estimated Water Use: 1900 to 1970

[In billions of gallons, daily average]

Year	Total water use		Irrigation [1]		Public water utilities		Self-supplied use					
							Rural domestic [2]		Industrial and miscellaneous [3]		Steam electric utilities	
	Total	Ground	Total	Ground	Total	Ground	Total	Ground	Total	Ground	Total	Ground
	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100	101	102	103
1970	327.30	54.27	119.18	33.13	27.03	6.65	4.34	4.13	55.95	10.24	120.80	0.12
1969	403.30	71.87	156.82	43.39	26.60	6.56	6.82	6.47	83.44	15.32	129.62	.13
1968	395.40	70.48	154.64	42.57	26.20	6.49	6.74	6.39	80.88	14.90	126.94	.13
1967	387.50	69.08	152.46	41.76	25.80	6.42	6.66	6.31	78.32	14.47	124.26	.12
1966	379.60	67.68	150.28	40.95	25.40	6.35	6.58	6.22	75.76	14.04	121.58	.12
1965	269.62	48.57	110.85	30.04	23.74	5.96	4.08	3.86	46.41	8.63	84.54	.08
1964	361.94	64.67	145.48	39.16	24.40	6.16	6.40	6.03	70.80	13.21	114.86	.11
1963	352.18	63.04	142.86	38.18	23.80	6.04	6.30	5.91	68.40	12.80	110.82	.11
1962	344.48	62.09	141.16	37.58	23.31	6.00	6.22	5.81	66.62	12.55	107.17	.15
1961	334.72	60.46	138.54	36.60	22.71	5.88	6.12	5.70	64.22	12.14	103.13	.14
1960*	322.90	58.17	135.00	35.24	22.00	5.68	6.00	5.58	61.20	11.57	98.70	.10
1958	299.26	54.02	127.52	32.78	19.72	5.12	5.76	5.31	56.40	10.72	89.86	.09
1955	263.80	47.79	116.30	29.08	16.30	4.27	5.40	4.91	49.20	9.45	76.60	.08
1950	202.70	35.19	100.00	19.80	14.10	3.78	4.60	4.09	38.10	7.47	45.90	.05
1946	165.74	27.88	86.44	15.04	12.00	3.25	3.50	3.06	33.00	6.50	30.80	.03
1945	170.46	28.33	83.06	14.12	12.00	3.28	3.20	2.78	41.00	8.12	31.20	.03
1944	178.43	29.19	80.65	13.55	12.00	3.30	3.18	2.76	48.00	9.55	34.60	.03
1940	136.43	22.56	71.03	11.22	10.10	2.82	3.10	2.64	29.00	5.86	23.20	.02
1930	110.50	18.18	60.20	9.09	8.00	2.30	2.90	2.40	21.00	4.37	18.40	.02
1920	91.54	15.78	55.94	8.17	6.00	1.79	2.40	1.94	18.00	3.87	9.20	.01
1910	66.44	11.68	39.04	5.27	4.70	1.49	2.20	1.76	14.00	3.15	6.50	.01
1900	40.19	7.28	20.19	2.22	3.00	1.05	2.00	1.60	10.00	2.40	5.00	.01

* Denotes first year for which figures include Alaska and Hawaii.

[1] Total take, including delivery losses but not including reservoir evaporation.

[2] Rural farm and nonfarm household and garden use, and water for farm stock and dairies.

[3] For 1900–1960, includes manufacturing industries, mineral industries, rural commercial industries, air conditioning, resorts, hotels, motels, military and other State and Federal agencies, and other miscellaneous uses; thereafter, includes manufacturing, mining and mineral processing, ordnance, and construction.

Series J 104–109. Water Wells in Use: 1900 to 1962

[In thousands]

Year	Total	Domestic wells		Public water supplies	Industrial and miscellaneous	Irrigation	Year	Total	Domestic wells		Public water supplies	Industrial and miscellaneous	Irrigation
		Farm	Nonfarm						Farm	Nonfarm			
	104	105	106	107	108	109		104	105	106	107	108	109
1962	14,751	5,354	8,831	36	347	183	1940	10,362	5,935	4,200	18	144	65
1961	14,651	5,336	8,770	35	334	176	1935	9,843	5,457	4,195	16	115	60
1960	14,554	5,317	8,709	34	323	171	1930	9,601	5,220	4,200	15	110	56
1959*	14,395	5,307	8,574	33	315	166	1925	9,265	5,139	3,952	13	105	55
1958	14,216	5,290	8,433	32	301	160	1920	8,844	5,080	3,600	12	100	53
1957	14,059	5,280	8,300	31	293	155	1915	8,104	4,712	3,244	10	92	45
1956	13,915	5,260	8,190	30	285	150	1910	7,336	4,305	2,900	9	84	38
1955	13,730	5,248	8,035	28	278	142	1905	7,046	4,038	2,898	9	75	26
1950	12,766	5,620	6,800	23	216	107	1900	6,866	3,975	2,800	7	67	17
1945	11,273	6,063	4,943	22	170	75							

* Denotes first year for which figures include Alaska and Hawaii.

The Island is plentifully stored with all sorts of English Cattel, Horses, Hogs, Sheep, Goats, &c. no place in the North of America better, which they can both raise and maintain, by reason of the large and spacious Medows or Marches wherewith it is furnished, the Island likewise producing excellent English grass, the seed of which was brought out of England, which they sometimes mow twice a year.

For wilde Beasts there is Deer, Bear, Wolves, Foxes, Racoons, Otters, Musquashes and Skunks. Wild Fowl there is great store of, as Turkies, Heath-Hens, Quailes, Partridges, Pidgeons, Cranes, Geese of several sorts, Brants, Ducks, Widgeon, Teal, and divers others: There is also the red Bird, with divers sorts of singing birds, whose chirping notes salute the ears of Travellers with an harmonious discord, and in every pond and brook green silken Frogs, who warbling forth their untun'd tunes strive to bear a part in this musick.

Towards the middle of Long-Island lyeth a plain sixteen miles long and four broad, upon which plain grows very fine grass, that makes exceeding good Hay, and is very good pasture for sheep or other Cattel; where you shall find neither stick nor stone to hinder the Horse heels, or endanger them in their Races, and once a year the best Horses in the Island are brought hither to try their swiftness, and the swiftest rewarded with a

silver Cup, two being Annually procured for that purpose. There are two or three other small plains of about a mile square, which are no small benefit to those Towns which enjoy them.

Upon the South-side of Long-Island in the Winter, lie store of Whales and Crampasses, which the inhabitants begin with small boats to make a trade Catching to their no small benefit. Also an innumerable multitude of Seals, which make an excellent oyle; they lie all the Winter upon some broken Marshes and Beaches, or bars of sand before-mentioned, and might be easily got were there some skilful men would undertake it.

To say something of the Indians, there is now but few upon the Island, and those few no ways hurtful but rather serviceable to the English, and it is to be admired, how strangely they have decreast by the Hand of God, since the English first setling of those parts; for since my time, where there were six towns, they are reduced to two small Villages, and it hath been generally observed, that where the English come to settle, a Divine Hand makes way for them, by removing or cutting off the Indians either by Wars one with the other, or by some raging mortal Disease.

They live principally by Hunting, Fowling, and Fishing: their Wives being the Husbandmen to till the Land, and plant their corn.

The meat they live most upon is Fish, Fowl,

and Venison; they eat likewise Polecats, Skunks, Racoon, Possum, Turtles, and the like.

They build small moveable Tents, which they remove two or three times a year, having their principal quarters where they plant their Corn: their Hunting quarters, and their Fishing quarters: Their Recreations are chiefly Foot-ball and Cards, at which they will play away all they have, excepting a Flap to cover their nakedness: They are great lovers of strong drink, yet do not care for drinking, unless they have enough to make themselves drunk; and if there be so many in their Company, that there is not sufficient to make them all drunk, they usually select so many out of their Company, proportionable to the quantity of drink, and the rest must be spectators. And if any one chance to be drunk before he hath finisht his proportion, (which is ordinarily a quart of Brandy, Rum, or Strong-waters) the rest will pour the rest of his part down his throat.

They often kill one another at these drunken Matches, which the friends of the murdered person, do revenge upon the Murderer unless he purchase his life with money, which they sometimes do: Their money is made of a Periwinkle shell of which there is black and white, made much like unto beads, and put upon strings.

For their worship which is diabolical, it is performed usually but once or twice a year, unless

upon some extraordinary occasion, as upon making of War or the like; their usual time is about Michaelmass, when their corn is first ripe, the day being appointed by their chief Priest or pawaw; most of them go a hunting for venison: When they are all congregated, their priest tells them if he want money, there God will accept of no other offering, which the people beleeving, every one gives money according to their ability. The priest takes the money, and putting it into some dishes, sets them upon the top of their low flat-roofed houses, and falls to invocating their God to come and receive it, which with a many loud hallows and outcries, knocking the ground with sticks, and beating themselves, is performed by the priest, and seconded by the people.

After they have thus a while wearied themselves, the priest by his Conjuration brings in a devil amongst them, in the shape sometimes of a fowl, sometimes of a beast, and sometimes of a man, at which the people being amazed, not daring to stir, he improves the opportunity, steps out, and makes sure of the money, and then returns to lay the spirit, who in the mean time is sometimes gone, and takes some of the Company along with him; but if any English at such times do come amongst them, it puts a period to their proceeding, and they will desire their absence, telling them their God will not come whilst they are there.

In their wars they fight no pitcht fields, but when they have notice of an enemies approach, they endeavor to secure their wives and children upon some Island, or in some thick swamp, and then with their guns and hatchets they way-lay their enemies, some lying behind one, some another, and it is a great fight where seven or eight is slain.

When any Indian dies amongst them, they bury him upright, sitting upon a seat, with his Gun, money, and such goods as he hath with him, that he may be furnished in the other world, which they conceive is Westward, where they shall have great store of Game for Hunting and live easie lives. At his Burial his nearest Relations attend the Hearse with their faces painted black, and do visit the grave once or twice a day, where they send forth sad lamentations so long, till time hath wore the blackness off their faces, and afterwards every year once they view the grave, make a new mourning for him, trimming up the Grave, not suffering of a Grass to grow by it: they fence their graves with a hedge, and cover the tops with Mats, to shelter them from the rain.

Any Indian being dead, his name dies with him, no person daring ever after to mention his Name, it being not only a breach of their Law, but an abuse to his friends and relations present, as if it were done on purpose to renew their grief: And

any other person whatsoever that is named after that name doth incontinently change his name, and takes a new one, their names are not proper set names as amongst Christians, but every one invents a name to himself, which he likes best. Some calling themselves Rattlesnake, Skunk, Bucks-horn, or the like: And if a person die, that his name is some word which is used in speech, they likewise change that word, and invent some new one, which makes a great change and alteration in their language.

When any person is sick, after some means used by his friends, every one pretending skill in Physick; that proving ineffectual, they send for a Pawaw or Priest, who sitting down by the sick person, without the least enquiry after the distemper, waits for a gift, which he proportions his work accordingly to: that being received, he first begins with a low voice to call upon his God, calling sometimes upon one, sometimes on another, raising his voice higher and higher, beating of his naked breasts and sides, till the sweat runneth down, and his breath is almost gone, then that little which is remaining, he evaporates upon the face of the sick person three or four times together, and so takes his leave.

Their Marriages are performed without any Ceremony, the Match being first made by money. The sum being agreed upon and given to the

woman, it makes a consummation of their Marriage, if I may so call it: After that, he keeps her during his pleasure, and upon the least dislike turns her away and takes another: It is no offence for their married women to lie with another man, provided she acquaint her husband, or some of her nearest Relations with it, but if not, it is accounted such a fault that they sometimes punish it with death: An Indian may have two wives or more if he please; but it is not so much in use as it was since the English came amongst them; they being ready in some measure to imitate the English in things both good and bad: any Maid before she is married doth lie with whom she please for money, without any scandal, or the least aspersion to be cast upon her, it being so customary, and their laws tolerating of it. They are extraordinary charitable one to another, one having nothing to spare, but he freely imparts it to his friends, and whatsoever they get by gaming or any other way, they share one to another, leaving themselves commonly the least share.

At their Cantica's or dancing Matches, where all persons that come are freely entertain'd, it being a Festival time: Their custom is when they dance, every one but the Dancers to have a short stick in their hand, and to knock the ground and sing altogether, whilst they that dance sometimes

act warlike postures, and then they come in painted for War with their faces black and red, or some all black, some all red, with some streaks of white under their eyes, and so jump and leap up and down without any order, uttering many expressions of their intended valour. For other Dances they only shew what Antick tricks their ignorance will lead them to, wringing of their bodies and faces after a strange manner, sometimes jumping into the fire, sometimes catching up a Fire-brand, and biting off a live coal, with many such tricks, that will affright, if not please an English man to look upon them, resembling rather a company of infernal Furies then men. When their King or Sachem sits in Council, he hath a Company of armed men to guard his Person, great respect being shewen him by the People, which is principally manifested by their silence; After he hath declared the cause of their convention, he demands their opinion, ordering who shall begin: The person ordered to speak, after he hath declared his minde, tells them he hath done; no man ever interrupting any person in his speech, nor offering to speak, though he make never so many or long stops, till he says he hath no more to say: the Council having all declar'd their opinions, the King after some pause gives the definitive sentence, which is commonly seconded with a shout from the people, every one

seeming to applaud, and manifest their Assent to what is determined: If any person be condemned to die, which is seldom, unless for Murder or Incest, the King himself goes out in person (for you must understand they have no prisons, and the guilty person flies into the Woods) where they go inquest of him, and having found him, the King shoots first, though at never such a distance, and then happy is the man can shoot him down, and cut off his *Long*, which they commonly wear, who for his pains is made some Captain, or other military Officer.

Their Cloathing is a yard and an half of broad Cloth, which is made for the Indian Trade, which they hang upon their shoulders; and half a yard of the same cloth, which being put betwixt their legs, and brought up before and behinde, and tied with a Girdle about their middle, hangs with a flap on each side: They wear no Hats, but commonly wear about their Heads a Snake's skin, or a Belt of their money, or a kind of a Ruff made with Deers hair, and died of a scarlet colour, which they esteem very rich.

They grease their bodies and hair very often, and paint their faces with several colours, as black, white, red, yellow, blew, &c. which they take great pride in, every one being painted in a several manner: Thus much for the Customs of the Indians.

Within two Leagues of New York lieth Staten-Island, it bears from New York West something Southerly: It is about twenty-miles long, and four or five broad, it is most of it very good Land, full of Timber, and produceth all such commodities as Long Island doth besides Tin and store of Iron Oar, and the Calamine stone is said likewise to be found there: There is but one Town upon it consisting of English and French, but is capable of entertaining more inhabitants; betwixt this and Long Island is a large Bay, and is the coming in for all ships and vessels out of the Sea: On the North-side of this Island After-skull River puts into the main Land on the West-side, whereof is two or three Towns, but on the East-side but one. There is very great Marshes or Medows on both sides of it, excellent good Land, and good convenience for the setling of several Towns; there grows black Walnut and Locust, as their doth in Virginia, with mighty tall straight Timber, as good as any in the North of America: It produceth any Commoditie Long-Island doth.

Hudsons River runs by New York Northward into the Countrey, toward the Head of which is seated New Albany, a place of great Trade with the Indians, betwixt which and New-York, being above one hundred miles, is as good Corn-land as the World affords, enough to entertain Hundreds of Families, which in the time of

RII/(5)

The
Inconstant Savage:

England and the
North American
Indian 1500-1660, 1979 (?)

H.C. Porter

Duckworth
The old Piano factory
43, Gloucester Crescent,
London, NW1

p. 106 1
p. 106 2
p. 107 3
p. 353 4
p. 428 5, 6 Plate etc
p 463-4 7
p 465-6 8

After the death of Moses, God said to Joshua (1:2-6): 'Arise, go over this Jordan, thou and all this people, unto the land which I do give to them.' 'I will be with thee: I will not fail thee, nor forsake thee. Be strong and of a good courage': 'From the wilderness and this Lebanon even unto the great river, the river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, and unto the great sea toward the going down of the sun, shall be your coast.' Richard Hakluyt invoked Joshua in a letter to Walter Raleigh in May 1587:[54]

> I conceive great comfort of the success of this your action, hoping that the Lord, whose power is wont to be perfected in weakness, will bless the feeble foundations of your building. Only be you of a valiant courage and faint not, as the Lord said unto Joshua, exhorting him to proceed on forward in the conquest of the Land of Promise.

From the wilderness, Joshua sent two spies to Jericho in the Land of Canaan. They were protected by the harlot Rahab; who said to them: 'I know that the Lord hath given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you' (2:9). On the eve of invasion, Joshua addressed the Israelites (Chapter 3). The 'living God is among you':

> He will without fail drive out from before you the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Hivites, and the Perizzites, and the Girgashites, and the Amorites, and the Jebusites. (v.10)

The key to the treatment of the native population had been given by Moses (Deuteronomy 7:2): when God 'shall deliver them before thee, thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou shalt make no convenant with them, nor show mercy unto them'.

The waters of the river dried up. And the 40,000 Israelites 'passed clean over Jordan' (Joshua 3:17).

The decisive event in the conquest of Canaan was the destruction of Jericho: described in the Book of Joshua, Chapter 6. God said to Joshua: 'I have given into thine hand Jericho' (v.2). During the seige Joshua decided: 'the city shall be accursed, even it, and all that are therein' – except Rahab and her kindred (v.17). After extra-mural musical activity, the city fell. And the Israelites

> utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword ... And they burnt the city with fire, and all that was therein ... So the Lord was with Joshua; and his fame was noised throughout all the country. (vv.21,24,27)

(Rahab and her household were spared: because she had concealed the spies, v.25.)

Chapters 10 and 11 relate how Joshua 'took the whole land,

[54] Taylor, ed., *Writings of the Hakluyts*, 376.

according to all that the Lord said unto Moses' (11:23): cities 'utterly destroyed' with 'the edge of the sword'. Joshua 'left none remaining, but utterly destroyed all that breathed, as the Lord God of Israel commanded' (10:40).

Naturally, the tribal chiefs in the Promised Land were apprehensive: because 'God commanded His servant Moses to give you all the land, and to destroy all the inhabitants' (9:24). Some came to Joshua, saying 'We are your servants: therefore now make ye a league with us' (9:11). With them Joshua made peace: 'and made a league with them, to let them live' (9:15). They became 'hewers of wood and drawers of water' (9:27).

In 1513 the colonist Martin Fernández de Enciso used this material to defend the royal rights over the Indies.[55]

> Joshua conquered all the Land of Canaan by force of arms, and many were killed, and those who were captured were given as slaves, and served the people of Israel. And all this was done by the will of God, because they were idolators.

In 1560 Las Casas petitioned the Pope to excommunicate anyone asserting that idolatry in itself justified war.[56] War against the Canaanites in particular was not, for Las Casas, an example to be followed against idolators in general.[57]

'If the Indians would not do this, he might justly wage war against them', Enciso said. He had in mind Deuteronomy 20:10-14:

> When you advance on a city to attack it, make an offer of peace. If the city accepts the offer and opens its gates to you, then all the people in it shall be put to forced labour and shall serve you. If it does not make peace with you but offers battle, you shall beseige it, and the Lord your God will deliver it into your hands. You shall put all its males to the sword, but you may take the women, the dependants, and the cattle for yourselves, and plunder everything else in the city. You may enjoy the use of the spoil of your enemies which the Lord your God gives you. (New English Bible)

Such was the Biblical fibre of the Spanish document to be read to the Indians: the 'Requirement'.[58]

From the 1580s, the English found inspiration in such precepts.

Peckham, in his *True Reporte* of 1583, devoted three paragraphs to Joshua: 'this valiant captain his conquest'.[59] In the wilderness

> Joshua their leader, replenished with the spirit of God, being assured of the justness of his quarrel, gathered the chief strength of the children of Israel together, to the number of 40,000, with whom he safely passed the huge river Jordan.

[55] Hanke, *Spanish Struggle for Justice*, 32. [56] *ibid.*, 184.
[57] Wagner and Parish, *Las Casas*, 179.
[58] See below, p.157.
[59] Quinn, (ed.), *Gilbert Voyages*, 454-55.

Before Jericho,

perceiving none of the Gentiles disposed to yield or call for mercy,[60] he then commanded (as God before had appointed) that both the city Jericho should be burned, yea, and all the inhabitants, as well old as young, with all their cattle, should be destroyed, only excepted Rahab, her kindred and family.

Peckham tells the story of the burning and massacre of the city of Ai (Joshua Chapter 8). And tells of those Gibeonites who 'sent ambassadors unto Joshua, to entreat for grace, favour and peace', occasioning the order of Joshua that 'all their lives should be spared, and that they should be admitted to the company of the children of Israel' – as 'drudges to hew wood and to carry water and other necessaries for his people'. Them apart, Joshua continued his Conquest:

which he pursued and never left till he had subdued all the Hethites, Amorites, Cananites, Pheresites, Hevites and Jebusites, with all their princes and kings, being thirty and one in number, and divers other strange nations besides, whose lands and dominions he wholly divided among God's people.

One of the leaders in the Exodus and Conquest was Judah. The book of Judges, the seventh Book of the Old Testament, tells how after the death of Joshua God appointed Judah (a personification of the tribe) as captain, and 'delivered the land into his hand' (1:2). The subsequent campaign was summarised by Peckham:[61]

Judah was constituted lord over the army, who, receiving like charge from God, pursued the proceedings of the holy captain Joshua, and utterly vanquished many gentiles, idolators, and adversaries to the children of Israel, with all such rulers or kings as withstood him: and namely Adoni-Bezek the most cruel tyrant, whose thumbs and great toes he caused to be cut off, forasmuch as he had done the like before unto seventy kings, whom, being his prisoners, he forced to gather up their victuals underneath his table.

Adoni-Bezek, king of the Canaanites in the town of Bezek, had cut off the thumbs and great toes of seventy kings, who then 'gathered their meat under my table' (1:7). Thus the mutilation by Judah was a just punishment: 'as I have done, so God hath requited me' (v.7). Peckham commented: 'In this, God showed His justice to revenge tyranny.' A marginal note (1583) stressed another point: 'A good note for all conquerors to be merciful.'

The successor to Joshua and Judah was Gideon: a 'most puissant and noble warrior', wrote Peckham, who continued their 'worthy

[60] In fact, the Book of Joshua gives no indication that the inhabitants of Jericho were given the choice of surrender.
[61] Quinn, (ed.), *Gilbert Voyages*, 455. [62] *ibid.*

acts'.[62] The story of Gideon, who saved the Israelites from the Midianites (a Bedouin people who controlled the central area of the Promised Land) is told in Judges, Chapters 6,7 and 8. Peckham summarised the material:

In short time he not only delivered the children of Israel from the hands of the multitude of the fierce Midianites, but also subdued them and their Tyrants, whose lands he caused God's people to possess and inherit.

At this point in his discussion of how Christian colonists can behave if the natives 'practice violence' in 'repelling' or 'withstanding' them, Peckham ended his foray into the Old Testament. 'I could recite divers other places out of the scripture which aptly may be applied hereunto; were it not I endeavour myself by all means to be brief.'

The 1610 *True Declaration of the estate of the Colonie in Virginia* made play with an episode in the reign of King David.[63] It concerns Hanun, King of the Ammonites, on the borders of Israel. The story is in the second Book of Samuel. David said: 'I will show kindness unto Hanun' (10:2). He sent ambassadors from Jerusalem to the Ammonite capital, Rabbah. Unfortunately, they were taken to be spies; and Hanun 'shaved off the one half of their beards, and cut off their garments in the middle, even to their buttocks, and sent them away' (10:4). This meant war. The Israelites 'destroyed the children of Ammon, and beseiged Rabbah' (11:1). (This was the campaign to which David sent Bathsheba's husband Uriah.) Joab, the Israelite general, captured Rabbah, and David 'brought forth the spoil of the city in great abundance' (12:30-1):

And he brought forth the people that were therein, and put them under saws, and under harrows of iron, and under axes of iron, and made them pass through the brick-kiln: and thus did he unto all the cities of the children of Ammon.

The 1610 pamphlet (approved by the London Council of the Virginia Company) explained that Hanun and the Ammonites had 'violated the law of nations' by their treatment of David's envoys: thus David had *just* cause to war'. In Virginia, the Indians have responded to the English in Ammonite fashion. Therefore war 'is lawful in us, to secure ourselves against the infidels'.

An issue naturally raised in the English colonisation of North America was that of intermarriage with the Indians. Here again, settlers such as John Rolfe consulted their Old Testament. Moses had spoken to 'all Israel' about God's command concerning the natives of the Land of Promise (Deuteronomy 7:3-4):

Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not

[63] *Colonial Records of Virginia*, III, no.1, p.6.

which reason offereth.' (William Whitaker thought that Wisdom, like Ecclesiasticus, was rightly excluded from the Old Testament canon, while 'replete with very beautiful admonitions, precepts and sentiments'.)[12] But the Biblical allusions in the 1610 text as a whole are to the New Testament.

The 'principal and main ends' of 'the hopeful plantations began in Virginia' are

> to preach and baptise into Christian religion, and, by propagation of the Gospel, to recover out of the arms of the Devil a number of poor and miserable souls wrapped up unto death in almost invincible ignorance; to endeavour the fulfilling and accomplishment of the number of the elect, which shall be gathered from out all corners of the earth; and to add our mite to the treasury of heaven, that, as we pray for the coming of the Kingdom of Glory, so to express in our actions the same desire, if God have pleased to use so weak instruments to the ripening and consummation thereof.[13]

No Englishman can 'flatter himself, that it concerns not him'.[14] For one thing, there must be 'a virtuous emulation between us and the Church of Rome'. Both churches have a common enemy: the Devil.

> How far hath she sent out her apostles, and through how glorious dangers? How is it become a mark of honour to her faith, to have converted nations, and an obloquy cast upon us, that we, having the better vine, should have worse dressers and husbanders of it?

The English should be stirred in this matter: by 'piety', 'honour', 'conscience' – and 'profit'. If they are not:

> Then let us turn from hearts of stone and iron, and pray unto that merciful and tender God, who is both easy and glad to be entreated, that it would please Him to bless and water these feeble beginnings; and that, as He is wonderful in all His works, so to nourish this grain of seed, that it may spread till all people of the earth admire the greatness and seek the shades and fruit thereof. That by so faint and weak endeavours His great councils may be brought forth, and His secret purposes to light, to our endless comfort and the infinite glory of His sacred name.

The 'grain of seed' allusion is to a parable of Christ, Matthew 13:31-2:

> The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: Which indeed is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.

Another version in Mark 4:30-2, Luke 13:18-19. (The image gave William Perkins a title for a 1597 book: *A Graine of musterde-seede, or the*

[12] *Disputation*, 86.
[13] Brown, *Genesis*, I, 339.
[14] Subsequent quotations, *ibid.*, 351-2.

least measure of grace that is or can be effectual to salvation.) So, the London Council of the Virginia Company directed:

> Let every man look inward, and disperse that cloud of avarice which darkeneth his spiritual sight, and he will find there that when he shall appear before the tribunal of heaven it shall be questioned him what he hath done. Hath he fed and clothed the hungry and naked? It shall be required, what he hath done for the advancement of that Gospel which hath saved him; and for the relief of his Maker's image, whom he was bound to save.

II

In Luke's Gospel, Christ tells a story (Chapter 14) about a 'certain man' who invited many guests to a feast. All made excuses, and did not arrive. The man ordered that there should be summoned the poor, maimed, crippled and blind. They came; but there were still vacant places. So the man issued a directive to his servant (v.23): 'Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled.' This was a favourite text for those advocating a 'hard' line against the Indian: conversion by compulsion. Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda so used it in the 1540s, and in 1550 during the Disputation at Valladolid.[15] His opponent, Las Casas, argued that the directive was to be interpreted as internal, not external, compulsion: the inspiration of God.[16]

There was other material in the New Testament which the 'hard liners' could appropriate. They could invoke the Christ who cursed the fig tree (Matthew 21:19; Mark 11:14) or the Christ who cast out the money changers from the Temple (Matthew 21:12; Mark 11:15; John 2:15). They could take as model the figure in Chapter 19 of the Book of Revelation who sat on a white horse: 'He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood' (v.13), 'and in righteousness he doth judge and make war' (v.11); 'his name is called the Word of God' (v.13), and 'he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of Kings and Lord of Lords' (v.16);

> and out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron: and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. (v.15)

Christ said: 'Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division' (Luke 12:51); 'Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword' (Matthew 10:34).

But Christ also said: 'All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword' (Matthew 26:52). (Compare Revelation 13:10: 'He that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword.') Isaiah wrote a

[15] Parry, *Age of Reconnaissance*, Mentor ed., 330.
[16] Hanke, *Spanish Struggle for Justice*, 120-121.

prophecy about the 'servant' who 'shall bring forth judgement to the Gentiles' (42:1-4):

> He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench; he shall bring forth judgement unto truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgement in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law.

When Christ urged discretion on His followers ('charged them that they should not make Him known') Matthew set this in context:

> That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall shew judgement to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall he not break, and smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgement unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust. (12:16-21)

The Christ who 'will not snap off the broken reed, nor stuff out the smouldering wick' (New English Bible) was the Christ of Erasmus; following Paul's tribute to 'the meekness and gentleness of Christ' (II Corinthians 10:1), 'the simplicity that is in Christ' (II Corinthians 11:3).

Erasmus quoted the flax/reed passage in his forty-five page essay on the adage 'War is sweet to those who do not know it': *Dulce bellum inexpertis*, probably written at Cambridge in the autumn of 1513 (he was based in Cambridge from the summer of 1511 until the beginning of 1514), first published in 1515, and printed in English in 1534.[17] The image means, said Erasmus, that Christ 'cherished and bore with the imperfect until it could grow better'.[18] And yet:

> We are getting ready to annihilate all Asia and Africa with the sword, though most of the population there are either Christians or half-Christians.

(As we have seen, to Erasmus 'the most excellent part of Christianity is a life worthy of Christ'.)[19] What should Christian policy be to the natives of Asia and Africa? 1513 was slightly early for Erasmus, in East Anglia, to mention America: we may mentally make the addition.

> Why do we not rather acknowledge them, give them encouragement and gently try to reform them? If we have designs of political expansion, if we are hankering after their wealth, why do we cover up such a worldly thing with the name of Christ?[20]

[17] New translation by M.M. Phillips, 1964: *The 'Adages' of Erasmus*, 308-53.
[18] *ibid.*, 346.
[19] Letter of 14 April 1519 (no 939 in Allen); tr. in Hillerbrand, ed., *Erasmus and His Age: Selected Letters*, 135. See above, p.88.
[20] Phillips, 347.

Erasmus' Christ, quoted in this Cambridge essay, was He who said, 'I am meek and lowly in heart' (Matthew 11:29); who said, 'Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword' (Matthew 26:52); who promised, 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you' (John 14:27). And yet Christians fight wars, including colonial wars, in His name: 'we make Christ the witness and authority for so criminal a thing'.[21] 'Christ who is Love, and who taught nothing, handed down nothing, that is not love and peace':[22] 'Examine the whole of His teaching: you will find nothing anywhere which does not breath the spirit of peace, which does not savour of love.'[23] The same is true of Erasmus' Paul: 'What else rings through all Paul's letters, but peace, gentleness and love?'[24]

Erasmus had been decisively impressed by lectures he had heard at Oxford in his brief stay there in 1499. The subject was St Paul: the lecturer, John Colet, M.A. One of Colet's themes in his attempt to follow 'the mind of Paul'[25] was that the work of the Holy Spirit is 'to make mild';[26] that Christ acted 'abjectly, gently, quietly, and in an acceptable way'.[27]

In 1533 Erasmus published *Symbolum sive Catechismus* (also known as the *Explanatio*) dedicated to Thomas Boleyn, Viscount Rochford, Earl of Wiltshire, and father of Anne Boleyn, who had married Henry VIII in January. An English translation (by William Marshall?) was printed at Easter 1534: *A playne and godly exposytion or declaration of the commune Creede*, by 'the famous clarke Mayster Erasmus of Roterdame'. It came to be used as a 'catechism' in many schools, including Winchester. The work takes the form of a dialogue between Master and Disciple. The Disciple asks about the Church. Part of the Master's reply is this:[28]

> It is sufficient to believe that in the earth there is such a certain society and fellowship of them that are predestinated to life, which company Christ hath glued or joined together with His spirit (*Christus suo Spiritu conglutinavit*) whether they be among the Indians (*apud Indos*), or else among the Gaditans (*apud Gaditanos*), or else among the Hyperboreans (*apud Hyperboreos*), or else among the peoples of Affryke (*apud Afros*). And it may be so, that in the world there are some lands, other islands, or else dry lands (*aliquae terrae, vel insulae vel continentes*), which are not yet found of mariners or geographers: in which for all that the Christian faith is strong and quick.

Did Erasmus mean communities like the kingdom of Prester John? Or was 'the spirit of Christ' among the heathen Indians, the law of nature, sufficient to glue them into the society of the Church? Was Erasmus thinking of the *insula* called Utopia?

[21] *ibid.*, 322. [22] *ibid.*, 352. [23] *ibid.*, 328. [24] *ibid.*, 329.
[25] *Lectures on Corinthians*, ed. Lupton, 119.
[26] Romans commentary, in *Moral Account of the Creation*, ed. Lupton, 86.
[27] *Lectures on Romans*, ed. Lupton, 115.
[28] 1534, folio 115, verso. Latin text: Leiden *Opera Omnia*, V, 1704, 1175A.

With breath of Incense I will glad thy heart,
But if like Us, of Mortal seed thou art,
Presents of rarest fowles and fruites I'll bring,
And in my Realmes thou shalt be more then King.

The essay 'Of Moderation' is Chapter 29 of Book One. Chapter 30 is an extensive treatment of Indian material: *Des Cannibales*.

Montaigne mentioned in this essay that he had been introduced to three Indians from Brazil at Rouen (the centre of French trade with America). That was in September 1562, when Montaigne was 29. Through an interpreter, he had talked with one of them.[18] Two of the things the chief said remained in his memory when he was preparing the essay in the late 1570s. The chief was amazed that the royal Swiss guard should submit to a 'beardless child' (Charles IX was twelve) and not 'choose one among them to command the rest'. And he was surprised that

> there were men amongst us full gorged with all sorts of commodities, and others which, hunger-starved, and bare with need and poverty, begged at their gates: and found it strange, these moyities so needy could endure such an injustice, and that they took not the others by the throat, or set fire on their houses.

(They 'have a manner of phrase whereby they call men but a moitie one of another'.)[19]

Montaigne was in turn surprised that the Indians had 'quit the calmness of their climate, to come and see ours'. Montaigne's library included some transcriptions of Indian songs: a 'warlike song' – defiant verses 'made by a prisoner'; and an 'amorous canzonet'.[20] He had eaten Indian bread; and found it too sweet.[21] By the late 1570s he had employed for 'long time' a servant, 'a simple and rough hewn fellow', 'fit to yield a true testimony', who had lived in Brazil for 'ten or twelve years'. He had introduced Montaigne to 'divers mariners, and merchants, whom he had known in that voyage'. He had lived 'in these parts where Villegagnon first landed, and surnamed Antartike France'.[22]

Nicolas Durand de Villegagnon had established a fort on an island in the Bay of Rio de Janeiro in November 1555. The patron of the enterprise was Coligny; and one of the aims was to establish a haven for French protestants. In 1556 Villegagnon wrote to Calvin asking for pastors from the seminary at Geneva. Calvin, secure in Geneva from 1555, was turning his attention to missionary work: two pastors had been sent to Piedmont, and one to Poitiers, in 1555, and one to Bourges in 1556. Two pastors were sent to Brazil: Pierre Richier and Guillaume Chartier. They arrived with the second contingent of colonists in March 1557. The colony was rather a disaster: there was

[18] I, 228-9
[19] Moiety: an equal part.
[20] 227-8. [21] 221 [22] 216, 218.

much *odium theologicum*; and soon the settlement was destroyed by the Portuguese. In 1565 there was published a *Bref Recueil de l'affliction ... au Pays du Brésil*, with the running title *Les Martyrs de Nostre Temps* (those who defended the principles of Geneva in a strange land). But the main authorities were the colonists André Thevet (1502-1590) and Jean de Léry (1534-1611). In 1556, shortly after his return, Thévet published in Paris *Singularités de la France antarctique, autremont nommée Amerique* (second edition, Antwerp 1558). Léry, a theological student at Geneva, published his version in 1578 at La Rochelle: *Histoire d'un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil*. We have already encountered Léry as a source for Montaigne.[23]

The idea of a Huguenot colony in the New World survived into the 1560s. In 1562 Jean Ribault established a settlement in 'Florida': Charlesfort, on Parris Island, Port Royal Sound, in the deep south of South Carolina (just north of Savannah, Georgia). The garrison revolted, and the survivors returned. Ribault went to London in 1563 and there published, also in 1563, *The whole and true discoverye of Terra Florida*. This was reprinted by Hakluyt in 1582 in *Divers voyages touching the discoverie of America*. In 1564 René de Laudonnière founded a fort in the very north of the present state of Florida: Fort Caroline, at the mouth of the St John's River, nearly forty miles north of St Augustine. The colonists were attacked by the Spaniards in 1565; among the survivors was the painter Jacques Le Moyne de Morgues.[24] Laudonnière wrote *L'histoire notable de Floride*, the manuscript of which Hakluyt acquired from Thévet in Paris in the mid-1580s; he published it in Paris, and prepared an English translation, published in London in 1587, with a dedication to Sir Walter Raleigh – *A notable historie containing foure voyages made by certayne French captaynes unto Florida*.

Montaigne relied heavily on Léry. Another of his sources in the late 1570s was the 1579 French translation (by Urbain Chauveton, published at Geneva) of *La Historia del mondo nuovo*, Venice 1565, of the Milanese Girolamo Benzoni, born in 1519, who went to Spanish America in 1541 and returned in 1554: his book was largely a compilation of earlier material, including passages from Columbus and Pietro Martire.

In some ways, the essay 'Of the Cannibals' notes, 'in respect of us, these are very savage men'. For one thing, the men have many wives, who procure for their husbands as many other females as they can.[25]

> Our women would count it a wonder, but it is not so: It is virtue properly matrimonial; but of the highest kind. And in the Bible, Leah, Rachel, Sarah, and Jacob's wives, brought their fairest maiden servants unto their husbands' beds.

[23] Chinard, *L'Exotisme américain*. Ch. 4, 'Les Français au Brésil: l'expédition de Villegagnon et le Cosmographe André Thévet'; Ch. 6, 'Un Moraliste Voyageur: Léry'. Also Atkinson, *Nouveaux Horizons*.
[24] For all this, see Quinn, ed., *North American Discovery*, 140-62: 'French Florida 1562-1580'.
[25] II, 228

Sarah, the principal wife of Abraham, indeed gave her handmaiden to her husband as his concubine. Leah and Rachel, wives of Jacob, both gave their maids to him. But Montaigne's venture into the Book of Genesis is rather confusingly phrased.

The cannibalism was of course the fascinating 'savage' feature. Léry had not been terribly indignant about cannibalism: it was the result of superstition, and the desire to be rid of enemies – and the Indians, the pastor remarked, would be horrified by the Massacre of St Bartholomew and subsequent horrors in France.[26] Montaigne adopted this approach. The Indians kill a prisoner, with ceremony: 'They roast, and then eat him in common, and send some slices of him to such of their friends as are absent.' This is 'an extreme, and inexpiable revenge'. But Europeans 'mangle by tortures and torments', set dogs and swine on a prisoner 'to gnaw and tear him'; and 'roast him in pieces'. This is, symbolically, to eat a live man: and 'I think there is more barbarism in eating men alive, than to feed upon them being dead'. The more so as Europeans do such things 'under pretence of piety and religion'. The Indians have seen the Portuguese bury prisoners to the waist, shoot at them with arrows, and then hang them. We should note the 'barbarous horror' of cannibalism; but Montaigne is 'grieved, that prying so narrowly into their faults we are so blinded in ours'.[27]

Montaigne much admired the 'invincible courage' of the Indian, his glory and valour.[28] 'Their wars are noble and generous, and have as much excuse and beauty, as this human infirmity may admit.'[29] And: 'It is an admirable thing to see the constant resolution of their combats, which never end but by effusion of blood and murder: for they know not what fear or routs are.' The victors bring home the heads of the slain, and fix them to the entrance of their dwellings.[30] All this is from the section on cannibalism.

The Indian language is 'a kind of pleasant speech, and hath a pleasing sound, and some affinity with the Greek terminations'.[31] Their food is fish and flesh with 'no resemblance at all with ours'; eaten 'without any sauces, or skill of cookery, but plain boiled or broiled'. They eat one meal a day, at rising. At the meal they do not drink; but thereafter 'drink many times a day, and are much given to pledge carouses'. The drink

> is made of a certain root, and of the colour of our claret wines, which lasteth but two or three days; they drink it warm: it hath somewhat a sharp taste, wholesome for the stomach, nothing heady, but laxative for such as are not used unto it, yet very pleasing to such as are accustomed unto it.

The warming of the drink is the 'chiefest office' of the women. The

[26] Chinard, *L'Exotisme américain*, 136-7. Las Casas made a similar point: Wagner and Parish, *Las Casas*, 179.
[27] II, 223-24.
[28] 225. [29] 224. [30] 223. [31] 228.

elders 'never miss' to remind men 'that it is their wives which keep their drink luke-warm and well seasoned'. There are two moral obligations: 'First, valour against their enemies, then lovingness unto their wives.' The women, however, spent the night apart from their husbands; 'every one hath his several couch' (their beds being 'of a kind of cotton cloth, fastened to the house-roof, as our ship cabins'.) Their houses are like European barns; very long, with a capacity of two or three hundred persons, and 'covered with barks of great trees, fastened in the ground at one end, interlaced and joined close together by the tops, after the manner of some of our granges, the covering whereof hangs down to the ground, and steadeth them as a flank.' From their hard wood they make swords, knives, and 'grid-irons to broil their meat with'. They also make razors from wood or stone: and 'are shaven all over, much more close and cleaner than we are'. Examples of their hammocks, ropes, swords, knives, wooden bracelets and 'great canes open at one end, by the sound of which they keep time and cadence in their dancing' are 'in many places to be seen', 'and namely in my own house'.[32]

There is material about religious beliefs and ceremonies.[33]

> They believe their souls to be eternal, and those that have deserved well of their gods, to be placed in that part of heaven where the sun riseth, and the cursed toward the west in opposition. They have certain prophets and priests, which commonly abide in the mountains, and very seldom show themselves unto the people; but when they come down, there is a great feast prepared, and a solemn assembly of many townships together.

The 'Prophet' addresses the people,

> exhorting them to embrace virtue and follow their duty. All their moral discipline containeth but these two articles: first an undismayed resolution to war, then an inviolable affection to their wives. He doth also prognosticate of things to come, and what success they shall hope for in their enterprises: he either persuadeth or dissuadeth them from war.

What Montaigne approved of was that 'if he chance to miss of his divination, and that it succeed otherwise than he foretold them, if he be taken, he is hewn in a thousand pieces, and condemned for a false prophet'. In Europe, there are too many false prophets 'that gull and conycatch us with the assurance of an extraordinary faculty'. ('Conycatch' means a cheat; one who traps a cony – a dupe, a sucker.) 'Divination,' Montaigne argued, 'is the gift of God; the abusing whereof should be a punishable imposture.'

America is a country of 'exceeding pleasant and temperate situation'. Indeed,

> as my testimonies have told me, it is very rare to see a sick body amongst

[32] 220-2. [33] 222.

whether to laugh or cry.) The so-called 'first letter' of Cortés described its use in Yucatan in 1519:[8]

> After having read the *requerimiento* to them three times, and having asked Your Royal Highness' notary to witness that he did not want war; but seeing that the Indians were most resolutely determined to prevent him from landing, and indeed had already begun to shoot arrows at us, he had ordered us to fire the guns and attack.

Las Casas wrote in 1552/1583 of these 'orders' to 'receive the faith, and render themselves unto the obedience of the King of Castile, or otherwise to bid them battle with fire and sword, and to slay them or make them slaves':

> As if the Son of God which died for every one of them had commanded in His law, where He saith Go teach all nations, that there should be ordinances set down unto infidels, being peaceful and quiet and in possession of their proper land, if so be they received it not forthwith, without any preaching or teaching first had, and if they submitted not themselves to the dominion of a King whom they never saw, and whom they never heard speak of, and namely such a one whose messengers and men were so cruel, and so debarred from all pity, and such horrible tyrants, that they should for that lose their goods and lands, their liberty, their wives and children, with their lives. Which is a thing too absurd and fond, worthy of all reproach and mockery, yea worthy of hell. (C.1.v)

The Spaniards have been the initial offenders.

> I know for certain and infallible, that the Indians had evermore most just cause of war against the Spaniards; but the Spaniards never had any just cause of war against the Indians, but they were all diabolical and most unrighteous, more than can be spoken of any tyrant that is on the whole earth.

The Indians 'never committed against the Spaniards any one mortal offence punishable by the law of man' (B.2.v). They 'never wrought any displeasure unto the Spaniards; but rather that they reputed them as come from heaven' (A.3.r). They 'never did harm unto the Spanish in any place wheresoever, until such time that they first received wrongs' (M.2.v). They

> never gave no more occasion or cause, than might a convent of good religious persons well ordered, why they should be robbed and slain, and why they that escaped the death should be retained in a perpetual captivity and bondage. (B.2.v)

The bulk of the 'brief narration' was devoted to atrocity stories: in Hispaniola, Jamaica, Cuba, and Trinidad; Florida (from 1528) and

[8] *Cortés: Letters from Mexico*, tr. Pagden, 20.

Peru (which Casas never visited); and (modern) Mexico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Colombia, and Venezuela. We have Montezuma (D.3-D.4); and Atahualpa (K.4.r) – here Las Casas based his account on the report of a Franciscan eye-witness (who considered the Incas 'the most kind hearted that ever hath been seen among all the Indians'). The theme, of course, is the 'most pernicious blindness which hath always possessed those who have governed the Indians, instead of the care which they should have for the conversion and salvation of those people, which they have always neglected' (C.1.v). Because of the wars and massacres 'there are dead more than fifteen millions of souls' (A.2.v). (Elsewhere he had 12 million, and 20 million: the population of Central Mexico on the eve of the Conquest was possibly 25 million.) Las Casas' statistics passed into the European consciousness:[9] the famous assertion that the population of Hispaniola had been reduced from three million to 200, for instance (A.2.r). Without 'the present succour of his Majesty to stay these unnatural devilish tyrannies, there will not remain as much as one man alive' (M.1.r). The Spaniards 'tear them in pieces, kill them, afflict them, torment them, and destroy them by strange sorts of cruelties' (A.1.r); using, for instance, hounds specially trained to tear Indians apart (M.2.r). Las Casas himself saw in Cuba 'so great cruelties, that never any man living either have or shall see the like' (B.4.v). In Hispaniola, where the Indians are 'the best made and most beautiful' (B.1.v), Casas saw 'infinite' horrors (A.4.r); including the roasting alive of five Indian chiefs on a grid-iron. (A.3.v). 'I have seen all the aforesaid things'; and he knew the perpetrators – 'I know his name, and friends in Seville' (A.4.r). There is for the reader, unfortunately perhaps, a law of diminishing returns in an incessant parade of atrocities. One passage can suffice. An Indian youth of Yucatan in the 1530s had refused to leave his home. A Spaniard

> drawing out his dagger cut off first one then the other ear. The young man abiding by it still that he would not leave his country, he mangled off also his nose, with the uppermost of his lips, making no more scrupulosity of the matter, than if he had given him but a fillip. This damnable wretch magnified himself, and vaunted him of his doings villainously unto a reverend religious person, saying that he took as much pains as he could, to beget the Indian women in great numbers with child, to the end he might receive the more money for them in selling them great with child for slaves; ... a certain Spaniard went one day with his dogs on hunting of venison, or else conies, and, not finding game, he minded his dogs that they should be hungry, and took a little sweet baby, which he bereaved the mother of, and cutting off from him the arms and the legs, chopped them in small gobbets, giving to every dog his livery or part thereof; by and by, after

[9] On Mexico statistics, Elliott, *Imperial Spain*, Mentor ed., 288. Cook and Simpson, *Population of Mexico in the 16th Century*. It appears that the Indian population of Central Mexico was 11 million in 1520, 6½ million by 1540 and 2½ million by 1600. See also Parry, *Spanish Seaborne Empire*, Ch.11. Modern scholars point out the importance of [illegible] and so on, rather than extermination as a sole factor.

these morsels thus dispatched, he cast also the rest of the body or the carcass to all the kennel together. (F.4.r-v)

For those not slain, there was 'bondage and calamity' (B.3.v): 'the most cruel, dreadful and heinous thraldom that ever hath been laid upon men or beasts" (A.2.v).

What was the cause of these hard hearts? The 'Prologue' pinpointed the Biblical words: 'Avarice'; 'ambition'. The diagnosis is insisted upon in the text. The 'perverse, wilfully blind and obstinate greediness and insatiable wretchedness of these most covetous tyrants' (I.4.r). The Spaniards are 'blinded with the covetousness of the riches' of the Indies (F.4.v). They are like Jeroboam, King of Israel, in the first Book of Kings, who built calves of gold to rival the Temple at Jerusalem (Chapter 12): as Las Casas has it, 'made Israel to sin by making two golden calves for the people to fall down before'. They are also like Judas (G.2.r). Although 'bearing the name of Christians', they are 'cursed' (H.3.r). By their treatment of a people 'created after the image of God, and redeemed with the blood of His Christ' they show that 'God hath delivered them up into a reprobate sense' (F.4.v). Of a certain 'tyrant' in Florida, Casas wrote:

We need not to doubt but that he lieth buried in hell; if algates [nevertheless] God of His infinite mercy secretly dispensed in His hidden wisdom hath not prevented him; not dealing with him after his demerits. (K.1.v)

In 1512 two friars from the Indies had appeared before Ferdinand. The Dominican, Antonio Montesinos, had preached in Hispaniola in December 1511 against the Spanish treatment of the Indian,[10] and reports of his sentiments had alarmed the Dominicans in Spain: Montesinos was said to have denied the right of Spain to conquer the Indies. The other friar, a Franciscan, was sent by the colonists to present a defence of Spanish activities. Ferdinand was impressed by Montesinos, and appointed a committee of lawyers and theologians to consider the matter.[11] The Dominican Bernardo de Mesa stressed the incapacity of the Indian. The Indians are a prey to idleness; they are inconstant; they have no natural inclination to the Faith; by nature they have a lack of understanding, and no capacity for goodness; by astrological influence they are servile. Thus the King of Castile can take charge of them for their own good, by entrusting them to faithful colonists; for their own sake they must be regulated in some sort of servitude. (Las Casas later said his fellow Dominican – who had never been to the Indies – regarded the Indians as savages to be divided up like cattle.) The committee did not disallow the system which had developed in Spanish America during the past decade: the *encomienda*. The Indian, though free, and able to possess his own land and property, must be obliged to work – and receive wages in kind; they

[10] See above, p.101.
[11] Material here from Wagner and Parish, 8-11.

must be useful to the King under whose lordship they were. Only one member of the commission struck at the notion of Indian servitude: a Dominican ally of Montesinos, Matías de Paz. His Latin manuscript *De dominio regum Hispaniae super Indos*, not published until 1933, argued that the plantations were despotic, and that the Spaniards were obliged to render restitution – a point which in 1514 was accepted by Las Casas. The result of the commission was the Laws of Burgos of December 1512; confirming the *encomienda* and the custom of Indian forced labour.

One of Las Casas' enemies (or so Las Casas thought) was the planter and colonial official Oviedo. Gonzalo Fernández de Oviedo (1478-1577): best known, surely, as Oviedo, though sometimes placed by index-makers and library cataloguers under 'F'. A courtier-soldier, Oviedo went to the Caribbean in 1514 as an overseer of the mining and smelting of gold on the mainland. He eventually became well established in Colombia, in the town of Santa María del Antigua del Darién; with a house

of such sort that I may well entertain and commodiously lodge any Lord or nobleman, reserving also a part for myself and family. For in this may many households be kept, both above and beneath. It hath also a fair garden with many orange trees both sweet and sour; cedars also, and lemonds, of the which there is now great plenty in the houses of the Christians. On one side of the garden there runneth a fair river. The situation is very pleasant, with a good and wholesome air, and a fair prospect about the river.

(Translation by Richard Eden, 1555.)[12]

Oviedo and Las Casas clashed in Barcelona in 1519.[13] Las Casas was soliciting a land grant on the mainland; and proposing to convert the Indians. Oviedo was among those opposing the concession; and eventually Las Casas was allowed a more modest grant in Venezuela. Las Casas was to write of Oviedo:[14]

He was one of the greatest enemies the Indians have had and has done them the worst harm, for he was blinder than others in not knowing the truth, perhaps because of his greater cupidity and ambition, qualities and customs which have destroyed the Indies.

Oviedo was an *encomendero*. He was also a naturalist and a reporter: his idol was Pliny (another Spaniard). He began work on a 'natural' and 'general' history of the Indies, being commissioned to write it by Charles. The *Natural hystoria de las Indias* was published at Toledo in 1526: 'a brilliant account of the flora, fauna, geography, folk-lore and customs of the natives of the Caribbean area.'[15] It appeared in Italian

[12] Arber (ed.), *First Three English Books on America*, 238.
[13] Wagner and Parish, 53-9.
[14] *ibid.*, 53-4.
[15] Stoudemire, Introduction to his translation: *Natural History of the West Indies*, 1959, ix. In 1969 the University of North Carolina Press published, in honour of Stoudemire, a facsimile of the 1526 edition.

with the marginal note, 'unnatural lechery'. Núñez 'found the king's brother and many other young men in women's apparel, smooth and effeminately decked'; and these the king ('by the report of such as dwelt about him') 'abused with preposterous Venus'. There were about forty offenders; and Núñez set the Spaniards' dogs on them, who tore them to pieces. Oviedo in 1526 had a longer section:[36]

> In many places the Indians are sodomites. The Indian chiefs and lords publicly have boys with whom they commit this damnable sin. As soon as these boys begin this practice, they put on the short cotton skirt of the Indian women, which extends from the waist to the knees. They also wear bead bracelets and necklaces, and other adornments usually worn by women. These boys do not go to war, nor do they occupy themselves with other labours of men. Rather they work in the house, sweeping, cleaning, and other customary duties of the women. The boys are hated most violently by the women. The women, however, are very submissive to their husbands, and do not dare speak of this often, except to the Christians. These boys are called in the Cueba language *camayoa*. And when one Indian wishes to insult another, or say he is effeminate, he calls him *camoyoa*.

This passage was omitted by Eden in 1555. Perhaps, having printed earlier in the volume the Pietro Martire material, he feared repetition.

The Dominican Tomàs Ortiz argued before the Council of the Indies in 1525 that the Indians 'are more given to sodomy than any other nation'.[37]

Although the theme of Indian vice and uncivility was not Oviedo's main concern, there was a notable absence in his book of any material which might confirm Las Casas' presentation of the Indian as a gentle child. The Eden version is not so 'black' as the real text. In 1535 Oviedo published in Seville the first part of his longer work, *Historia General y Natural*; the second part did not appear until 1557 (Valladolid). There has never been an English translation of the *General History*. However, in 1949 Lewis Hanke compiled a brief 'estimate' of Oviedo's general portrait of the Indian,[38] as

> naturally lazy and vicious, melancholic, cowardly, and in general a lying, shiftless people. Their marriages are not a sacrament but a sacrilege. They are idolatrous, libidinous, and commit sodomy. Their chief desire is to eat, drink, worship heathen idols, and commit bestial oscenities. What could one expect from a people whose skulls are so thick and hard that the Spaniards had to take care in fighting not to strike on the head lest their swords be blunted?

The 1583 *Briefe Chronicle of the Acts and gestes of the Spaniardes in the West Indies* contained further Las Casas material in addition to the

[36] S:104-5. To the Elizabethans, sodomy was the Spanish, as well as the Indian, Vice: Maltby, *Black Legend in England*, 30, 85, 94.
[37] Quoted Washburn, *Red Man's Land – White Man's Law*, 9.
[38] *Spanish Struggle for Justice*, 11; see *ibid.*, 182, note 29.

translation of the *Brevísima Relación*. An appendix, printed in roman type, contained eight pages devoted to 'The sum of the disputation between Friar Bartholomew de las Casas' and the Emperor's 'chronographer', Doctor Sepúlveda.

Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda (indexed sometimes under 'G' and sometimes under 'S': surely 'S' is more helpful) was born in 1490, studied at the new university of Alcalá, and then, from 1515, spent twenty years in Italy.[39] In 1526 at Rome he published a confutation of Luther's treatise on free will (thinking that Erasmus' 1524 Reply had been too timid). And at Rome in 1535 he published a Dialogue on the theme of the Just War: called *Democrates*, the name of one of the debaters. His main field of study was Aristotle: his Latin translation of the *Politics* was published in Paris in 1548. The theme of the Just War had obvious relevance to Spanish policy towards the Indian. And by 1542 Sepúlveda had completed a sequel, concerning the Indies: *Democrates alter o secundus, sive de justis belli causis apud Indos*. In the event, this remained unpublished until 1750.[40]

The 1583 'sum of the disputation' gives the 'two principal conclusions' of *Democrates alter*: that 'the Spaniards' wars against the Indians were, as concerning the cause and equity that moved them thereto, very just' and 'may and ought to be continued'; and that 'the Indians are bound to submit themselves to the Spaniards' government, as the foolish to the wise: if they will not yield' the Spaniards may wage war (Q.3.r).

We may give here a fuller account. Democrates argues for the justice of war against the Indian. His adversary, Leopoldus, who thinks the Conquest unjust, is characterised as 'a German considerably tainted with Lutheran errors'.[41]

Democrates relates Oviedo-type material about the Indian State of Nature:[42] their cannibalism, human sacrifice, sodomy and unnatural acts, their tribal wars, and their cowardice. They are merely *homunculi*: sorry creatures. They do not 'entirely lack reason': but in them

> you will scarcely find even vestiges of humanity, who not only possess no science, but who also lack letters, and preserve no monument of their history ... Neither do they have written laws, but barbaric institutions and customs. They do not even have private property.

Homunculus had an implied association with 'monster'. Paracelsus had written a book *De Homunculis et Monstris*; the homunculus being a child produced by a sort of artificial insemination.[43]

In Sepúlveda's conception of the Law of Nature, what is 'natural' is

[39] See the brief monograph by Bell, *Sepúlveda*, 1925.
[40] Edition of the Latin text, with a Spanish translation, Madrid, 1951: editor, A. Losada.
[41] Hanke, *Aristotle and the American Indians*, 40.
[42] *ibid.*, 46-7.
[43] Healy, note on p.112 of his edition of Donne's *Ignatius His Conclave*.

and worship of God'; bringing 'infidels and savages living in those parts to humane civility, and to a settled and quiet government'.

Further royal instructions came in November 1606.[45] It was made clear that in America laws enacted by the local authority were to be 'for the substance thereof, as near to the common laws of England, and the equity thereof, as may be'. Also that

> the true word and service of God and Christian faith be preached, planted and used, not only within every of the said several colonies and plantations, but also, as much as they may, among the savage people which do or shall adjoin unto them or border upon them, according to the doctrine, rites and religion now professed and established within our realm of England.

(The authorities in America also had power 'to punish all manner of excess, through drunkeness or otherwise, and all idle, loitering and vagrant persons'.) The colonists were firmly instructed to 'well entreat those savages in those parts, and use all good means to draw the savages and heathen people' to 'the true service and knowledge of God'; and 'that all just, kind and charitable courses shall be holden with such of them as shall conform themselves to any good and sociable traffic and dealing with the subjects of us, our heirs and successors'.

The Instructions of the London Council itself followed early in December 1606.[46] The 'captains and company which are sent at this present to plant there' were ordered to 'have great care not to offend the naturals, if you can eschew it; and employ some few of your company to trade with them for corn, and all other lasting victuals'. But never be unsuspicious: 'how weary soever your soldiers be, let them never trust the country people with the carriage of their weapons, for if they run from you with your shot, which they only fear, they will easily kill them all with their arrows.' If any English are killed, conceal the fact, or the Indians will conclude that the colonists are but 'common men'. 'you shall do well also not to let them see or know of your sick men.' These Instructions (now in the Library of Congress) were practical, sensible, pithy; worth a dozen sermons.

The voyagers under the auspices of the Virginia Company of Plymouth (120 of them, all male) settled in August 1607 a quarter of the way up the coast of Maine (twenty-five miles north-east of Portland) on the river then called Sagadahoc (now, Kennebec). They arrived in two vessels, one controlled by the aged George Popham, who became President of the colony, the other by Raleigh Gilbert. The vessels had left Plymouth within four weeks of each other, in May and June. (In August 1606 the Plymouth Company had sent out an exploring ship, captured by the Spanish; and in October 1606 another vessel, with Martin Pring on board, which had reached Maine successfully, and returned with good reports.)

[45] Barbour, *Jamestown Voyages*, 34-44.
[46] *Ibid.*, 49-54.

This 'northern colony on the river Sagadahoc' barely lasted a year. It was abandoned in the summer of 1608. A 'fort' had been constructed, Fort St George. The painstaking Reverend Richard Seymour (not, it seems, a Cambridge man) had preached the first sermon heard in New England: August 1607. But the two ships returned to England late in 1607, leaving only forty-four settlers to face a harsh winter – but no colder, William Strachey was critically to comment, than winter in Scotland.[47] There were quarrels and factions, and a devastating fire. Sir John Popham died in England; George Popham died in the Fort; and the impetuous Raleigh Gilbert decided, for family reasons, to return to England. Thus the plantation, wrote John Smith, was 'begun and ended in one year, and the country esteemed as a cold, barren, mountainous, rocky desert'.[48]

The New England coast was left for the moment to the fishing vessels.

As we know now, the London branch of the Virginia Company stole the limelight. Their three ships set sail down the Thames on 20 December 1606: the 'Susan Constant', under Christopher Newport, the 'Discovery', under John Ratcliffe, and the 'Godspeed' – under Bartholomew Gosnold.

[47] *Virginia Britania*, 35.
[48] Smith-Arber, 696. For the Sagahadoc colony: Andrews, I, 90-7; Rowse, *America*, 98-101.

encountered, making a bad impression: he 'so set his countenance, striving to be stately, as to our seeming he became fool'. He was to seem less of a fool to the English along the James in 1622, when he master-minded a crucial and traumatic massacre.

Nearly forty miles along the river from Jamestown, on the north bank, the party met an Indian Queen. She held court on a mat under a mulberry tree. Sitting 'with a staid countenance', she would permit none to stand or sit near her. She was

> a fat, lusty, manly woman. She had much copper about her neck, a crownet of copper upon her head. She had long black hair which hanged loose down her back to her middle, which only part was covered with a deer's skin, and else all naked. She had her women attending on her adorned much like herself, save that they wanted the copper.

John White would have enjoyed doing a drawing of her. She relaxed her 'we are not amused' pose when Newport presented his gifts. She then asked to hear a musket, and, unlike Arrohattoc, took the noise calmly. She seemed to Archer to be 'of as great authority' as any male chief in the region. Newport dubbed her settlement 'Queen Appomattoc's Bower'.

Archer's observations give a general impression of 'great joy and gladness'. Dancing, eating, fishing, and friendly welcomes: 'We sat merry, banqueting with them, seeing their dances and taking tobacco'; 'we were entertained with great joy and gladness, the people falling to dance, the women to preparing victuals, some boys were sent to dive for mussels: they gave us tobacco, and very kindly saluted us'.

Things were not so happy at Jamestown itself. When the boat returned, the explorers found that two settlers, one of them a boy, had been killed, and more than a dozen hurt, in a sixty minute Indian attack on the settlement; Wingfield had received an arrow through his beard. Archer commented that the Indians must be 'a very valiant people'.[36]

On 22 June 1607 the 'Susan Constant' and the 'Godspeed' sailed back to England, with Newport, leaving the 'Discovery', a pinnace, at Jamestown, and provisions calculated to last until the end of September. By the time of departure, the palisading of the settlement, and the fortification, had been completed, and the triangular Fort of Jamestown stood firm. There were frequent Indian attacks: 'Alarums by ambuscadoes', as Smith said.[37] Archer remarked that the English had been unwise enough to have long grass and reeds uncut near the fort; one colonist had gone into the grass 'to do natural necessity', and was wounded.[38] There were positive things. Percy tells us that the settlers had 'sown most of our corn on two mountains, it sprang a man's height from the ground'.[39] A collection of material from the

[36] *JT*, 95 [37] *JT*, 172 [38] *JT*, 96. [39] *JT*, 142

original planters published in London in 1612 (edited by the Reverend William Symonds)[40] is less bland:

> What toil we had with so small a power to guard our workmen a'days, watch all night, resist our enemies, and effect our business; to reload the ships, cut down trees, and prepare the ground to plant our corn.

There were quarrels, with Hunt again as the reconciler. And not much to eat. The settlers got from the sailors on the ships a daily ration of biscuits: in exchange for 'money, sassafras, furs, or love'. Smith was to describe the bad feeling between the settlers and the sailors:[41] the sailors eating every day with good cheer, the settlers having only a little meal and water – plus the victuals given them by the Indians. Although, wrote Smith,

> there be deer in the woods, fish in the rivers, and fowls in abundance in their seasons, yet the woods are so wide, the rivers so broad, the beasts so wild, and we so unskilful to catch them, we little troubled them nor they us.

Percy confirms that the 104 colonists left at Jamestown on 22 June 1607 were 'very bare and scanty of victuals'.[42]

The two returning vessels arrived in Plymouth at the end of July 1607, carrying the first letters to reach England from the colony. There was a brief note to the London Council from the Jamestown Council[43] (which from 10 June had included Smith as an active member): the colonists had fortified, sown wheat, built houses, explored, and so on. Virginia, certainly, could 'flow with milk and honey'. Sir Walter Cope, a member of the London Council, wrote on 12 August to Salisbury (Robert Cecil):[44]

> If we may believe either in words or letters, we are fallen upon a land that promises more than the Land of Promise. Instead of milk, we find pearl; and gold instead of honey.

Cope had read the account of the Indian chief made ill by 'hot drinks' in the exploration of the James, and fills out the story:

> One of their kings sick with drinking our aquavite thought himself poisoned. Newport told by signs that the next day he should be well, and he was so. And telling his countrymen thereof, they came apace, old men and old women, upon every bellyache, to him, to know when they should be well.

Cope's theory about relations with the Indian was that they 'used our

[40] Printed with Smith's *Map of Virginia* 'Proceedings' 'taken faithfully as they were written out of the writings of' eight named colonists and 'divers other diligent observers there present then'; ed. W.S. (William Symonds). *JT*, 375-464. My three quotations: 380, 381, 384

[41] Smith, *Advertisements*, 930

[42] *JT*, 145 [43] *JT*, 78-9. [44] *JT*, 108-10

men well until they found that they began to plant and fortify. Then they fell to skirmishing' – the attack on Jamestown about ten days after the landing. That letter is preserved at Hatfield House. There is also at Hatfield House a letter written by Cope on the very next day[45] pointing out to Cecil that the minerals sent back to England have shown no trace of gold or copper. 'Our new discovery is more like to prove the land of Canaan that the land of Ophir.' In other words, to emphasise gold is to underestimate the prospects of the plantation. (For Ophir; see above, page 22.) Other observers in London were more depressingly metallic, reminding one of Captain Seagull in *Eastward Ho*. Dudley Carleton, writing on 18 August 1607,[46] was supercilious about the planters who had returned with 'much commendation of the air and the soil and the commodities', but with no gold or silver – and no certainty of 'peace with the inhabitants'. Carleton disapproved of the word 'Jamestown' – 'no graceful name'. Jamesforf he would have preferred; 'because it comes near to Chelmsford'.

Spain was of course much concerned with 'the Virginia matter'. James I, speaking to the Spanish Ambassador in September 1607, tried to calm fears by saying that 'he had heard that the land was unproductive, and that those who thought to find great riches there were deceived'.[47] Difficult to guess how much of that was diplomacy, and how much was pessimism about 'Earth's only Paradise'.

The summer and early autumn of 1607 were grim at Jamestown. Evidence comes from Percy, Smith and Wingfield; and from the 1612 compilation of planters' accounts edited by William Symonds.[48] There was the question, again, of rations. It seems that a cup of boiled wheat and a cup of boiled barley (both from the ship's hold) was the actual basic allowance per man per day. The charge went that Wingfield and his special cronies kept the liquor for themselves (Smith). Wingfield said the brandy was reserved for extremities, and the sack for communion. The Symonds contributors accused Wingfield of hogging food also; oatmeal, beef, eggs – and oil. They pointed out that the barley to be boiled had been in the hold for twenty-six weeks, and was mainly worms. Percy says the men drank river water. Some managed to catch sturgeon; but Smith gave the over-eating of sturgeon as a cause of death. In August there were nineteen deaths; including, on the 22nd, Bartholomew Gosnold. Some were due, wrote Percy, to 'swellings, fixes, burning fevers'. Others, to starvation. By 10 September, according to Smith, 46 were dead: 45% of the settlement. Percy gave the most vivid pictures:

[45] *TJ*, 111. [46] *TJ*, 113-14.

[47] *TJ*, 119. For James' diplomacy with Spain concerning America, see Quinn, 'James I and the Beginnings of Empire in America', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, Jan. 1974, II, 2.

[48] All in *TJ*: Percy's 'Discourse' (Purchas 1625), 144-5. Smith's *True Relation* (1608), 173-4. Wingfield's 'Discourse' (1845), 217-25. Symonds material, 384-5 (see note 49).

our men night and day groaning in every corner of the fort, most pitiful to hear. If there were any conscience in men, it would make their hearts to bleed to hear the pitiful murmurings and outcries of our sick men, without relief every night and day for the space of six weeks; some departing out of the world, many times three and four in a night; in the morning their bodies trailed out of their cabins like dogs to be buried.

Smith portrayed the leaders at Jamestown as 'sick or discontented'; the colonists 'in such despair as they would rather starve, and rot with idleness, than be persuaded to do anything'.

The only ray of hope was that the Indians supplied the colonists with food. Smith tells us that the werowance of Quiyoughcohannock 'did always at our greatest need supply us with victuals of all sorts'; and 'charged his people that they should for ever keep good quiet with the English'. Smith was sent out to trade with the Indians. He went to Kecoughtan; where the Indians, 'thinking us near famished, with careless kindness offered us little pieces of bread, and small handfuls of beans or wheat, for a hatchet or a piece of copper'.

Philip Barbour remarks that 'Smith was one of the few colonists who realised that trade or barter with the Indians was a *sine qua non* of survival'.[49] But Professor Quinn is critical of Smith's handling of that trade:[50]

Smith's tirades against those who gave the Indians too good barter rates and his compliments to himself for his businesslike astuteness seem to show no understanding at all of the relative seasonal plentifulness or scarcity of food in Indian hands.

Quinn's general point is that the Jamestown settlers

seem to have had no idea that in acquiring surplus corn from the Indians, they were causing an upset to the local economy, and that the value of stored corn to the Indians varied very greatly according to whether it was asked of them in September, in December or in May.

The Indians at Roanoke had been antagonised by English demands for food in the winter of 1585/86. And throughout – and in all settlements in North America –

a major element in the deterioration of European-Indian relations was the demand of the settlers for quantities of grain, especially during late winter and spring, which the native economy was not geared to supply.

So, as alderman Robert Johnson wrote in 1612,[51] the Virginia colonists grew 'factious and disordered', 'like the college of English fugitives in Rome'. Harsh words. Smith himself thought that the half

[49] *TJ*, 437.

[50] Quinn (ed.), *North American Discovery circa 1000-1612*, xxv-xxvi.

[51] *A New Life of Virginia*, 10.

Spanish ambassador, doubting the boy's imperial status, had been amused by the honour paid him: 'I hold it for surer that he must be a very ordinary person'.)[71] So Newport had to go up river in November 1608 – 100 miles – to crown Powhatan. Various items of furniture, a bed, basins and jugs, were set up, and Powhatan robed in a scarlet cloak (assured by Namontacke that it was harmless). The crowning was more tricky, the emperor 'neither knowing the majesty nor meaning of a crown, nor bending of the knee'.[72] At last, 'by leaning hard on his shoulders, he a little stooped, and Newport put the crown on his head'. The London Council may have found the news impressive, but to frontiersmen it seemed removed from the realities of power, apart from being slightly ridiculous. Newport left behind a boy, Thomas Savage, to learn the language.

The London Council of the Virginia Company made effective play in England with the coronation. An official pamphlet published in 1610 gave various arguments why the English possess Virginia lawfully.[73] They had a 'real concession' from the 'rural Emperor', 'that hath licensed us to negociate among them, and to possess their country with them'. And Powhatan 'received voluntarily a crown and a sceptre, with full acknowledgement of duty and submission'. The only real effect of the 'coronation' was to increase Powhatan's conceit; because of the gifts, and because he felt his alliance with the English was firmer.

On 29 December 1608 another party set off from Jamestown, in two boats: one contained Smith and a dozen others, the second Percy plus twenty-five. (At that time the population of Jamestown was about 200.) Also, a soldier was sent off with two Indian guides with 'directions how to search for the lost company of Sir Walter Raleigh'.[74] The climax of the expedition was another meeting with Powhatan. And the pages devoted to this winter expedition in the narrative edited by William Symonds in 1612 are an invigorating adventure story. The party stayed for a week at Kecoughtan.

> The extreme wind, rain, frost and snow caused us to keep Christmas amongst the savages, where we were never more merry, nor fed on more plenty of good oysters, fish, flesh, wild fowl and good bread; nor never had better fires in England than in the dry, warm, smokey houses of Kecoughtan.

The James River was frozen over in parts. And in the journey along the river

> the frost forced us three or four days also to suppress the insolency of those proud savages, to quarter in their houses, and guard our barge, and cause them to give us what we wanted.[75]

[71] *JV*, 163. [72] *JV*, 414.
[73] *A True Declaration*, Force, *Tracts*, III, no.1, pp.6-7.
[74] *JV*, 423. [75] *JV*, 423.

At another Indian settlement, the English again needing food,

> the people imparted what little they had, with such complaints and tears from women and children, as he had been too cruel to be a Christian that would not have been satisfied, and moved with compassion.[76]

Early in 1609 the settlement of the emperor was reached. The narrative gives a dialogue between Powhatan and Smith, three speeches to each, very stylised, polished for publication on the classical model. The mood is of wary and respectful co-existence. The 'subtle savage' Powhatan made one especially 'subtle discourse':[77]

> Think you I am so simple not to know it is better to eat good meat, lie well, and sleep quietly with my women and children, laugh and be merry with you, have copper, hatchets or what I want, being your friend, than to be forced to flee from all, to lie cold in the woods, feed upon acorns, roots and such trash, and be so hunted by you that I can neither rest, eat nor sleep.

(We know that some English boys had been sent to live among the Indians, learning the language, 'which many of them already know perfectly':[78] so the general drift of the Powhatan orations can be taken as accurate.) The 1612 narrative includes material on the morality of the dealings with the Indian:[79] a defence against those critics in England who accused the colonists of being too kind. To some, the settlers

> may seem too charitable to such a daily daring treacherous people; to others, unpleasant that we washed not the ground with their bloods, nor shewed such strange inventions in mangling, murdering, ransaking and destroying, as did the Spaniards, the simple bodies of those ignorant souls.

Against such 'hawks' at home, it was pointed out that conditions in Virginia were different from those in Spanish America. It was comparatively 'ill peopled'; and the few Indians were 'idle, improvident, scattered', 'careless of anything but from hand to mouth'.

We also read of the rumour that Smith intended to marry Pocahontas, and make himself a King. Certainly Pocahontas seems to have been a welcome visitor to Jamestown; on one occasion 'she by stealth in the dark night came through the wild woods', to warn Smith of one of her father's intrigues.[80]

Before venturing on this winter journey Smith wrote a letter to the London Virginia Company: a doleful report on the state of the colony, which reached London in January 1609. It was to be printed in 1624 in his *The Generall Historie of Virginia, New England and the Summer Isles*.[81] This is the letter containing the passage, already noted, criticising the sailors, and the ignorance of the settlers in being unable to fish or

[76] *JV*, 426. [77] *JV*, 154. [78] *JV*, 438-9. [79] *JV*, 459. [80] Smith-Arber, 442-5.

native population in other parts of America. What is needed is 'greater moderation' and 'stricter ceremony in their kind of marriage.' However, the women are 'very painful';[22] a favourite puritan word, usually applied to preachers: painstaking.

> The men bestow their times in fishing, hunting, wars, and such man-like exercises without the doors, scorning to be seen in any effeminate labour; which is the cause that the women be very painful, and the men often idle.

The Emperor Powhatan has, in all, over 100 wives, 'according to the order and custom of sensual heathenism'. Only about a dozen, however, are operative at any one time: Strachey gives twelve names, given him by an Indian called Kempes, who died of scurvy after being resident for nearly a year at Jamestown, where he learnt 'a pretty deal of English', and also 'came orderly to prayers, and observed with us the keeping of the Sabbath, both by ceasing from labour, and repairing to Church'[23] (no doubt to the delight of the Reverend Richard Buck, who had arrived in Jamestown in May 1610 from Bermuda, having been, like Strachey, a passenger on the *Sea Venture*: the third known cleric to be sent to Virginia – Hunt was dead, and the mysterious puritan had presumably departed). Strachey respected Powhatan, although he disapproved of him. He was 'proud and insolent': a 'great tyrant'[24] – and to an Inns of Court man tyranny was traditionally loathed. Strachey was sure that Powhatan had massacred the 'lost colony', and was preparing for the Jamestown settlers 'the same cup which he made our poor countrymen drink of at Roanoke'. All the same, Powhatan did not seem 'willing to hold any open quarrel or hostility with us'. And he was frightened:

> with the danger and mischief which he saith we intend unto him, by taking away his land from him, and conspiring to surprise him; which we never yet imagined nor attempted.

Powhatan was said to be nearly 80. He was 'a goodly old man, not shrinking':

> of a tall stature, and clean limbs; of a sad aspect; round fat visaged; with gray hairs, but plain and thin, hanging upon his broad shoulders, some few hairs upon his chin, and so on his upper lip.

He was a ruler of 'subtle understanding and politique carriage'.[25] And although a 'barbarous and uncivil prince' he has 'majesty':[26]

> Such is, I believe, the impression of the divine nature, and howsoever these (as other) heathens, forsaken by the true light, have not that portion of the knowing blessed Christian spirit, yet I am persuaded there is an infused kind of divineness, and extraordinary (appointed that it shall be so by the King of

[22] 81. [23] 61. [24] 105-6. [25] 57. [26] 60-1.

> Kings) to such who are his immediate instruments on earth, how wretched soever otherwise under the course of misbelief and infidelity.

Powhatan was guided by Prophecies given him by his priests. He had exterminated, 'not many years since', the Chesapeake Indians because it was foretold 'how that from the Chesapeake Bay a nation should arise which should dissolve and give end to his Empire'. There was also a Prophecy about 'such strangers as should invade their territories, or labour to settle a plantation'. Powhatan and his people would overthrow them twice; 'but the third time they themselves should fall into their subjection, and under their conquest.'[27]

The structure of Powhatan's empire was of subsidiary regions, 'shires as it were', each under a werowance or 'absolute commander': there were over 30 such.[28] Strachey estimated the total population of the confederacy as 3,220.[29] (In fact, it was probably nearer 11,000.) This organisation was basically admirable:[30]

> Although the country people be very barbarous, yet have they amongst themselves such government as that their magistrates for good commanding, and their people for due subjection and obeying, excel many places that would be accounted Civil. The form of their commonwealth, by what hath been already delivered, you may well gather to be a *Monarchal government*: where one, as Emperor, ruleth over many kings.

There are no 'positive laws'; 'the law whereby he ruleth is custom.' The weakness is that when Powhatan 'pleaseth, his will is law, and must be obeyed; not only as a king, but as half a god, his people esteem him.' Strachey was most offended by the provision that Powhatan took 80 per cent of the produce of his empire: wheat, vegetables, fish and fowl, roots, skins.[31] This, plus his cruel punishments: he 'doth at his pleasure despoil them both of their lives and goods, without yielding them any reason'.[32] Strachey saw the English as Liberators of the Indian.[33] Under English rule, the Indians will 'enjoy the fruits of their own territories'. They will engage in 'peaceable and frank trade with the English'. True, there will be some Tribute payable, but this will be much less than that to Powhatan, and, in order to pay it, the Indians will be constrained to make better use of their land: they will 'cleanse double as much ground as they do'. The English 'will take of their poorest into their families'. And

> their better sort shall by patents and proclamations hold their land as free burghers and citizens with the English, and subject to King James, who will give them Justice, and defend them against all their enemies; whereas now they live in miserable slavery, and have no assurance of their lives or of their goods.

There is a tribute here to Spanish policy in Peru. Strachey had been

[27] 83. [28] 69. [29] 77. [30] 87. [31] 91. [32] 91-3.

reading the 1604 translation of José de Acosta: *The Naturall and Morall Historie of the East and West Indies*. The Indians will become 'the more civil; as likewise to enjoy the rest of their own more freely than under Powhatan; they will find themselves in far better estate than now they are' – 'they shall for hereafter be delivered from his tyranny.'

Powhatan was said to have twenty sons and ten daughters. Strachey had seen Pocahontas, 'playful one', 'a well favoured but wanton young girl'.[34] Until they were twelve, Indian girls went naked. And Pocahontas at Jamestown would

> get the boys forth with her into the market place and make them wheel, falling on their hands, turning their heels upwards; whom she would follow, and wheel so herself, naked as she was, all the Fort over.

Strachey followed Smith in stressing the inconstancy of the Indian. 'They are inconstant in everything but what fear constraineth them to keep; crafty, timorous' – also short tempered, and slow to forget a grudge.[35] But English deaths are due more to English stupidity than to Indian venom. Strachey said he could not name three Englishmen killed in open conflict:

> Let me truly say, how they never killed man of ours, but by our men's folly and indiscretion; suffering themselves to be beguiled and enticed up into their houses without their arms; when then, indeed, they have fallen upon them, and knocked out their brains, or stuck them full of arrows (no force) for their credulity.

Such deaths are to be attributed to English 'weakness' and Indian 'subtlety'.[36]

In generalising about the nature of the Indian, Strachey lapses into his rather sophomoric scholastic manner.[37] The Indians

> have many moral goods, such as are *per accidens* plentiful enough amongst them; and as much, poor souls, as they come short of those *bona moralia* which are *per se*.

They are 'healthy enough, which is *Bonum corporis*'.

> Nor is Nature a stepdame unto them concerning their *aptas membrorum compositiones*. Only, God wot, I must grant that *Bonum morale* (as aforesaid) which is *per se*, they have not *in medio*, which is *in Virtute*; and then how can they ever obtain it *in Ultimo*, which is *in felicitate*?

Holofernes on the James.

Another plank in the platform of Indian Liberation was deliverance from the power of the Priests. An Indian high priest (*Quiyoughquisock*) 'is no less honoured than Diana's priests at Ephesus'.[38] They are

[34] 72. [35] 74-5. [36] 45. [37] 132. [38] 88.

'ministers of Satan' who persuade the people 'every year to sacrifice still their own children'.[39] We have the familiar material about the ceremony with the adolescent boys, here attributed to the observations of George Percy.[40] The material has the points that the observers did not see what in the end happened to the boys; and that the werowances explained that only one of them died, the rest being held in seclusion to become 'priests and conjurers, to be instructed by tradition from the elder priests'. The habit of child sacrifice Strachey explains is universal 'over all the Indies': Florida and Mexico, for instance (reference again to Acosta); and it was common in Antiquity. The Strachey thesis is that the Indian lay magistrates are wholly swayed by the priests and prophets. It is the priests who

> persuade their werowances to resist our settlement, and tell them how much their *Okeus* will be offended with them, and that he will not be appeased with a sacrifice of a thousand, nay a hecatomb of their children, if they permit a nation despising the ancient religion of their forefathers to inhabit among them.[41]

Thus the priests should be captured, and delivered to the Governor of Virginia: who will 'perform the same acceptable service to God that Jehu King of Israel did when he assembled all the priests of Baal and slew them to the last man in their own temple'.[42] All this is conformity with the 'Instructions' given by the London Council of the Virginia Company to Sir Thomas Gates in 1609.[43] The seducers taken care of, the Indian will be amenable to English influence:

> We shall by degrees change their barbarous natures, make them ashamed the sooner of their savage nakedness, inform them of the true God and of the way to their salvation, and finally teach them obedience to the King's Majesty and to his Governors in those parts.[44]

The 'ancient religion of their forefathers' teaches that there are two gods.[45] (A touch here of Strachey the Cambridge High Calvinist?) There is *Ahone*, the 'good and peaceable god', who 'intendeth all good unto them, and will do no harm'. He is the great god who

> governs all the world, and makes the sun to shine, creating the moon and stars his companions, great powers, and which dwell with him, and by whose virtues and influences the under earth is tempered, and brings forth her fruits according to her seasons.

[39] 89. [40] 98-9. [41] 90.

[42] 94. Jehu, king of Israel, massacred the worshippers in the temple of the foreign cult of Baal: 'Go in and slay them; let none come forth. And they smote them with the edge of the sword' (II Kings 10: 25).

[43] 14-15.

[44] 91. [45] 89.

As the minister, being a subject, must yield his obedience to the magistrate, so the magistrate must be careful to yield him countenance to keep him from neglect, and maintenance to encourage him in his ministry.

The sermons of 1609 make quite clear that there had been debate in England not only about the use of planting colonies, but about the morality. The preachers were nervously sensitive to opposition, actual or potential – from what Price called 'our own lazy, drowsy yet barking countrymen'.[65] On this theme, Symonds rose to his most offensive rhetoric. Some think that the planting of colonies is odious, that the possession of Indian territory is against 'conscience and equity' (such critics 'think themselves to be very wise).[66] Such a critic comes "dropping out of some anabaptists' spicery' with 'a cankered mouth and a stinking breath', opening 'his school in the fantastical shop of his addle imagination'; in the end he will be 'hissed out of the universities'[67] (did opposition especially come from Cambridge and Oxford, and perhaps the Inns of Court: the three universities of England?). Symonds invoked the noble Roman and the noble Saxon:[68]

Is only now the ancient planting of colonies, so highly praised among the Romans and all other nations, so vile and odious among us, that what is and hath been a virtue in others must be sin in us? And if our objector be descended of the noble Saxon's blood, let him take heed lest while he cast a stone at us he wounds his father, that first brought him in his loins from foreign parts into this happy isle.

That was more about 'use' than morality – a point to be developed later.

Neither Price nor Crakanthorpe had very much to say about the Indian himself. Price stressed that 'a savage country' is 'to become a sanctified country'. The assumption being that the 'Virginian' yearns for the English presence: 'the angel of Virginia crieth out to this land, as the angel of Macedonia did to Paul: O come and help us.'[69] Crakanthorpe said a little more, but did not go beyond the obvious. The Indian lives in 'brutish incivility'. The 'poor and savage and to be pitied Virginians' in 'the blindness of their infidelity and superstition do offer sacrifices, yea even themselves, unto the Devil'. (William White and John Smith have a lot to answer for.) Incivility is to be replaced by 'humanity'; and superstition by 'religion' – 'reducing' the Indian to 'faith and salvation by Christ'.[70] There is the feel that the Virginia enterprise fell into place as an appendix to the Old Testament: the English being

[65] Price, F.2.v.
[66] Symonds, 10.
[67] 13-14. [68] 15.
[69] Price, F.2.v-F.3.r.
[70] Crakanthorpe, D.2.v.

the means or furtherers of so so happy a work, not only to see a new Britain in another world, but to hear also those as yet heathen, barbarous and brutish people, together with the English, to learn the speech and language of Canaan.[71]

The Old Testament imperative was stressed by Symonds and Gray. Indeed Symonds began his sermon with the Book of Genesis. His text was Chapter 12, verses 1 to 3:

Now the Lord had said unto Abraham, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee. And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing. And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.

By page 9 (out of 54) we have been taken through the Bible to the words of Christ to his Disciples, as given by Mathew: 'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Symonds was preaching to the new children of Israel; reminding them of the directive to Abraham. He was of course aware of the 'black legend' of Spanish policy in the Americas. There are those who 'tear in pieces, murder and torment the natural inhabitants, with cruelties never read nor heard of before', who 'burn millions of them, and cast millions into the sea', or 'bait them with dogs, that shall eat up the mothers with their children': such atrocities are the work of 'purple Rome', that is, 'Antichrist and his fry'.[72] Every Spanish or Portuguese vessel crossing the Atlantic has its cargo of Jesuits and Friars. This of course is a bad thing. But Symonds is forced to compare such active faith with the 'snorting idleness of the ministry' in England.[73]

Symonds' conception of the Indian was sombre. Virginia is 'a waste country, where the people do live but like deer in herds'. Like the deer, they are naked: they 'have not as yet attained unto the first modesty that was in Adam, that knew he was naked'. They 'know no god but the devil, nor sacrifice, but to offer their men and children unto Moloch'.[74] Thus 'their god is the enemy of mankind, "that seeketh whom he may devour" '. Fortunately they are no match for an armed European Christian: 'a mat is their strongest portcullis, a naked breast their target of best proof, an arrow of reed on which there is no iron their most fearful weapon of offense.'[75]

One thing is quite clear. The English must not marry the Indians.[76]

Then must Adam's posterity keep to themselves. They may not marry nor give in marriage to the heathen, that are uncircumcised. And this is so plain

[71] D.3.r.
[72] ...nds, 14.
[73] ... 15. [74] 25. [75] 35.

that out of the foundation arose the law of marriage among themselves. The breaking of this rule may break the neck of all good success of this voyage; whereas by keeping the fear of God, the planters in short time, by the blessing of God, may grow into a nation formidable to all the enemies of Christ.

Symonds is arguing, in Old Testament terms, for the cohesion and integrity of an elect nation in covenant with God, and faced with 'heathen'. The 'rule' has no relevance to colour; except in so far as the mark of the Faith was whiteness. Whiteness is of course an image of purity: blackness an image of darkness and evil. It was to be a common belief in later seventeenth century England that at the resurrection, negroes will appear white. Sir Thomas Browne, M.D., wrote in the reign of Charles II that: 'Some Negroes who believe the Resurrection, think that they shall rise white.'[77] It seems that in the early seventeenth century, colour was invoked more often than not for literary rather than ethnological purposes. Here is William Strachey saluting in sonnet form the London Council of the Virginia Company in 1612:[78]

> And where white Christians turn in manners Moors
> You wash Moors white with sacred Christian blood.

To comment on the assumptions, allusions and traditions behind that couplet would require a separate essay!

The Colonist John Rolfe, anxious to marry Pocahontas in 1614, was to be tortured by the Old Testament 'rules' mentioned by Symonds in 1609.[79]

Robert Beverley of Virginia, born in 1673, wrote in 1705:[80]

> Intermarriage had been indeed the method proposed very often by the Indians in the beginning, urging it frequently as a certain rule that the English were not their friends if they refused it. And I can't but think it would have been happy for that country, had they embraced this proposal.

Two 'certain rules' in collision! Beverley thought marriage a 'kind method' of conversion. And it would have lessened that Indian 'jealousy' of the English which Beverley took to be the First Cause of animosity. William Byrd II, writing in the 1720s, elaborated the point, in his discussion of early years in Jamestown:[81]

> They had now made peace with the Indians, but there was one thing wanting to make that peace lasting. The natives could by no means persuade themselves that the English were heartily their friends, so long as they disdained to intermarry with them. And, in earnest, had the English

[77] Browne, *Christian Morals*, part II, section VI.
[78] Quoted by Wright, introduction to *Virginia Britania*, xxvi.
[79] See above, pp. 111-12.
[80] *History and Present Estate of Virginia*, 38.
[81] 'History of the Dividing Line': Pearce, *Colonial American Writing*, 417-18.

> consulted their own security and the good of the colony – had they intended either to civilise or convert these Gentiles – they would have brought their stomachs to embrace this prudent alliance.
>
> Morals and all considered, I can't think the Indians were much greater heathens than the first adventurers, who, had they been good Christians, would have had the charity to take this only method of converting the natives to Christianity. For, after all that can be said, a sprightly lover is the most prevailing missionary that can be sent amongst these or any other infidels. Besides, the poor Indians would have had less reason to complain that the English took away their land, if they had received it by way of portion with their daughters. Had such affinities been contracted in the beginning, how much bloodshed had been prevented, and how populous would the country have been, and consequently how considerable? Nor would the shade of the skin have been any reproach at this day; for if a Moor may be washed white in three generations, surely an Indian might have been blanched in two.

Of course, an eighteenth-century Virginia planter was hardly likely to be obsessed by the Book of Ezra.

Symonds dealt brusquely with scruples about two points: the dispossession of the Indian, and the use of force in colonisation,[82] There are those who maintain that rulers 'must not make offensive wars', even 'if it were to gain the whole world to Christ' (such people as Erasmus, he might have conceded). Nonsense. We whip children to educate them – an observation to be approvingly quoted by William Strachey in 1612.[83] And 'what wrong I pray you did the apostles in going about to alter the law of nations, even against the express commandment of the prince, and set up the throne of Christ?' Some argue that Virginia 'is possessed by owners that rule and govern it in their own right; then with what conscience and equity can we offer to thrust them, by violence, out of their inheritance?'[84] In his own exposition of true conscience and equity, Symonds developed his commendation of 'the strong title of the sword', a title 'magnified by historians, politicians and civilians'; albeit to the loathed objectors no more than 'a spider's web, or the hatching of a cockatrice his egg'. History shows us many admirable 'conquering and subduing nations'.[85] We look at Assyria, Persia, Greece and Rome. More important, we consult the stories of the Old Testament – true histories. Did not God approve of Cyrus, Jacob, Joseph, David, Solomon and Joshua?[86] (Joshua, as we have seen in Chapter 5, was regarded as an honorary member of the Virginia Company.)

Gray was especially at home in the Old Testament. His basic dogma was that every 'example' approved in the Bible was a 'precept':[87] that is, a rule of action for 1609 (a much discussed – and disallowed – conception of the interpretation of scripture). Joshua told

[82] Symonds, 13-14.
[83] *Virginia Britania*, 24.
[84] Symonds, 10.
[85] 11. [86] 13.
[87] See above, pp. 98, 113-15. Below, 365-72.

his people to 'enlarge their territories and dilate their borders by destroying God's enemies'.[88] Thus 'the children of Joshua' have an 'express commandment' to 'destroy those idolators and possess their land'.[89]

As every example in the scripture, as I said, is a precept, we are warranted by this direction of Joshua to destroy wilful and convicted idolators rather than let them live, if by no other means they can be reclaimed.[90]

Also, David 'doth promise a blessing to those that shall take the children of the idolatrous Babylonians and dash them against the stones'. Thus there is a firm direction for all Christians: 'they that have taken arms against such a people are said to fight the Lord's battles.'[91]

The tradition of Christian thought, Gray claimed, is firm on this point. All true writers on affairs of state

do with one consent hold and maintain that a Christian king may lawfully make war upon a barbarous and savage people, and such as live under no lawful or warrantable government, and may make a conquest of them, so that the war be undertaken to this end, to reclaim and reduce those savages from their barbarous kinds of life and from their brutish manners to humanity, piety and honesty.

St Augustine wrote that war was warranted if undertaken in the interests of peace, and for the suppression of 'lewd and wicked men'. Augustine, had he been resident in London in 1609, would confirm that 'we might lawfully make war upon the savages of Virginia'.[92]

Milton, in his *History of Britain* (published 1671) was to reflect on 'the necessity of war and dominion'.[93] There are 'wasting and ruining wars', pursued by 'greedy and violent men', 'wild beasts and destroyers' compelled by 'ambition and the love of rapine'. But war can be used 'not to destroy but to prevent destruction, to bring in liberty against tyrants, law and civility among barbarous nations' – by the Miltonic hero of 'just and true valour': with 'recourse to the aid of Eloquence'.

Gray reminded his congregation of the reports that the Indian was 'by nature loving and gentle'. Also, that he was 'desirous to embrace a better condition'. Desirous, that is, of conversion: 'Oh how happy were that man that could reduce this people from brutishness to civility, to religion, to Christianity, to the saving of their souls.'[94] The English should emulate Columbus, adept at winning over the Indian. They must 'first try all means before weapons': 'weapons should always be the last means.' If the sword is resorted to, it must not be because of 'ambition, or greediness, or gain, or cruelty, or any private respect whatsoever'; but because of 'necessity of preserving our own

[88] C.1.r. [89] C.3.r. [90] C.2.r. [91] G.1.r-v. [92] C.4.r-v.
[93] Beginning of Book II, ed. French Fogle, Yale, 1971, 40.
[94] Gray, C.2.v.

lives' against 'the enemies of God'. Bloody cruelty is always to be eschewed.[95] The object of any use of force must be to bring the Indian

to a civil and Christian kind of government, under which they may learn how to live holily, justly and soberly in this world, and to apprehend the means to save their soul in the world to come, rather than to destroy them or utterly to root them out. For a wise man, but much more a Christian, ought to try all means before they undertake war. Devastation and depopulation ought to be the last thing which Christians should put in practice.[96]

By nature the Indian may be loving and gentle. By fact he is 'barbarous and savage'. Gray comments on colonists' literature available in 1609:[97]

The report goeth that in Virginia the people are savage and incredibly rude; they worship the devil, offer their young children in sacrifice unto him, wander up and down like beasts, and in manners and conditions differ very little from beasts, having no art, nor science, nor trade to employ themselves or give themselves unto.

Such a negative view of the American Indian was to appeal to Thomas Hobbes, who used the example of the Indian on three occasions. In noting the disadvantages of a state of perpetual war he pointed out that 'they in America are examples hereof, even in the present age', with an existence 'fierce, short-lived, poor, nasty, and deprived of all that pleasure and beauty of life which peace and society are wont to bring with them'.[98] No *douceur de vivre*. In *Leviathan* (published 1651) Hobbes argued that for the study of philosophy it is necessary to have both leisure and a sophisticated method. 'The savages of America are not without some good moral sentences; also they have a little arithmetic, to add and divide in numbers not too great: but they are not, therefore, philosophers'.[99] The most familiar section of *Leviathan* is that in which Hobbes portrayed the 'natural condition of mankind' as 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short': a 'condition of war'.[100]

It may peradventure be thought, there never was such a time, nor condition of war as this; and I believe it was never generally so, over the world: but there are many places, where they live so generally now. For the savage people in many places of America, except the government of small families, the concord whereof dependeth on natural lust, have no government at all; and live at this day in that brutish manner.

The 'brutish manner' is a series of negatives: no 'industry', 'culture of the earth', 'navigation', 'commodious building', 'instruments of

[95] C.3.r. [96] C.2.r. [97] C.2.v.
[98] Hobbes, 'Philosophical Rudiments', *English Works*, ed. W. Molesworth, II, 12.
[99] *Leviathan*, IV, 46.
[100] I, 13.

included whipping, public penance in the church, and a period of service in the boats. There were heavy penalties for blasphemy (beginning with a bodkin through the tongue; and, finally death). The death penalty was to be imposed for murder; sodomy ('horrible and detestable'); adultery; rape of 'woman, maid or Indian'; perjury; embezzlement; robbery; treason – and for soldiers offending or ill-treating the Indian (by setting fire to an Indian house, for example).[40]

Alderman Robert Johnson, writing in 1612, praised the laws of 1610 forbidding 'injurious violence against the Indian'.[41]

Military rules, really, for a beleagured and slack settlement. Every settler was to

> give up an account of his and their faith and religion, and repair unto the minister, that by his conference with them, he may understand and gather whether heretofore they have been sufficiently instructed and catchised in the principles and grounds of religion.[42]

Henry VIII had made it clear in 1530[43] that there should be in England

> unity and agreement in one persuasion of faith and religion, the dissension wherein, as being ground and fundament, moveth, confoundeth and totally subverteth all the rest.

The community 'faith' was the 'fundament'; the basic foundation of any commonwealth, Catholic, Protestant or Puritan, especially, the Virginia Company had come to realise, of a commonwealth on the frontier. John Smith was to write in 1630 of the dangers of 'factions in religion', 'divisions and opinions', to a 'well settled commonwealth' – which should have 'one religion'; that is, acknowledge 'the prime authority of the Church of England'.[44]

In 1611 all this was confirmed as suitable for 'select, painful and religious adventures';[45] and other requirements were added. The captains of the watch were to recite every morning and evening the text of a prayer which would have taken twenty minutes to read.[46] It acknowledged that God has 'honoured us to choose us out to bear Thy name unto the gentiles', the 'highest end of our plantation' being 'to set up the standard and display the banner of Jesus Christ, even here where Satan's throne is Lord'. The Indian must never have occasion to comment, 'Where is now your God?' Let

> Dagon fall before Your ark, let Satan be confounded in Thy presence, and let the heathen see it and be ashamed, that they might seek Thy face; for their God is not as our God ... As the smoke vanisheth, so let Satan and his

[40] 12.
[41] *The New Life of Virginia*. Force, *Tracts*, I, no. 7, p. 13.
[42] 17.
[43] May 1530. Quoted in Cooper, *Annals of Cambridge*, I, 342.
[44] Smith-Arber, 959-60.
[45] 29. [46] 63-8.

> delusions come to naught, and as wax melteth before the fire, so let wickedness, superstition, ignorance and idolatry perish at the presence of Thee our God ... Lord, bless England, our sweet native country; save it from popery, this land from heathenism, and both from atheism.

Such were the 'religious' fundamentals for 'the first seed-plot and settlement of such a temporary kingdom and state as may reduce and bring poor misbelieving miscreants to the knowledge of the eternal kingdom of God'.[47]

Ten years later one of the charges against the reign of Sir Thomas Smythe as Treasurer of the Virginia Company was that he 'suffered a Book of Laws for government of the Colony chiefly extracted out of the Laws for governing the army in the Low Countries'. (This derivation is doubtful.)[48]

When Gates left London for Virginia in May 1609 he had carried instructions from the London Council of the Virginia Company,[49] to be observed when he arrived at Jamestown (in the event, May 1610). He was to endeavour the conversion of the Indians, 'which the better to effect you must procure from them some convenient number of their children to be brought up in your language and manners'. This could be done by force, by taking them prisoner, in order to remove them from the baleful influence of the Priests. For the Indians are 'so wrapped up in the fog and misery' of priestly 'iniquity', and

> so terrified with their continual tyranny, chained under the bond of death unto the Devil, that while they live among them to poison and infect them their minds, you shall never make any great progress in this glorious work, nor have any civil peace or concur with them.

The opinion, we have seen, of Gates' fellow voyager William Strachey. The English could deal 'sharply' with the Priests, and 'proceed even to death' – in case of 'necessity or conveniency'. The Virginia Company Council 'pronounce it not cruelty or breach of charity'; while 'referring the consideration of this, as a weighty matter, of important consequence, to the circumstances of the business and place, in your discretion'.[50] The werowances, on the other hand, should be well treated, and their sons educated in English 'manners and religion' – thus in time becoming 'civil and Christian'. But Powhatan was 'no way' to be trusted: 'it is clear even to reason, besides our experience, that he loved not our neighbourhood.' It may not be wise to take him prisoner; but he must become a 'tributary', acknowledging 'no other lord but King James'.[51]

In civil cases, Gates was instructed not to emphasise too much 'the niceness and letter of the law'; to act 'rather as a chancellor than as a

[47] 42.
[48] Kingsbury (ed.), *Records*, IV, 83 (1623). See Andrews, *Colonial Period*, I, 115.
[49] Kingsbury (ed.), *Records*, III, 12-24.
[50] 14-15. [51] 18-19.

for three years. He now elected to 'abide in my vocation here until I be lawfully called from hence'.[92] As things turned out, he was now at the halfway mark of his ministry. In his letter to William Gouge in 1614, Whitaker gave a glimpse of the routine of his 'preaching ministry' at Henrico. (William was the son of Thomas Gouge, shareholder in the Virginia Company, and Elizabeth Culverwell Gouge, the sister of Alexander's mother.)

> Every Sabbath day we preach in the forenoon, and catechise in the afternoon. Every Saturday at night I exercise in Sir Thomas Dale's house. Our church affairs be consulted upon by the minister and four of the religious men. Once every month we have a communion; and once a year a solemn Fast.

This passage was printed in 1615 (page 60) in the second issue of Ralph Hamor's *A True Discourse of the Present Estate of Virginia*: it had not been in the first. (The 1860 reprint published at Albany, N.Y., is of the second issue; the 1957 facsimile edition – Virginia State Library Publications No. 3, Richmond, Va. – is of the first.) This spiritual routine was really 'according to the constitutions of the Church of England in all fundamental points'; with a marked bias in the 'puritan' direction. (So marked, perhaps, as to have made desirable Whitaker's departure from Yorkshire.) By the Canons of 1604 (LIX) the minister had to 'catechise' every Sunday for thirty minutes before evening prayer; that is, to instruct the 'youth and ignorant persons' in the Commandments, the Creed, and the Catechism contained in the book of Common Prayer, so Whitaker was orthodox there, although one imagines his instruction was not so confined by the Liturgy. There were various 'catechisms' in more or less official circulation in England, including one already mentioned, by Alexander's great-uncle Alexander Nowell. In 1622 someone presented the Quarter Court of the Virginia Company in London with the Catechism of Zacharias Ursinus, to be sent to the colony.[93] The Prayer Book catechism had the advantage of brevity. To preach every Sunday was hardly customary among the majority of incumbents in England, and Authority was slightly suspicious of over-sermonising; but the 'godly pastors' had always tried to do so. Monthly communion was the practice of Calvin at Geneva. By the 1604 Canons, the laity were bound to receive communion three times a year at least (XXI,XXII) – except at the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge, the requirement for all members thereof being at least four times (XXIII). But the Canons had the ideal of 'oftentimes receiving the communion' (XIII); and the communion service was to be celebrated every month at Oxford and Cambridge Colleges (XXIII). (The 'pilgrim' church at Leiden from 1609 celebrated the Lord's Supper every Sunday; a practice they were unable to follow at first in New Plymouth, as there

[92] Hamor, *True Discourse*, 60-1.
[93] Kingsbury, *Records*, I, 589.

was no cleric on the 'Mayflower.') Canon LXXII recognised 'solemn fasts' (and 'fasting days' were in the calendar: LXIV); but such were to be held only at 'the license and direction' of the Bishop. Also, only the Bishop could authorise 'prophecies or exercises' (put on a level with exorcisms): LXXII. Such 'prophesyings' – meetings to discuss scripture – were banned in the Province of Canterbury from the 1570s, because of the danger of lay participation; but they continued in the North. So Whitaker's routine in Henrico was very like that of his Yorkshire parish: the 'exercise' in Henrico was a prayer and study meeting with his parishioners – a feature again of English 'puritan' pastors, on the fringes of illegality, perhaps.

The four 'religious men' spring from Gates' 1610 requirements. To some readers in England they would seem suspiciously like 'elders', as in the Church of Scotland. One thinks also of the four Elders whom the Reverend Lewis Hughes of Bermuda was to institute as part of his church government in 1617, in the convenient absence of the Governor:

> I have, by the help of God, begun a church government by Minister and Elders. I have made bold to choose four Elders for the town publicly, by lifting up of hands, and calling upon God, when the Governor was out of the town.[94]

Hughes was a Welshman, twenty-four years older than Whitaker, who had gone up to Jesus College Oxford in 1582. The 'precedent' for his action was the presbyterian form of government allowed by Elizabeth I in the Channel Islands.

Virginia was, by necessity (and perhaps even from conviction) a community in which the laity played a greater part than in England. Whitaker's four 'religious' laymen are a hint of the development of the lay Vestry (the governing body of the parish) in Virginia from the 1630s.[95]

Compulsion was greater than in England; again, the feel of the military garrison on the frontier. In 1618 it was to be decreed in Virginia that a settler who missed attendance at church on Sunday was to be imprisoned for one night and made 'a slave the week following' (there were as yet no negroes in Virginia: the equation of black skin and slave status is a later development). For a second offence, the transgressor was to be a slave for a month; and after the third, for a year and a day.[96] But, as the General Assembly at Jamestown confirmed in 1619, all was to be 'according to the ecclesiastical laws and orders of the Church of England'.[97]

[94] Manchester Papers, Historical Manuscripts Commission, 8th Report, Appendix, part II, 1881, p. 32. For Hughes and puritanism in Bermuda see Andrews, I, 229-35; W.F. Craven, *William and Mary Quarterly*, January 1937.
[95] Brydon, *Virginia's Mother Church*, 90-102.
[96] Kingsbury, *Records*, III, 93.
[97] *Ibid.*, 172.

Assembly on 30 July 1619;[28] the seizure by English parties of canoes and corn. The offending Captain was rebuked.

In 1619 the whole question of relations with the Indians seemed to be in an uncertain and tricky state.

The November 1619 letter of Yeardley and the Jamestown Council also reported a request from Opechancanough,[29] relayed by Nenemettanan (whom the English called 'English Jack', 'Jack of the Feathers'). Opechancanough wished to revenge himself on an Indian tribe for 'murdering certain women of his country, contrary to the Law of Nations'; and wanted ten English soldiers to help him. He would provide Indian shoes; his warriors would carry the Englishmen's armour; and the Indians and the English between them would agree to 'share all the booty of male and female children, of corn and other things; and to divide the conquered land into two equal parts between us and them'. This was an offer which Jamestown could not refuse. The campaign was 'lawful and well grounded'; the help required was small, 'and not of consequence enough for Opechancanough to put any treacherous disaster upon'. It would oblige him, at a difficult time. And English aid might, 'at least for the present',

win amity and confidence from Opitchapan the great king; from Opechancanough his brother; and likewise from their subjects of these three rivers of Roanoke, Powhatan (James) and Pamunkey (York).

It was also thought that

the children taken in their war might in time serve as well for private uses of particular persons as to furnish the intended college; this being a fair opportunity for the advancement of this blessed work, seeing those Indians are in no sort willing to sell or, by fair means, to part with their children.

By 1619 the question of educating the Indian – and of education in general in Virginia – was exercising the mind of the Virginia Company in London.

By one of the ironies – perhaps the most trenchant irony – in American history, the same month which saw the prorogation of the General Assembly at Jamestown (the traditions of Westminster transplanted to Virginia) saw also the arrival of the first negroes. (Nothing is known of the fate of the negroes – possibly three hundred or more – who were in Drake's fleet when he arrived off Roanoke in June 1586: some may have been put ashore, in what is now North Carolina, but there is no evidence for this.)[30] The Assembly ended on 4 August 1619. At 'the latter end of August' a Dutch vessel arrived in Chesapeake Bay from the West Indies. The captain, wrote Rolfe in his

[28] Kingsbury, *Records*, III, 152.
[29] *Ibid.*, 228.
[30] Quinn, *England and Discovery of America*, 433-4.

1620 letter to Sandys, 'brought not anything but twenty and odd negroes'. He needed provisions. And Yeardley, at 'the best and easiest rate' possible, 'bought' the negroes for 'victuals'.[31] By 1625 there were 23 negro 'servants' in Virginia. (There were also 487 white 'servants' and 2 Indian 'servants'; most of them in the service of 48 families.)[32]

It was not without significance for the development of North America that John Smith, in a book published at London in June 1616,[33] had drawn a distinction between the 'poor savages' of Virginia and New England, and the 'black brutish Negers' of Africa.

[31] Kingsbury, III, 243. For a critical assessment of Rolfe's information, Craven, *White, Red, and Black*, 1971, 77-81.
[32] Sigmund Diamond, *American Journal of Sociology*, March 1958 (XLIII, 5), 472.
[33] *Description of New England*, Smith-Arber, 191. In 1630 Smith wrote about Negroes: 'as idle and devilish people as any in the world', and yet in Spanish America the 'best servants' (Smith-Arber, 955). Milton in 1641 imagined the damned in Hell providing for the Prelates a 'raving and bestial tyranny', treating them as 'their slaves and negroes' (*Of Reformation in England*, final paragraph). In 1599 George Abbot described the natives of the Zona Torrida as 'not only blackish, like the Moors', but 'exceedingly black'. Varenius, 'named Negroes, as them whom no men are blacker' (*Briefe Description of the whole World*; 'De Reliquis Africae regionibus maritimis'). See further, Jones, *Elizabethan Image of Africa*, 1971; Jordan, *White Over Black*, 1968.

Samoset also said that the Indian name for Plymouth was Patuxet, and that 'about four years ago all the inhabitants died of an extraordinary plague, and there is neither man, woman nor child remaining'. This is the first reference to the pestilence of (about) 1617 which destroyed the Indians of the Plymouth area. Bradford wrote of the 'wasting plague', the 'late great mortality'.[46] The Indians 'not being able to bury one another, their skulls and bones were found in many places lying still above the ground where their houses and dwellings had been; a very sad spectacle to behold'. John Smith observed in 1622 that where, in 1614, he had seen one hundred or two hundred Indians, it appeared that now 'there is scarce ten to be found'.[47] Thomas Morton, who was to arrive in the region in 1625, described the Indian skulls and bones he saw in the 'forest near the Massachusetts': 'it seemed to me a new-found Golgotha.'[48] To Smith and to Thomas Morton this was the work of Providence. The paucity of Indians, wrote Morton, makes New England 'so much the more fit for the English nation to inhabit in, and erect in it temples to the glory of God'. Smith reported that 'God had laid open this country for us, and slain the most part of the inhabitants by cruel wars and a mortal disease'. Smith was here retailing the sentiments of the men of Plymouth. Nathaniel Morton, who went to Plymouth, a boy of ten, in 1623, was to make much of the theme in 1669, in *New England's Memoriall*. His mother's sister married the widowed Bradford at Plymouth. Nathaniel's book, as we have noted, was based on his uncle's manuscript History; but Nathaniel was more addicted to the pointing of Biblical morals (and much harsher to the Indian). Nathaniel refered to Exodus 23, verses 28 and 30:[49]

> I will send hornets before thee which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite and the Hittite from before thee. By little and little I will drive them out before thee, until thou be increased and inherit the land.

He was also fond of verse 8 of Psalm 80: 'Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt: thou hast cast out the heathen and planted it.' Thus at Plymouth 'God made way for His people, by removing the heathen, and planting them in the land.'[50] God's bounty was not confined to Plymouth, but embraced the whole of New England:[51]

> God hath very evidently made way for the English, by sweeping away the natives by some great mortalities; as first, by the plague here in Plymouth jurisdiction; secondly by the smallpox in the jurisdiction of the Massachusetts, a very considerable people a little before the English came into the country, as also at Connecticut.

[46] *Ibid.*, 87.
[47] *New England's Trials*, 1622. Everyman *Chronicles*, 251.
[48] *New English Canaan*. Force, *Tracts*, II, no.5, p.19.
[49] Everyman *Chronicles*, 43.
[50] *Ibid.*, 36. [51] *Ibid.*, 43.

All part of God's marvellous works in the beginning and planting of New England.

It appears that in 1620 there were no more than 18,000 Indians in New England. The Narragansetts of Rhode Island, untouched by the pestilence, numbered about 4,000. The Wampanoag and the Massachusetts had been reduced to about 500. (The Powhatan Confederacy in Virginia may have been about 11,000; the Cherokee of Georgia about 22,000. It was once thought that there were less than 1,000,000 Indians in North America by the sixteenth century. Recent work tends considerably to expand that figure. A recent estimate (1966) is between 9,800,000 and 12,250,000.)[52]

At the practical level, Samoset's account of the plague made clear to the planters of Plymouth in March 1621 that 'there is none to hinder our possession, or to lay claim unto it'.[53] (In any case, the Plymouth area had probably been used only as a game reserve.)

Samoset left Plymouth on the morning of Saturday 17 March. He was given a knife, a bracelet and a ring. On the Sunday he reappeared, with 'five other tall, proper men'.[54] They wore deer skins. And

> they had most of them long hosen up to their groins, close made; and above their groins to their waist another leather; they were altogether like the Irish trouses. They are of complexion like our English gypsies; no hair, or very little, on their faces; on their heads long hair to their shoulders, only cut before; some trussed up before with a feather (broad-wise, like a fan), another a fox tail hanging out.

They had left the bows and arrows a quarter of a mile away (an arrangement the planters had made with Samoset). They were entertained, ate English food, 'sang and danced after their manner, like Anticks', and 'made semblance unto us of friendship and amity'. Some had their faces painted black from the forehead to the chin, in strokes three inches broad. They were quickly dismissed, 'because of the day'. On the following Wednesday two or three Indians approached, and 'made semblance of daring us, as we thought'.[55] Standish was dispatched with his musket. The Indians 'whetted and rubbed their arrows and strings, and made show of defiance'. But they fled when Standish approached.

The planters regarded these Indian visits as tiresome interruptions to the work of drawing up laws and orders, and of digging, and sowing seed.[56]

At noon on Thursday 22 March, 'a very fair warm day', the

[52] On Indian demography before Columbus, see Wilbur R. Jacobs in *William and Mary Quarterly*, January 1974 (Series 3, vol.XXXI, no.1, pp.123-32). It is fashionable among recent American scholars to give the highest possible estimates of Indian numbers before the arrival of the Europeans. The subsequent decline in numbers is thus greater, and the European 'conquest' the more pernicious.
[53] *Ibid.*, 58. [54] *Ibid.*, 59. [55] *Ibid.*, 60. [56] *Ibid.*

perceived some treachery intended to them by these hellhounds) to look to himself – and withal ran away for fear of the mischief he strongly apprehended and so saved his own life – yet his master, out of the conscience of his own good meaning and fair deserts ever towards them, was so void of all suspicion, and so full of confidence, that they had sooner killed him than he could or would believe they meant any ill against him.

For Waterhouse, Thorpe had been 'too kind and beneficial'. And in his story of the Indian fear of English mastiffs,[16] 'implacable and terrible unto them', he comments approvingly on the canine implacability: 'knowing them by instinct, it seems, to be but treacherous and false-hearted friends to us, better than ourselves.' His portrait of Thorpe, quoted in the preceding chapter, is thus, in intention, a warning.

Waterhouse records no deaths at Jamestown or Elizabeth City. It was the plantations, hundreds and farms down the River which suffered; such as Captain Berkeley's plantation, nearly seventy miles from Jamestown, towards Richmond – the furthest of the frontier outposts. The college lands were almost as far; and seventeen of the 'college people' were killed.[17] In all, there were nearly eighty English settlements along the James.

The 'greatest cause' of the massacre, Waterhouse suggested to be the colonists' 'desire to draw those people to religion by the careless neglect of their own safeties'. The 'hearts' of the English were 'ever stupid'; 'averted from believing anything that might weaken their hopes of speedy winning the savages to civility and religion by kind usage and fair conversing among them.' Waterhouse, a High Calvinist lawyer, was suspicious of facile conversion. We have quoted his description of Indian conversion as 'that great masterpiece of works' – a contemptuous description: Faith, not Works, is alone sufficient. The Deity, after all is inscrutable, and not bound by the laws of nature: He will effect the conversion of the Indian 'in His good time, and by such means as we think most unlikely'.[18]

Waterhouse was as shocked by the killing of the 347 English along the James in 1622 as modern readers are assumed to be by the murder of 153 Indians at Wounded Knee, South Dakota, in 1890. (Waterhouse's *Relation*, unlike Mr Dee Brown's 1971 *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee*, was addressed to a reading public innocent of the Book-of-the-Month Club, the Popular Science Book Club, and the Playboy Book Club.) Waterhouse was urgently concerned to reveal 'the bloody and barbarous hands of that perfidious and inhumane people'.[19] The Indians are a 'viperous brood', 'wicked infidels', 'hell hounds', 'treacherous and false hearted'. Venereal disease was 'the Indian disease'.[20] Columbus used 'fair usage' to the Indian. Like Thorpe, he was deceived. Waterhouse recommends us to read Oviedo's judgment

[16] 552
[17] List of the dead, 565-71
[18] 553-4 [19] 551 [20] 560

on the Indians of the West Indies, 'that you may compare and see in what, and how far, it agrees with that of the natives of Virginia'.[21]

They are (saith he) by nature slothful and idle, vicious, melancholy, slovenly, of bad conditions, liars, of small memory, of no constancy or trust. In another place he saith, The Indian is by nature of all people the most lying and most inconstant in the world, sottish and sudden; never looking what dangers may happen afterwards; less capable than children of six or seven years old, and less apt and ingenious. This is the general disposition of most of them, though there be some (says he) that be wise and subtle.

Thus 'savages and pagans are, above all other, for matter of justice ever to be suspected'.[22]

But the loss of blood in Virginia can be beneficial: it can 'make the body more healthful'. For 'betraying of innocency never rests unpunished'. We now have the right to punish: 'our hands which before were tied with gentleness and fair usage are now set at liberty by the treacherous violence of the savages: not untying the knot, but cutting it.'[23] The 'fault is on their sides, not on ours, who have used so fair a carriage; even to our own destruction'.[24] So we can claim for Virginia more men and more munitions. The Indians 'who before we used as friends may now most justly be compelled to servitude and drudgery'. The meanest settlers can

employ themselves more entirely in their arts and occupations, which are more generous, whilst savages perform their inferior works of digging in mines, and the like; of whom also some may be sent for the service of the Sommer Islands.[25]

Waterhouse writes in terms of Conquest and Invasion. We may now

by right of war, and law of Nations, invade the country; and destroy them who sought to destroy us. Whereby we shall enjoy their cultivated places, turning the laborious mattock into the victorious sword (wherein there is more both ease, benefit and glory) and possessing the fruits of others' labours. Now their cleared grounds in all their villages (which are situated in the fruitfullest places of the land) shall be inhabited by us; whereas heretofore the grubbing of woods was the greatest labour.

Virginia will be more abundant; for the Indian used to kill the deer, the turkey and the hen – and we can 'orderly' use their fishing weirs.[26] Moreover –

the way of conquering them is much more easy than of civilising them by fair means, for they are a rude, barbarous and naked people, scattered in small companies, which are helps to Victory, but hindrances to Civility. Besides that, a conquest may be of many, and at once. But Civility is in particular,

[21] 562. [22] 559. [23] 559. [24] 559. [25] 558-9. [26] 557.

and slow, the effect of long time and great industry. Moreover, victory of them may be gained many ways: by force; by surprise; by famine in burning their corn; by destroying and burning their boats, canoes and houses; by breaking their fishing weirs; by assailing them in their huntings, whereby they get the greatest part of their sustenance in winter; by pursuing and chasing them with our horses, and bloodhounds to draw after them, and mastiffs to tear them, which take this naked, tanned, deformed savages for no other than wild beasts, and are so fierce and fell upon them, that they fear them worse than their old Devil they worship, supposing them to be a new and worse kind of Devil than their own. By these and sundry other ways, as by driving them (when they fly) upon their enemies who are round about them, and by animating and abetting their enemies against them, may their ruin or subjection be soon effected.

Take advantage of enmities and quarrels amongst the Indians themselves. It is the 'maxim of the politician': Divide and Conquer. Thus the Romans overcame Britain, Pizarro became master of Peru, and Cortez gained Mexico.[27]

The first reaction of the Virginia Company in London to the massacre was a letter dated 1 August 1622 to Wyatt and the Virginia Council from Sandys and the Council for Virginia in London.[28] The letter was critical of the administration in Jamestown: 'surprised by treachery in a time of known danger'; 'deaf to so plain a warning as (we now too late understand) was last year given';[29]

not to perceive anything in so open and general conspiracy, but to be made in part instruments of contriving it, and almost guilty of the destruction by a blindfold and stupid entertaining of it, which the least wisdom or courage sufficed to prevent, even on the point of execution.

(An occasion of Opechancanough's 'great suspicion and jealousy' had been the death on 6 March of Nenemettanan, shot in error by two English boys: Nenemettanan, 'Jack of the Feathers', had been for six years a friendly intermediary between the English and the Indians, and an acquaintance of Thorpe.)[30] So the massacre was a punishment of God upon the colonists: in particular for

those two enormous excesses of apparel and drinking, the cry whereof cannot but have gone up to heaven, since the infamy hath spread itself to all that have but heard the name of Virginia, to the detestation of all good minds, the scorn of others, and our extreme grief and shame. In the strength of those faults, undoubtedly, and the neglect of the divine worship, have the Indians prevailed.[31]

So what to do now? 'You have conquered Sparta, now adorn it.' The Company is sending out more arms, and four hundred young

[27] 557-8. [28] 666-73. [29] 666.
[30] Barbour, *Pocahontas*, 205.
[31] 666.

men: 'the multitude of people is the strength of a kingdom.' One obvious fault in Virginia had been the 'inordinate straggling' of the settlements:[32]

We think it fit that the houses and buildings be so contrived together as may make, if not handsome towns, yet compact and orderly villages; that this is the most proper and succesful manner of proceeding in new plantations.

Charles City, Henrico, the iron works and the college land must be replanted; and the new settlers can replenish the ranks of 'the college tenants, and those belonging to the iron works' (the iron works to be under the supervision of Maurice Berkeley).[33] The 'college affairs' are especially pressing, 'not only as a public, but a sacred business'. (We remember that in July 1622, before London had heard of the massacre, Copland had been named Rector of 'the intended college for the conversion of the infidels'.)[34] There must be 'building of convenient houses, planting of orchards, gardens, etc, on the college land'.

As for the brick-makers, we desire they may be held to their contract made with Mr Thorpe, to the intent that when opportunity shall be for the erecting of the fabric of the college, the materials be not wanting.[35]

The Virginia Company has 'zealously affected' the saving of Indian souls. But now: 'we cannot but, with much grief, proceed to the condemnation of their bodies.' The 'innocent blood of so many Christians doth in justice cry out for revenge'. Thus –

we must advise you to root out from being any longer a people, so cursed a nation, ungrateful to all benefits and uncapable of all goodness. At least to the removal of them so far from you, as you may not only be out of danger, but out of fear of them, of whose faith and good meaning you can never be secure. Wherefore, as they have merited, let them have a perpetual war without peace or truce. And although they have deserved it without mercy too, yet remembering who we are rather than what they have been, we cannot but advise not only the sparing, but the preservation, of the younger people of both sexes; whose bodies may by labour and service become profitable, and their minds, not overgrown with evil customs, be reduced to Civility, and afterwards to Christianity.

So burn their corn; provoke their enemies; maintain

continually certain bands of men of able bodies, and inured to the country, of stout minds and active hands, that may from time to time, in severed bodies, pursue and follow them, surprising them in their habitations, intercepting them in their hunting, burning their towns, demolishing their temples, destroying their canoes, plucking up their weirs, carrying away their corn,

[32] 669. [33] 670. [34] Kingsbury, II, 91.
[35] Kingsbury, III, 671.

and depriving them of whatsoever may yield them succour or relief. By which means, in a very short while both your just revenge and your perpetual security might be certainly effected.[36]

Anyone taking Opechancanough prisoner will have 'a great and singular reward from us'. As for the Indians 'whom God used as instruments of revealing, and preventing the total ruin of you all' – they can best be thanked by 'a good and careful education', 'whereby they may be made capable of further benefits and favours'.[37]

No ship had been able to leave Jamestown until about a month after the massacre. The letter to London carried by that vessel, from Wyatt and the Jamestown Council,[38] acknowledged receipt of letters of late November and early December 1621, which had not arrived in Jamestown until the middle of April: eighteen weeks. The last letter from Jamestown had left in January 1622. Since when

it hath pleased God for our manifold sins to lay a most lamentable affliction upon this plantation by the treachery of the Indians; who on the 22nd of March last attempted in most places, under the colour of unsuspected amity, in some by surprise, to have cut us off all, and to have swept us away at once throughout the whole land; had it not pleased God of His abundant mercy to prevent them in many places, for which we can never sufficiently magnify His blessed name. But yet they prevailed so far that they have massacred in all parts above three hundred men, women and children; and have since not only spoiled and slain divers of our cattle, and some more of our people, and burnt most of the houses we have forsaken, but also have enforced us to quit many of our plantations, and to unite more nearly together in fewer places, the better for to strengthen and defend ourselves against them.[39]

(This was to breed disease. Epidemics followed the massacre. The population by 1624 was just over 1,000, in spite of the new settlers sent across in 1622 and 1623. In all, nearly 8,000 colonists crossed to Virginia between 1607 and 1624: in the three years 1620 and 1622, 3,000 immigrants died.[40] The shipboard diseases – cholera, dysentery, typhoid fever – exacerbated the fevers, the respiratory disorders and the dietary deficiences which were prevalent in the plantations, perhaps more lethal than malaria.)[41]

After the massacre, most of the cattle had been brought to Jamestown, 'the island being the securest place for them which we hold in all the River'. All settlements had been abandoned except seven: Jamestown; the plantations on the other side of the river from Jamestown; Kecoughtan; Newport Mews; Southampton Hundred; Flowerdie Hundred; and two other plantations. The 'frontier' had contracted. What the colony really needed – and had always needed – was a really 'defensible' settlement site.[42] The more so now:

[36] 672. [37] 673. [38] 611-15. [39] 612.
[40] Kingsbury, IV, 525; III, 537.
[41] Pomfret, *Founding the Colonies*, 42.
[42] Kingsbury, III, 612.

since this late woeful experience hath taught us that our first and principal care should have been for our safety, by the neglect whereof the plantation, though it hath seemed to go in a hopeful and flourishing course, yet hath all this while gone but so much out of the way.

Wyatt intended to find such a site during the summer. Another danger was 'extreme famine'. We need corn: 'to feed so many mouths as are here, two third parts whereof are women, children and unserviceable people.'[43] The season for planting corn was almost lost; the colonists must give priority to defence.

Neither can we now plant corn in so many places as we could wish, especially near our houses, by reason it spreadeth all over the ground like a thick grove, that the Indians may hide themselves therein, who will from time to time peck out many of our people whilst they are about their weeding and dressing thereof; and we have great reason to doubt, since they have heretofore practised the like, that where we do plant any corn they will either cut it down, or destroy it in summer before it be ripe, or by stealth share with us at harvest.

We can get corn from friendly Indians by trade, or from enemies by force: both methods are 'uncertain and hazardous'. There is also a lack of weapons; a third of the able-bodied men have none. Fortification engineers are needed; and spades, shovels, and pickaxes. We can repay with 'very good tobacco'.[44]

A very practical letter; of distress, but not despair. In reply to the criticisms from London, the Jamestown Council was to admit[45] that the settlers had been too optimistic in 'security': the result of 'the Indians coming daily amongst us, and putting themselves into our powers'. Otherwise Jamestown was stung by the 'disgraceful reproofs'. Would it were not that 'the covetousness of some at home did not minister swell to our drunkenness here, filling the country with wine not only in quantity excessive but in quality base and infectious'. For apparel, 'we know no excess, but in the Purists'.

On 7 May 1622, eleven weeks after the massacre, Wyatt authorised Ralph Hamor in Jamestown to voyage in Chesapeake Bay in 'The Tiger' and 'trade with the Indians for corn';[46] and 'in case he can get no trade with them, or not such as he expecteth, then it shall be lawful to take it from them, if he be able, by force.' Later in the year Hamor was similarly authorised to sail down the Potomac River in 'The Tiger'.[47] The Potomac tribe were traditional allies of the English (in the sense that they were enemies of the Pamunkey tribe). Nevertheless, Hamor was instructed to make a decision

either in the setting free of the king of Potomac and his son, or detaining and

[43] 613. [44] 614.
[45] Kingsbury, IV, 11 January 1623.
[46] Kingsbury, III, 622.
[47] 607.

keeping them or any other Indians prisoners, as occasion shall be offered, and them or more in bringing to James City.

In fact the Potomac king and his son were brought to Jamestown. And there were those colonists who were offended by this. One of the complaints has been preserved:[48]

We ourselves have taught them how to be treacherous by our false dealing with the poor king of Potomac, that had always been faithful to the English; whose people was killed, he and his son taken prisoners, brought to Jamestown, brought home again ransomed, as if had been the greatest enemy they had.

The writer was Peter Arundel. And he thought a 'just revenge' was the death in the Potomac country of Captain Henry Spelman, 'the best linguist of the Indian tongue of this country's'. In April 1623 Spelman was sent trading in 'The Tiger', with a pinnace directed by John Pountis, a member of the Jamestown Council, with over 30 armed men on board. Spelman thought danger was ahead.

He had warning of it by an Indian. He and his men coming with their armour, the king of that place asked why he came so armed. Spelman told him of his distrust, and showed him the man that gave him warning. Whereupon the king in his presence caused the fellow's head to be cut off and cast into the fire before the said Captain his face; a bad reward, to betray him that had given him so faithful a warning. But his own life paid for it; for the next day he and his men, coming ashore disarmed, thinking to trade, were all cut off by the Indians. They took Mr Pountis his shallop and hewed her to pieces; and came with sixty canoes to take the unlucky ship 'The Tiger', who had but four sailors and some few land men, who whiffed up sails, and went faster than their canoes.

Arundel lamented that 'if we had sufficient provision, we should not need to seek after the Indians'.

The English in turn had their revenge.[49] In the autumn of 1623 Wyatt

set forward to the river of Potomac to settle the trade with our friends; and to revenge the treachery of the Pascoticons and their associates, being the greatest people in those parts of Virginia, who had cut off Captain Spelman, and Mr Pountis his pinnace. In which expedition he put many to the sword, burnt their houses, with a marvellous quantity of corn carried by them in to the woods, as it was not possible to bring it to our boats.

In the autumn of 1622 Jamestown received the reproving letter from the London Council. And the policy had begun of 'setting upon the Indians in all places'.[50] Campaigns were mounted against the tribes

[48] Kingsbury, IV, 89.
[49] *ibid.*, 450.
[50] *ibid.*, 9-10.

that were confederate with Opechancanough: Yeardley against Opechancanough's seat of Pamunkey, and against the Weanoc, Nansemond and Warraskoyack; Captain John West against the Powhatan; Captain William Powell against the Chickahominy; Mr Trevor against the Topahanock – and Hamor, in his Potomac voyage, decimated the Nacotchtanke. We 'have slain divers, burnt their towns, destroyed their weirs and corn'. But it had become

most apparent that they are an enemy not suddenly to be destroyed with the sword, by reason of their swiftness of foot, and advantages of the woods, to which upon all our assaults they retire. But by the way of starving, and all other means that we can possibly devise, we will constantly pursue their extirpation. By computation, and confession of the Indians themselves, we have slain more of them this year than have been slain before since the beginning of the colony.

This news was given in a letter to Henry, Earl of Southampton, signed at Jamestown on 20 January 1623 by Wyatt and five others (including Yeardley and Hamor). The great failure has been the iron works, which must now be abandoned, so many of the workmen being slain: Maurice Berkeley is returning to England to report.[51] The men sent 'for the building of the East Indie school' (four of whom died) have for the moment been placed amongst the 'college tenants': as soon as convenient they will move to Martin's Hundred, 'according to Mr Copland's request to the Governor'.[52] The college tenants themselves,

with much difficulty, we are now about to resettle, and have engaged ourselves to supply them with corn until harvest, having strengthened them with divers of the Old Planters.[53]

The reverend William Leate had arrived in the late summer of 1622: a 'minister', said the London Council, 'recommended unto us for sufficiency of learning and integrity of life'.[54] By the end of the year he was dead; though 'the little experience we had of Mr Leate made good your commendations of him'.[55] It is uncertain how many clerics were in Virginia at the beginning of 1623. Thomas White, certainly, who had arrived at the end of 1621; Patrick Copland, Richard Buck, William Wickham and Robert Pawlett? – perhaps they were still alive.

The letter from Jamestown of January 1623 ended with an appeal to London not to

judge of us by the events of things which are ever uncertain, especially in a new plantation, nor by reports of branded people, some of whom have deservedly undergone several kinds of punishment, nor of the malicious and unknowing

[51] *ibid.*, 12, 14. [52] *ibid.*, 15. [53] *ibid.*, 16.
[54] Kingsbury, III, 657.
[55] Kingsbury, IV, 15.

Give credit, rather, to the 'public informations' from the Governor and his Council.[56]

The attitude of official Jamestown towards the Indian continued unrelenting. The spur was necessity, rather than continuous hatred. There was still 'very great want of corn', especially as, in 1623, 'our numbers do daily increase', and one must 'provide for the future'. Wyatt continued to issue instructions for captains to investigate the Bay and the Rivers, in search of corn, peas, beans, or whatever, to be obtained by

> trade, or take by force of arms, or any other ways and means, from the Indians there inhabiting, as subjects or confederates with Opechancanough, or as those who had their hands in the cruel and treacherous murdering of our people.[57]

By the early summer of 1623 some Indians were again 'resorting to private plantations, and treating with them', which occasioned a proclamation from Wyatt[58] that no one other than 'the chief commander of any plantation' shall

> hold any conference with any Indians (if at any time they shall in peaceable manner resort unto them and desire a parley) without first giving notice thereof to his Commander. And that no Commander of any plantation shall in any wise give them pledges. Whereupon if they shall stand out, to shoot or kill them by any means they can. But if they shall voluntarily come in and yield themselves unto him, then to take and keep them safely guarded, until they can give notice thereof to the Governor, or send them unto him.

No settler was to go out into the fields to work unarmed, and without armed sentries posted. Deer should not be hunted without the Commander's permission, and the hunters must be in 'sufficient parties'; the danger lay in straggling. And

> generally in all points to be very careful and watchful, to prevent their treacheries, knowing that (with God's assistance) they cannot hurt us through their strength, but of our own carelessness; being well assured that their perfidious craft is much more dangerous than open violence.

The Indians were 'base savages'.[59] And in March 1624 the General Assembly at Jamestown (the burgesses of which included Jabez Whitaker and Raleigh Crashaw) decreed[60] that from the following June 'all trade for corn with the savages, as well public as private' was prohibited (Edict 17). That (Edict 23) 'every dwelling house shall be palisaded in for defence against the Indians'. And that (Edict 32) at the beginning of July 1624 'the inhabitants of every corporation shall fall upon their adjoining savages, as we did the last year'.

The 1624 General Assembly also confirmed proclamations by Wyatt against swearing and drunkenness (churchwardens to be the

[56] *ibid.*, 17. [57] *ibid.*, 6-7. [58] *ibid.*, 167-8. [59] *ibid.*, 172. [60] *ibid.*, 580-5.

enforcing officers) (Edict 19); enacted requirements that every plantation was to have a 'house or room' set aside for worship, that those absent from Sunday service were to pay an amount in tobacco, that no 'minister' was to be absent from his cure more than eight weeks in the year, and that there should be 'an uniformity in our church, as near as may be, to the Canons in England, both in substance and circumstance' (1-5: the Canons were those of 1604). The 'Old Planters' (those dating from 1614 or earlier, the first eight years of the colony) were to be exempt from military service and from taxes ('Church duties excepted': Edict 10). And the Governor was not to 'lay any taxes or impositions upon the colony' except 'by the authority of the General Assembly' (Edict 8).

Thus far we have considered official reactions to the massacre: in London and Jamestown. There were other voices. In Virginia, there was that of Captain John Martin.

John Martin's 'The manner howe to bringe in the Indians into subjection without makinge an utter exterpation' of them, a manuscript now in the British Museum, is dated 15 December 1622.[61] This succinct essay is laid out step by step in the manner recommended by William Perkins. There are reasons 'why it is not fitting utterly to make an extirpation of the savages yet'.

> My reasons are grounded twofold: first upon Holy Writ and my own experience. Secondly, other necessary uses and profit that may return by the same.

Holy writ says that God advised

> the Children of Israel (though they were of far greater numbers than we are yet in many ages like to be, and came into a country where were walled towns) not to utterly destroy the heathen: lest the woods and wild beasts should over-run them.

Martin's own observation

> hath been such as assureth me that if the Indians inhabit not amongst us under obedience (and, as they have ever, kept down the woods, and slain the wolves, bears and other beasts, which are in great number) we shall be more oppressed in short time by their absence, than in their living by us: both for our own security, as also for our cattle.

And if

> they shall be brought into subjection, and shall be made to deliver hostages for their obedience, there is no doubt by God's grace but of the saving of many of their souls. And they, being natives, are apter for work than yet our English are; knowing how to attain great quantity of silk, hemp and flax, and most exquisite in thereof for our uses; fit for guides upon discovery into other

[61] Kingsbury, III, 704-7.

countries adjacent to ours: fit to row in galleys and frigates; and many other pregnant uses too tedious to set down.

There must of course be strict supervision: to prevent 'the main body of the enemy from having the sinews of all expeditions' (such as food). They must be kept from planting corn and fishing. This to be effected

by having some two hundred soldiers on foot continually harrowing and burning all their towns in winter, and spoiling their weirs. By this means our people securely may follow their work; and yet not to be negligent in keeping watch.

They must be kept from their 'accustomed trading for corn', by ten shallops 'that in May, June, July and August may scour the Bay, and keep the rivers that are belonging to Opechancanough'.

By this ariseth two happy ends. First, the assured taking of great purchases in skins and prisoners. Secondly, in keeping them from trading for corn on the eastern shore, and the southward, from whence they have five times more than they set themselves.

The enemy Indians will be forced to 'yield to obedience'. Their alternative is to seek refuge with their neighbours: but they will not receive them. 'At the Northwest end of his dominions the Monacans are their enemies. On the Northernmost side, the Potomacs and other nations are their enemies.' The prevention of Indian trade 'with the eastern shore' will assure corn for us. This

is best known to myself, for that by sending and discovering those places, first I have not only reaped the benefit, but all the whole colony since; who had perished had it not been discovered, before Sir George Yeardley came in, by my ancient, Thomas Savage, and servants.

(Yeardley had arrived as Governor in 1619.) The Indians of that area are 'more industrious than any other Indians in our Bay'. We can use them for getting skins: 'my ancient and servants have seen in trade at one time forty great canoes laden with these commodities.' There must be 'two especial irrevocable laws':

First, that none, of what rank soever, do ever trink or trade in the late precinct of Opechancanough, nor any bordering neighbours that aided him in this last disaster. Secondly, for our own people to set and sow a sufficient proportion of corn for their own uses: and yearly to lay up into a granary a proportion, for which if they have no use for themselves the next year, then to be sold, and every man to have his due paid him.

Two granaries must be built. Thus

the savages shall be frustrated of all means of buying any manner of victuals and clothing, but what they shall have from us for their labour and industry;

as also being disabled from hiring any auxiliaries if at any time they would rebel.

For

the infinite trade they have had in this four years of security enabled Opechancanough to hire many auxiliaries; which in former times I know for want thereof Powhatan was never able to act the like.

And the colony will have the benefit of the storing of corn.

In a second paper dated 15 December 1622, Martin proposed that Virginia 'may be made a Royal Plantation'.[62] The English part of Virginia ('in which we are seated and fit to be settled on for many hundred years') is defined thus:

Is within the territories of Opechancanough (it lieth on the west side of Chesapeake Bay) who commandeth from the southernmost part of the first river to the southernmost part of the fourth river, called Potomac, which lieth north next hand to our river: some fifty leagues in latitude. In longitude it extendeth to the Monacan country next hand west and by north of equal length with the latitude. His own principal seat is in the second river, called Pamunkey, in the heart of his own inhabited territories. This revolted Indian king in his square commandeth thirty two kingdoms under him, every kingdom containing the quantity of one of our shires here in England.

(The Pamunkey is the York River.) Martin wanted the King, the Privy Council and the Virginia Company to arrange that thirty-two English shires should each dispatch one hundred men to possess the thirty-two kingdoms; living 'under the command of some noble general fit for so royal a plantation', with some 'worthy gentleman' from each shire as a Deputy Lieutenant. If the Opechancanough areas are thus possessed – with JPs, iron workers, tanners, weavers and husbandmen –

it will not only quite frustrate and disable the Indians (our enemies) ever to subsist of themselves, but force them to have their dependency upon us for food and clothing, which their industry will well acquit to the whole kingdom in short space. And all other borderly kingdoms, seeing their villainies and treacheries so rewarded, will be ever afraid to enterprise the like against our nation when it shall so increase that they must stretch further their possessions and territories.

One of the critics in England of the organisation of the Virginia Company in London was a soldier and small merchant, Captain John Bargrave; related, presumably, to the Reverend Thomas Bargrave who had died in Virginia in 1621. At the end of 1623 he wrote a paper on Planting in Virginia – after seven years' study, he said, of the

concept (held also by the Indian) about the occupation of desolate land, which, he claimed, was never allowed to over-rule an Indian claim to title. Francis Jennings, in an important article published in 1971,[25] maintains however that in Massachusetts Bay from 1630 to 1633 there were no 'purchases' of land, the only legal title to land in America being conceived as deriving from the English: legally, America *was* vacant. After 1633 it was assumed that an Indian could be a rightful landlord; but the assumption was merely for convenience, not a recognition of a right valid in law. Jennings admits that there was a *shine* of legality: but this was a matter of strategem and pretext, by courts which (until the 1670s) had no Indian members. The English occupation was thus a 'conquest'. He is concerned on this point to criticise Vaughan's thesis that in Plymouth from 1621 and in Massachusetts from 1629 the English 'scrupulously observed the property rights of the natives' and were 'mindful of native claims'; and that they observed 'the niceties of purchase'. Land was acquired by 'conquest', says Vaughan, only at a time of declared war. (We have seen Edward Waterhouse stating that the 1622 Massacre in Virginia meant that the settlers, by right of war, could invade Indian villages and cultivated land.)

These approaches are perhaps too technical to be a key to the policies of the planters of Plymouth in the 1620s.

Neither Vaughan nor Jennings accepts the thesis that Indian land was tribal, held in common ownership, and therefore not capable of being sold by an individual. It seems that the tribal sachem had a sort of domain right over the entire territory, and the final right to sell land; that subordinate chiefs had hunting and fishing rights; but that cultivated land was held as common, the sachem annually assigning the area to be tilled by each family. Any land sale had to be confirmed by the actual inhabitants of the area. (Jennings is more precise and detailed than Vaughan.) It is also accepted that the Indians were *eager* to sell; and, Vaughan says, they always retained hunting, fishing, and, sometimes, planting rights.

How far the Indians were aware of the implications of all this is surely doubtful. (Vaughan thinks they were.) And with what did the English 'purchase' the land? Trinkets, more often than not; or the promise of friendship.

Of one thing there is no doubt: Plymouth planters engaging in land deals were closely supervised by the Plymouth General Court. The

[25] 'Virgin Land and Savage People', *American Quarterly*, October 1971 (XIII, 4), pp 519-41. See also David Bushnell, 'Treatment of Indians in Plymouth Colony', *New England Quarterly*, June 1953 (XXVI, 2). W.E. Washburn discusses the land tenure question down to the 1950s in 'Moral and Legal Justification for Dispossessing the Indians', being ch 2 of *Seventeenth-Century America*, ed Smith, 1959. R.H. Pearce's 'The Indian and the Puritan Mind', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, April 1952 (XIII, 2) is less satisfactory. Pearce's 1953 book *The Savages of America: A Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization* is essentially about the place of the Indian in the conscience and imagination of Americans in the first half of the nineteenth century. See also Nash, *Red, White, and Black*, 1974.

Court declared in 1643 that 'it hath been the constant custom from our' first beginning that no person or persons have or ever did purchase rent or hire any lands, herbage, wood or timber of the natives but by the magistrates' consent'; to do otherwise is 'unlawful and of dangerous consequence'; and any planter negotiating without 'consent and assent of the Court' is to be very heavily fined.[26] The General Court of Massachusetts issued a similar edict in 1634. This was confirmed in the *Laws and Libertyes* printed at Cambridge, Mass., in 1648: 'No person whatsoever shall henceforth buy land of any Indian, without license first had and obtained of the General Court.' We also see in 1648 that Indians with corn fields near the settlements had obtained that land by gift or sale from the English (who were to show them how to fence it). That was the 'ground where they have the right to plant'. The assumption at Boston was that such Indians 'are become subjects to the English; and have engaged themselves to be willing and ready to understand the Law of God'.[27]

Cushman thought that the peace with the Indian will be breached only if 'our security engender in them some unthought of treachery; or our uncivility provoke them to anger'. The English, then, he continued, have the honourable opportunity 'to plant a rude wilderness', and 'to display the efficacy and power of the Gospel', in 'zealous preaching, professing and wise walking under it before the faces of these poor blind infidels'. Naturally we ought to use 'means to convert them' – and not refer only to 'God's extraordinary work from heaven'. We must 'further the knowledge and salvation of the sons of Adam in that New World'.

Old England has its disadvantages. It groans under 'close-fisted and unmerciful men' – compare the 'consumption' at home with 'the easiness, plainess and plentifulness in living in those remote places'. There is 'the bitter contention that hath been about religion, by writing, disputing and inveighing earnestly one against another':

> the heat of which zeal, if it were turned against the rude barbarism of the heathens, it might do more good in a day than it hath done here in many years.

If the Indians 'had but a drop of that knowledge which here flieth about the streets', they would be filled with joy; and 'would even pluck the kingdom of heaven by violence, and take it as it were by force'.

At the beginning of 1622 Plymouth Plantation began to be worried about the Indians to the west of Massasoit, the Narragansetts, whose chief was Canonicus (*c*.1565-1647). In January a messenger from Canonicus arrived in Plymouth with a bundle of arrows wrapped in the skin of a rattlesnake. Squanto said that this was a symbol of enmity. Governor Bradford had the skin stuffed with powder and with

[26] Langdon, *Pilgrim Colony*, 1966, 134-5.

[27] E.I.C. 1929 reprint, ed. M. Farrand, 28-9.

plantations were built upon wordly interests, New England upon that which is purely religious'.[120] A popular text in Boston was that of the 'city set on a hill', from the Sermon on the Mount. Matthew 5:14-16:

> Ye are the light of the world. A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid. Neither do men light a candle and put it under a bushel, but on a candlestick; and it giveth light to all men that are in the house. Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father.

How far that light shone upon the Indian in New England after 1630 – in Plymouth, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Hampshire and New Haven – was, and is, a matter of controversy. The scheme of my book has permitted only a cursory glance at the New England issues. Alden T. Vaughan's book, published in 1965, is an attempt to demonstrate that the New England puritans 'followed a remarkably humane, considerate and just policy in their dealings with the Indians':[121] *New England Frontier: Puritans and Indians 1620-1675*. The thesis was intended to be provocative, to redress an historiographical tradition of hostility to the puritans. It went, so to say, too far in the other direction: perhaps following Thomas Cartwright's puritan rule in the 1570s that 'contraries are cured by their contraries'.[122] Some critics felt not only that the author was too favourable to the New Englanders, but also that evidence had been distorted and withheld.[123] And the lively treatment often relies more on narrative than on analysis. But any reader interested in Indian relations in New England after 1630 will have to reckon with *New England Frontier*. There is relevant material also in a good book by Peter N. Carroll published in 1969: *Puritanism and the Wilderness: The Intellectual Significance of the New England Frontier, 1629-1700*.

Matthew Cradock warned John Endecott in 1629 'not to be too confident of the fidelity of the savages'.[124] 'It is an old proverb, yet as true, The burnt child dreads the fire. Our countrymen have suffered this by their too much confidence in Virginia. Let us by their harms learn to beware.'

It is time to return to Virginia: remembering that Cradock told Endecott to bear in mind the advice of Christ to His disciples when he told them to go forth and preach (Matthew 10.16). 'I send you forth a sheep in the midst of wolves: be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves.'

[120] *Brief Relation of the State of New England*: Force, *Tracts*, IV, no.11, p.3.
[121] vii.
[122] Quoted by John Whitgift, *Works*, Parker Society, II, 441.
[123] For example T.B. Lewis, *William and Mary Quarterly*, July 1966, XXIII, 3. The 1971 article by Jennings has been discussed (note 25).
[124] *Records of Massachusetts Bay*, ed. Shurtleff, I, 385.

26

Conditions of Peace in Virginia, 1625-1662

By 1632, 22 March had become a Holy Day in Virginia, 'in commemoration of our deliverance from the Indians at the bloody massacre'.[1] The General Assembly at Jamestown in March 1630 had ordered 'that the war begun upon the Indians be effectually followed, and that no peace be concluded with them'.[2] The Indians were held to be – recorded the General Assembly of February 1632 – 'our irreconcilable enemies'.[3]

The Governor of the Colony at the time of the dissolution of the Virginia Company, Sir Francis Wyatt, continued as the first Royal Governor until 1626. The royal 'take-over' was slow. Until 1630 there followed three interim appointments: Yeardley took over in 1626 but died in 1627; Captain Francis West, son of De La Warr (1627-9); and Dr John Pott (1629-30). Charles I appointed Sir John Harvey as Governor in 1628; but he did not arrive in Virginia until 1630. Yeardley, West and Pott took a hard line against the Indian. Shortly before his death, Yeardley organised a massacre by the English. Each 'particular plantation' was to invade an Indian town, kill as many as possible, and seize or destroy the corn. This was not completely successful – the English ran out of ammunition. Pott, a medical doctor, had conceived a project in 1624 of exterminating the Indians by poison!

Nancy O. Lurie writes:[4]

> Doubtless Opechancanough expected reprisals, but he was totally unprepared for the unprecedented and utter devastation of his lands and the wholesale slaughter of his people. The tribes were scattered, some far beyond the traditional boundaries of their lands, and several of the smaller groups simply ceased to exist as definable entities.

Harvey was Governor for five years.[5] He was thought too lenient to the Indian (and to the – mainly papist – colonists in Maryland from

[1] Hening, *Statutes*, I, 177. [2] *Ibid*., 153. [3] *Ibid*., 176.
[5] For Harvey and his troubles, Washburn, *Virginia under Charles and Cromwell*, 7-9, 26.
6: Bailyn, in Smith (ed.), *Seventeenth-Century America*, 96-7.

If the Indians shall bring in any children, as gages of their good and quiet intentions to us and amity with us, then the parents of such children shall choose the persons to whom the care of such children shall be entrusted; and the country, by us their representatives, do engage that we will not use them as slaves: but do their best to bring them up in Christianity, civility, and the knowledge of necessary trades.

The J.P.s of each county were to report on the families under whose 'tuition' the children were placed: and if they do 'really intend the bettering of the children', they were to receive a fee. Thirdly: no land sale or bargain by the Indians was to be valid unless confirmed by the General Assembly at Jamestown. Otherwise it would

put us to a continual necessity of allotting them new lands and possessions; and they will always be in fear of what they hold, not being able to distinguish between our desires to buy, or enforcements to have – in case their grants and sales be desired.

There was a second session of the 1656 Assembly, in December. In the meantime, there had been an unfortunate episode which occasioned bad consciences in Jamestown. Colonel Edward Hill in the summer of 1656 had gone with one hundred men to parley with Indians who had come down beyond the falls of the James. (It seems that they had come to discuss trade.) Hill had been ordered to attack only in self-defence; he blundered, there was a battle, and five Indians were killed. Hill was suspended.[53] At the December General Assembly[54] it was noted that there existed the Act 'that makes killing of Indians lawful that are taken committing trespass or other harm'; the oath of the killer to be taken as proof of the trespass. That was a bad Act: the oath of one man was hardly evidence; the 'harm' might be too slight to merit death; the wording allowed 'to great a latitude'. Indian blood has been shed for 'small account', and the Assembly viewed with 'sad apprehension' the 'wanton and unnecessary shedding of blood' – an 'injustice': 'whereby we may probably be involved in a war for us and our posterity.' The Act was therefore repealed. No Indian was to be killed unless he commit what in an Englishman would be felony, and this was to be proved by the oaths of two witnesses. For lesser harms, viewed and valued by two sufficient men', an Indian could be 'corrected, but not to death or maiming'. It is true that there have been frequent Indian mischiefs. To prevent this, it was enacted that

no Indian come within our fenced plantations without a ticket from some person to be nominated on the head of each river where the Indians live. And it shall be then lawful for all Indians in amity to repair to the house of that party; coming without arms, or having his ticket, they may fowl, fish or

[53] Washburn, *Virginia under Charles and Cromwell*, 54-5.
[54] 415.

gather the wild fruits without hinderance of any, provided it be not within any fenced plantation.

Also, the English could trade with the Indians, within the areas allowed by the 1646 treaty:

It shall be lawful for any freeman to repair to the said houses or Indian marts, and to truck with the said Indians, for any commodities not prohibited by the laws of this country. And of debates arising in their bartering, the first in commission in that place to be judge[55] and to distribute equal justice to them both, and his order in the business to be of force both to the English and Indian.

Such was the position when the Assembly of March 1658 came to revise and codify the Laws, of Virginia. The Laws of Virginia had first been revised in 1632, under Harvey. The 1658 Laws confirmed the annual commemorations of the massacres on 22 March and 18 April.[56] They approved the disposal of Indian children to the English 'for education, or instruction in Christian religion, or for learning the English tongue'; but made clear that such a child was to be 'free' when he or she was twenty five.[57] (Indian 'servants' could be male or female; as were 'negroes imported'.)[58] There had been corruptions in this matter of Indian children. Some had been stolen, or fraudulently acquired; some had been bought from other Englishmen. Such 'perfidious dealing' is 'to the great scandal of Christianity and the English nation': it makes 'religion contemptible, and the name of Englishmen odious'.[59]

No one was to provide the Indians, by sale or barter, with arms or ammunition. Anyone informed upon as doing so was to lose his whole estate, half of which was to go to the informer. Nor was an Indian to be lent arms or ammunition: 'It shall be lawful for any person or persons meeting such Indian so furnished to take away either piece, powder or shot.'[60] Indians could be employed to exterminate wolves: provided they were not armed 'with English arms and guns'.[61]

The provisions about land were the most central. Indians were to have 'liberty of all waste and unfenced land for hunting' (except in the English 'reservation' between the James and the York). No grant of Indian land was to be made to any colonist 'until the Indians be first served with the proportion of fifty acres of land for each bowman'. If any English land patent in the Rappahannock region was to be found to be on Indian land, then the colonist was to give up the land, or purchase it from the Indians.[62] The Assembly had received many complaints

touching wrong done to the Indians in taking away their land, and forcing them into such narrow straits and places that they cannot subsist either by

[55] i.e. the senior JP.
[56] 459 [57] 455-6. [58] 454 [59] 481-2 [60] 441 [61] 457 [62] *Ibid.*

a collapse which the failure to make a profit seemed to render inevitable. In 1622 an Indian massacre nearly finished the settlement, and it is plain that if the fortunes of the colony and of the company had been identical, Virginia would have been another Roanoke.

The colony was saved because private individuals took over the activities formerly reserved for the company, and made the profits of the free planters themselves the basis of the settlement's life. We have already noted some aspects of this process as reflected in the system of land distribution, and we have seen how from a kind of collective farming project a society of independent farmers had evolved. It remains to show how private enterprise began to participate in the management of emigration from England.

As early as 1617 the company granted to certain groups of men the privilege of transporting settlers to Virginia and establishing them in semi-independent plantations generally called "hundreds." Little is known exactly about these hundreds before 1620, but the rules and regulations obtaining in them seem to have been different from those outside, and their proprietors had the privilege of trading independently of the company's magazine.[16] Their existence marks the first relaxation by the company of its monopolistic control of emigration. What conditions may generally have been offered to prospective settlers in these hundreds we do not know, but from the papers of one of them comes the first genuine servant's indenture which has survived. Four gentlemen who had been granted the right to establish what became known as Berkeley Hundred made on September 7, 1619, the following agreement with one Robert Coopy, of North Nibley in Gloucestershire:

That the said Robert doth hereby covenant faythfully to serve the said S[r] Willm, Richard George and John for three years

from daye of his landinge in the land of Virginia, there to be imployed in the lawfull and reasonable workes and labors of them . . . and to be obedient to such governors his and their assistants and counsell as they . . . shall from tyme to tyme appoynt and set over him. In consideracon whereof, the said S[r] Willm Richard George and John do covenant with the said Robert to transport him (with gods assistance) with all convenient speed into the said land of Virginia at their costs and charges in all things, and there to maintayne him with convenient diet and apparell meet for such a servant, And in thend of the said terme to make him a free man of the said Cuntry theirby to enjoy all the liberties freedomes and priviledges of a freeman there, And to grant to the said Robert thirty acres of land within their Territory or hundred of Barkley. . . .[17]

It happened that Robert decided not to make the voyage, and perhaps that was the reason that his document of indenture was preserved, for it cannot have been unique. The proprietors of Berkeley Hundred as well as other similar groups probably made many such agreements, and in fact the Virginia Company itself may have commonly used the same form.

Presumably these sub-corporations were the first to transport settlers independently of the company itself, but from about 1618 private individuals were also granted land by the company on condition that they transport persons to the colony. This turned out to be one of the most satisfactory methods of encouraging settlement; it became known as the headright system, and was used in nearly every one of the colonies. There is no certain knowledge of when or how it began; a document of December, 1617, may indicate that it had not been worked out at that time.[18] Soon afterwards, however, it became customary to make a grant of fifty acres for each person transported to the colony, and in April, 1623, it was reported to the company that during the past four years, forty-four patents for land had been issued to persons each of whom had agreed to

take at least one hundred men to Virginia. During the spring and summer of 1621, according to the company's deputy, nearly one thousand emigrants had gone out, but of these some nine hundred were upon the charge of private men.[19] Doubtless many of these emigrants were servants who did not pay their own passage, and it may be assumed that some of them were "sold" to planters already resident in the colony, but of this there is no direct evidence.

Thus the handling of emigration passed from the hands of the company into those of private individuals, and the unfortunate organization which alone had made the colony possible saw its honors and profits turned over to others. After the massacre of 1622 the courage of the undertaking was gone; the land for the "colledge," situated up the James River nearly as far as present-day Richmond, had to be abandoned, while the pious hope of educating the Indians to true religion and civility seemed ironic indeed. The colony itself barely survived that terrible year, but it recovered quickly after the winter had passed, while the company in London went through painful days to its dissolution in 1624. By that time the customs of indentured servitude had been fixed. In 1619 the first legislative assembly in America provided for the recording and enforcing of contracts made with servants before their departure from England, and they became a distinct class in the community. The census of 1624-1625 showed 487 of them in a population of 1,227;[20] the idea of indenturing them in England, bringing them to America, and transferring their services to resident planters for a sum of money or tobacco had become familiar, and the servant trade was ready to bring them in great numbers.

The usual form of indenture was simple. It was a legal contract, by which the servant bound himself well and faithfully

to serve the master in such employments as the master might assign, for a given length of time, and usually in a specified plantation. In return the master undertook to transport the servant to the colony, furnish him with adequate food, drink, clothing, and shelter during his service, and perhaps give him a specified reward when his term was ended. In the majority of cases this was all the agreement that was made, but it could be varied at will according to the bargain struck by the two persons concerned.[21] Skilled workmen sometimes secured a clause entitling them to annual wages or providing that they should do no common labor in the fields. A child's indenture might specify that he be given the rudiments of an education or taught a trade. German servants often entered into indentures providing that they be taught to read the Bible in English. The length of service varied considerably; it might be any number of years, but was generally four, and when longer terms were called for it was usually because the servant was a child. Diversity is also found in the "freedom dues"; some indentures named a sum of money, certain tools, clothes, or food, or a plot of land. In all colonies, however, these matters were regulated from early times by custom, and most servants depended upon this custom to direct their lives, contenting themselves with leaving their indentures in common form.[22]

By the year 1636 one could procure printed indentures, with blank spaces left for the names of the servant and master and for any special provisions desired. These forms were entered in the Stationers' Register by Nicholas Bourne, printer, and must have sold well, for in 1661 Bourne's executors petitioned against persons who "during the late disorders" had been illegally producing them.[23] Similar forms were used throughout the colonial period, and one may be quoted here as representative of all servants' indentures:

This Indenture made the *21st February 1682/3* Between *Rich. Browne aged 33 years* of the one party, and *Francis Richardson* of the other party, witnesseth, that the said *Rich. Browne* doth thereby covenant, promise, and grant to & with the said *Francis Richardson* his Executors & Assigns, from the day of the date hereof, until h*is* first & next arrival *att New York or New Jersey* and after, for and during the term of *foure* years, to serve in such service & imployment, as he the said *Francis Richardson* or his Assigns shall there imploy h*im* according to the custom of the Country in the like kind—In consideration whereof, the said *Francis Richardson* doth hereby covenant and grant to and with the said *Richard Browne* to pay for h*is* passing, and to find and allow h*im* meat, drink, apparrel, and lodging, with other necessaries, during the said term, & at the end of the said term to pay unto *him according to the Custom of the Country*

In Witness thereof the parties above mentioned to these Indentures have interchangeably set their Hands and Seals the day and year above written.

The servant took his indenture with him, and a copy might also be furnished to his master or even to the authorities of the plantation where he took up residence.[24] He could be sold for service only according to the terms of the contract, which thus became his protection against an unjust master. In most cases, and especially if the servant was less than eighteen years old, the indenture was chiefly useful to him as a certificate of the length of service required, but if generous freedom dues or any other particularly liberal provisions were included, it became of more obvious value. Colonial courts were always ready to enforce the terms of any servant's indenture which could be produced, and on occasion they even accepted the testimony of a servant's friends who had seen the document and would swear to its terms though it had since been lost. For one living the life of a laborer in the plantations it was not always an easy matter to keep possession of these small scraps of paper.

The pamphleteer John Hammond strongly advised all servants to make their contracts in this manner before leaving England, and to have them properly signed and sealed, so that questions and disappointments after arrival might be reduced to a minimum.[25] After 1682 the English regulations were so strict that this became almost necessary to protect the ship captain from a charge of kidnapping. Yet a great many servants, especially before the turn of the century, went to the colonies without written indentures. Some made verbal agreements with the merchants who shipped them, not realizing that such agreements were of no legal validity and would not be enforced in the colony. On their arrival they were sold as servants because they had not paid their own passages, and to regulate their treatment each colony evolved a certain standard known as the "custom of the country." Sooner or later this custom was set down in statutory law by nearly all colonies, and the earliest of these statutes were to specify the time which servants arriving without indenture should serve. Thus the new arrival, whether with or without previous indenture, found himself fairly well protected against capricious and excessive exploitation, while his importer knew with some exactness what could be expected in years of labor and expense of upkeep.

Few planters could journey to England and select their own servants. Hence they were practically always indentured to a merchant, an emigrant agent, a ship captain, or even to one of the seamen, and then exported like any other cargo of commodities. Upon arrival in the colonies they were displayed on deck, the planters came on board to inspect them, and they were "set over"[26] to the highest bidder. If the servant had a document of indenture, a note of the sale and of the date of arrival was often made on its back, and the transaction was then complete. The invention and acceptance of this system

made it possible to handle emigration as a business proposition, and to treat white labor as a commodity. The trade in servants became quite an important part of colonial trade, and the peopling of English America proceeded according to the crudest manifestations of the law of supply and demand. Throughout the colonial period vast numbers of ordinary indentured servants were thus transported to the colonies, while convicts, rogues and vagabonds, political prisoners, all were sold in the plantations as servants and taken there by merchants as merchandise.

During all of the seventeenth century indentured servitude was practically the only method by which a poor person could get to the colonies or by which white labor could be supplied to planters. About the beginning of the eighteenth century, however, a new scheme made its appearance, and the "redemptioner" took his place alongside the "servant." At first this class of emigrant came generally from the Continent. The movement of Germans and Swiss to the colonies, which had been occasional and scattering since the 1680's, began to assume large proportions in 1708 and 1709. Large numbers of people descended the Rhine to Rotterdam, seeking a passage to the new world, and many of them found when they arrived at the seaport that their financial resources were insufficient to get them the rest of the way. Accordingly, merchants used to take whatever money the emigrant might have left, put him and his goods and his family aboard ship, and contract to deliver them in America. After arrival a certain period of time, commonly fourteen days, was allowed during which the passenger might try to find the balance which was due the shipper, the hope being that he might locate friends who would advance the money. But if the necessary amount could not be found

within the time limit then he was to be sold into indentured servitude by the captain of the ship, for an amount sufficient to satisfy his indebtedness. Thus the length of his servitude would depend roughly upon the size of his debt.

The first contemporary references to this method of migration are of no earlier date than 1728, but they indicate that it had been familiar for some time.[27] Though confined at first to Germans, it soon spread across the Channel and was considerably used, particularly by those who transported Irish to Pennsylvania. Many English travelled under redemptionist agreements to the colonies, but the system never wholly replaced the older scheme of indentured servitude among them. Germans, on the other hand, seem rarely to have adopted the seventeenth-century method, and as far as we know nearly all who did not pay their own passage went out as redemptioners. In consequence the total migrations of the eighteenth century consist much more of this class than of ordinary indentured servants.

Between these two methods of transporting persons to the plantations there were certain significant differences which have commonly been overlooked. It is true that once a redemptioner had been sold for his passage money, he became in every respect an indentured servant, and there was no distinction between the two classes. But to the prospective emigrant in Europe, contemplating the possibilities for getting to America, there were virtues in each scheme, and his choice might depend upon his personal circumstances. In the first place, it was customary to supply an indentured servant with food, clothing, and shelter from the time he signed his contract until the end of his term of servitude; destitute persons in Britain, when all other hopes had faded, therefore, could and did sign up as indentured servants and get free of their worst immediate troubles from that moment.

I. EMIGRATION FROM ENGLAND

a. 1654-1686. Emigration of Servants from Bristol.

The following figures (on facing page 309) were taken from the "Tolzey Book," in the Bristol City Archives. For an explanation of this record see above, page 71.

For the years 1655 to 1678 the average annual emigration of servants from Bristol was almost exactly 400.

No other evidence exists by which the accuracy of these statistics may be checked. One may be sure that the figures are no larger than they should be; it is not so certain whether or not they are smaller. I believe them to be substantially correct, but the destinations seem a bit open to suspicion. Those servants bound for the West Indies doubtless went there, but it seems unlikely that so many went to Nevis and so few to Jamaica, or that so many went to Virginia and so few to Maryland.

b. 1684. Emigration of servants from London.

From September 1, 1683, to August 31, 1684, the magistrates at the Middlesex Guildhall recorded the indentures of 641 servants: 249 for Maryland, 172 for Virginia, 104 for Barbados, 72 for Jamaica, and the rest for other colonies. During the same period, the mayor of the City of London approved 123 indentures: 51 for Maryland, 40 for Virginia, 11 for Pennsylvania, and the rest elsewhere.

Total emigration of servants from London in this year: 764.

These figures certainly represent something less than the actual number of servants departing. Those from Middlesex were obtained by tabulating data from the file of indenture forms kept by the clerk; each form is numbered, and it is plain that many are missing, so that the proper total should probably be about 800 for Middlesex alone. The mayor of the City appar-

Year	*Virginia*	*Barbados*	*New England: Nevis*	*New England: land*	*Jamaica*	*Maryland*	*other colonies*	*destination not given*	*Total*
1654*	40	16	1	—	—	—	—	—	57
1655	115	150	2	—	—	—	1	1	269
1656	136	194	—	—	—	—	—	6	336
1657	79	357	2	1	—	—	2	176	617
1658	172	273	27	6	—	—	17	276	771
1659	254	415	11	—	—	1	—	105	786
1660	167	277	72	—	—	4	14	58	592
1661	334	117	233	—	—	—	13	18	715
1662	510	105	179	27	13	4	4	—	842
1663	157	61	130	28	—	4	18	1	399
1664	120	62	54	11	—	—	10	1	258
1665	241	24	29	1	1	2	10	—	308
1666	255	70	2	3	—	4	—	—	334
1667	221	106	22	1	—	—	—	—	350
1668	280	83	18	9	—	2	—	—	392
1669	199	43	72	11	7	—	1	—	333
1670	158	45	75	9	10	14	14	4	329
1671	147	41	63	8	14	4	5	3	285
1672	192	10	20	—	7	16	8	1	254
1673	63	12	9	—	2	5	—	1	92
1674	186	46	108	13	—	6	2	3	365
1675	283	22	48	12	10	9	9	—	393
1676	158	27	9	—	9	13	3	4	223
1677	120	22	10	2	32	9	6	—	201
1678	133	12	16	7	—	5	4	1	178
1679†	37	15	21	8	6	—	5	1	93
1680	45	6	5	—	7	16	—	—	79
1684‡	24	33	4	1	49	9	11	—	131
1685	47	17	5	1	299	10	9	—	388
1686§	1	17	—	3	2	—	1	—	24
TOTALS	4874	2678	1247	162	468	137	167	661	10,394

*Entries begin September 25.

†From this point the books are incomplete. Figures for 1679 are to August 27.

‡From April.

§To June 12. In the column headed "other colonies" are included 67 servants going to St. Christopher, 35 to Montserrat, 31 to Antigua, 14 to Newfoundland, 3 to New York, and 17 to Pennsylvania. The 299 going to Jamaica in 1685 may have been Monmouth rebels.

ently kept no special record of servants indentured, and the figures were compiled from entries in his "Waiting Book," which may or may not be complete. For explanations of these recordings see above, pp. 78-79.

c. 1697-1707. Emigration of servants from Liverpool.

See below, p. 355, n. 30 for a description of this record. About 1,500 servants were registered as departing for the colonies during this period.

This record is not clear enough to permit a tabulation of dates and destinations which would be accurate. It is plain, however, that the registration was not systematically made, and one cannot assume that it is nearly complete, especially after 1701, when names become scanty. Probably half the total number of servants were registered in 1698, 1699, and 1700. It may be inferred from this evidence that the annual emigration of servants from Liverpool about the turn of the century was at least 200.

d. 1720-1732. Emigration of Servants from London.

The following figures are tabulated from "A Register of the Names and Surnames of those persons who have Voluntarily Contracted & bound themselves to go beyond the Seas into his Majestys Colonys and Plantations in America and Certified to the sessions according to the directions of the Statute in that case made and provided." Found at the Guildhall, London. See above, p. 81.

Destination	Number	Destination	Number
Maryland	918	Barbados	31
Maryland or Virginia	44	Jamaica	1146
Virginia	223	Antigua	165
Pennsylvania	423	St. Lucia (in 1723)	24
Carolinas	27	Nevis	22
New England	32	elsewhere and uncertain	202
		Total	3,257

This registry book commences with scattering entries from 1718, which are not included in the tabulation. Dates are not clear enough so that an annual tabulation would be accurate, but there is no very wide variation from year to year, and the annual number departing must have been very close to 300.

e. 1736. Emigration of servants from London.

After the conclusion of the registry book summarized in the last section, a few loose forms of indenture remain from subsequent years, but only from 1736 are there enough to make a tabulation worth while. 222 servants were registered that year, of whom 169 were for Jamaica. It is extremely unlikely that the figure is complete, but the proportion going to Jamaica is interesting.

f. 1718-1772. Annual transportation of convicts from London and the Home Circuit.

Taken from the Treasury Money Books, in the Public Record Office. These figures may be accepted as complete, but it must be carefully noted that they apply only to London and

Date	Number	Date	Number	Date	Number	Date	Number
1719	301	1732	220	1746	272	1760	178
1720	207	1733	162	1747	149	1761	216
1721	181	1734	349	1748	280	1762	216
1722	300	1735	149	1749	440	1763	364
1723	271	1736	463	1750	557	1764	513
1724	308	1737	202	1751	312	1765	424
1725	341	1738	378	1752	475	1766	480
1726	282	1739	348	1753	367	1767	516
1727	309	1740	421	1754	417	1768	569
1728	241	1741	327	1755	333	1769	521
1729	250	1742	306	1756	317	1770	475
1730	338	1743	277	1757	274	1771	295
1731	319	1744	265	1758	332	1772	228
		1745	138	1759	240		

Total 17,470. Number of shiploads 190

(312)
the Home Counties, not to the rest of Great Britain and Ireland.
The contract expired in 1772; figures for that year are therefore incomplete.

grants for whose importation a headright of fifty acres each was claimed. Practically all are described as servants. It is unlikely that all arrivals were registered, as headrights became a drug on the market (see McCormac, *White Servitude in Maryland*, pp. 17ff.) If we assume that the annual immigration of servants was about 500 by the year 1670, some checks will be provided by the quotations given below.

b. 1660.

1,078 servants in a population of 12,000. Estimate by McCormac, pp. 28-29.

c. 1698. Servants imported.

600 or 700 servants, "chiefly Irish" were imported during the year. Estimate of the governor, *C.S.P. Colonial*, 1697-1698, p. 390.

To November 1, 1698, there were 901 servants imported, according to the Naval Officers account, kept for the sake of levying the duty on servants. From a Journal of the committee appointed to inspect the public accounts of the revenue of the province, in C.O. 5/749, no. 6.

d. 1707. Census.

33,833 souls; 3,003 servants; 4,657 slaves. Greene and Harrington, p. 124. N.B. To maintain a population of 3,000 servants, with an average term of five years each, would require an annual importation of 600.

e. 1755. Census.

98,357 free whites; 6,871 servants; 1,981 convicts; 3,592 mulattoes; 42,764 Negroes.

f. 1752-1755. German Immigration.

1,060 arrived. Society for the History of Germans in Maryland, *Fifth Annual Report*, p. 19. This is an underestimate, based on the Port Books. Newspapers show more cargoes of Germans arriving; Scharf estimated that at least 3,000 came in 1752-1754 (*History of Maryland*, I, 373).

VII. Maryland
a. 1633-1680 Immigration of servants.
Total, about 21,000. This figure is taken from the records in the Land Office, Annapolis, wherein twenty-six volumes are registered the names of more than 21,000 immi-

g. 1745-1775. Immigration of servants, mainly to the port of Annapolis.

The following figures were tabulated from the Naval Officer's Returns, of which two volumes are at the Mary-

Year	from London	from Bristol	from Ireland	from Gt. Britain other ports	Total servants	Convicts	Total servants and convicts
1745	—	—	218	63	281	—	281
1746	—	—	124	—	124	7	131
1747	—	—	29	4	33	21	54
1748	—	—	—	3	3	153	156
1749	—	43	—	—	43	222	265
1750	2	40	—	29	71	225	296
1751	262	7	—	8	277	206	483
1752	120	30	—	31	181	297	478
1753	126	—	199	—	325	465	790
1754	233	118	39	—	390	352	742
1755	153	107	34	7	301	366	667
1756	43	53	1	1	98	298	396
1757	8	18	—	39	65	459	524
1758	3	2	—	—	5	133	138
1759	3	—	—	—	3	321	324
1760	1	7	—	—	8	197	205
1761	—	3	—	—	3	159	162
1762	11	—	—	—	11	215	226
1763	20	—	—	—	20	81	101
1764	157	—	55	—	212	164	376
1765	15	—	40	—	55	464	519
1766	—	—	176	61	237	564	801
1767	78	1	189	35	303	430	733
1768	185	—	139	92	416	581	997
1769	152	12	237	54	455	498	953
1770	156	35	553	—	744	362	1106
1771	9	22	667	21	719	288	1007
1772	43	13	636	2	694	320	1014
1773	304	17	616	75	1012	589	1601
1774	910	101	1175	83	2269	507	2776
1775*	415	78	708	1	1202	416	1618
	3,409	707	5,835	609	10,560	9,360	19,920

*To October 1.

(p. 326)
land Historical Society, Baltimore,

p. 336 If we exclude the Puritan migration of the 1630's, it is safe to say that not less than one-half, nor more than two-thirds,

That there was such an urban system operating in the colonial South however much neglect it has suffered at the hands of historians, did not go unnoticed at the time. Thus, James Robinson, chief factor for William Cunninghame and Company of London, was very much aware of the operation of a major component in that system when he advised John Turner, who ran a central store for the Company at Rocky Ridge just below Richmond, that in selecting a proper place for a branch, or "Back store," farther up the James River in an area recently opened to settlement, "much regard should be paid to the Soil of Land in the Neighbourhood and the Circumstances of the People in a Circle of 12 or 14 miles as the Influence of such a Store seldom reaches farther."[54]

Yet when all is said there is still a nagging question that remains unanswered, namely, that of the links between urban places and systems in their various and subtle forms, and the important structural changes taking place in the regional economies of the South after the mid-eighteenth century.[55] This is a subject for future research. Nonetheless the theoretical problem it poses is clear. If urbanization in the colonial South is directly linked to significant economic change, then perhaps the concern with urban forms and functions is misplaced. That is, urban form and function, like urban size and significance, may be distinctions left over from earlier days. "Urban," in short, is a traditional category that only confuses the real issues, which are the structure and operation of the regional economies of the period. In the final analysis, the question of urbanization in the colonial South is simply the wrong question to ask—at least at this time.

[54] Oct. 6, 1771, in William Cunninghame and Company Letterbooks, 1767-1772, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh (microfilm, Colonial Williamsburg Research Library, Williamsburg, Va.). For evidence that a system of branch stores also operated in areas other than those penetrated by the Scots, see the Account Book of Joseph Kershaw, 1774-1775.

[55] For a brief discussion of some of these structural changes see Marc Egnal and Joseph A. Ernst, "An Economic Interpretation of the American Revolution," *WMQ*, 3d Ser., XXIX (1972), 11-28.

The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America

Nicholas P. Canny*

ALTHOUGH the lordship of Ireland had long been in English hands, effective control over the country had been lost during the late medieval period, with the result that independent and autonomous Irish jurisdictions covered much of the island until the end of the sixteenth century. Attempts to reassert English authority over Ireland produced under Elizabeth I a pattern of conquest, bolstered by attempts at colonization, which was contemporaneous with and parallel to the first effective contacts of Englishmen with North America, to plans for conquest and settlement there, and to the earliest encounters with its Indian inhabitants. The Elizabethan conquest of Ireland should therefore be viewed in the wider context of European expansion.

David B. Quinn has stressed the connection between English colonization in Ireland and the New World, and he has established the guidelines for a full investigation.[1] No historian, however, has dealt with the legal and ethical considerations raised by colonization in Ireland or with

* Mr. Canny lectures on history in the National University of Ireland at University College, Galway. He wishes to thank Professors Richard S. Dunn and Edward M. Peters of the University of Pennsylvania for their criticism of this work when in dissertation form; Professor David B Quinn of the University of Liverpool for his encouragement, criticism, and valuable suggestions; Professor F. X. Martin and Dr. John Bossy for their helpful comments.

[1] See the following works by David Beers Quinn: *Raleigh and the British Empire* (London, 1947); *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1966); "Ireland and Sixteenth-Century European Expansion," *Historical Studies*, I (1958), 20-32; "Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory," American Philosophical Society, *Proceedings*, LXXXIX (1945), 543-560; "The Munster Plantation: Problems and Opportunities," *Cork Historical and Archaeological Society Journal*, LXXI (1966), 19-41. See also Theodore K. Rabb, *Enterprise and Empire: Merchant and Gentry Investment in the Expansion of England, 1575-1630* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967); Howard Mumford Jones, *O Strange New World: American Culture, The Formative Years* (New York, 1964); Charles Verlinden, *Les Origines de la Civilisation Atlantique: De la Renaissance a l'Age des Lumières* (Paris, 1966), and *The Beginnings of Modern Colonization* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1970).

the means by which these were resolved to the satisfaction of the aggressors' consciences. It is the purpose of the present article to tackle this problem and to show how the justifications for colonization influenced or reflected English attitudes toward the Gaelic Irish and, by extension, toward the imported slave and the indigenous populations in North America. It will also be shown that those sixteenth-century Englishmen who pondered the Irish problem did so in secular terms, and that through their thinking on the social condition of the Irish they approached a concept of cultural evolution no less "advanced" than that of the Spaniard José de Acosta in his writing (1590) on the indigenous population of the New World.[2]

The question of how to treat the native Irish first confronted the Tudors during the years 1565-1576 in the context of establishing English colonies in the Gaelic areas of the country. There had been earlier attempts at plantation in sixteenth-century Ireland but always in terms of defending the Pale—the loyal area in the vicinity of Dublin—from Gaelic Irish marauders. The strategic consideration had never been absent, but an offensive dimension was added in 1565 when it became the avowed purpose of the government to bring all of Ireland under English control. Equally significant was the fact that all subsequent attempts at colonization in Ireland were privately sponsored, the adventurers being members of the gentry and younger sons of England's aristocracy rather than soldiers in the government's pay. All could justify their presence on the grounds of pursuing the public good, but there were some who had scruples about seeking private gain at the expense of the original inhabitants of the lands to be colonized, and each colonizer had to justify the attendant aggression for himself. The years 1565-1576 therefore produced an outpouring of justifications for colonization and conquest. These arguments were to be elaborated upon and drawn together in later years, notably in Edmund Spenser's *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596).[3]

[2] José de Acosta, *Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias*, ed. Edmundo O'Gorman, 2d ed. rev. (Mexico, 1962); J. H. Elliott, *The Old World and the New, 1492-1650* (Cambridge, 1970), 39-51; J. H. Rowe, "Ethnography and Ethnology in the Sixteenth Century," *Kroeber Anthropological Society Papers*, XXX (1964), 1-19; J. R. Hale, "Sixteenth-Century Explanations of War and Violence," *Past and Present*, No. 51 (May 1971), 3-26.

[3] Edmund Spenser, *A View of the Present State of Ireland* (1596), ed. W. L. Renwick (Oxford, 1970).

The leading personality behind the colonization scheme was Sir Henry Sidney who was appointed lord deputy of Ireland in 1565 and remained a controlling influence in Irish affairs until 1579. Sidney enjoyed the almost undivided support of the English government in his colonization ventures, particularly those of his brother-in-law, the earl of Leicester, and of Sir William Cecil and Sir Thomas Smith, all three of whom sponsored colonization in Ireland. The personnel of the various Irish expeditions reflected this sponsorship.[4]

The first attempt (1565-1566) was to colonize that part of Ulster lying east of the river Bann. The leader of this expedition was Sir Arthur Champernoun of Devon who was accompanied by a closely-knit group of West Country gentry, notably Sir Humphrey Gilbert, John Champernoun, and Philip Butshed. In 1567 some of these adventurers shifted their interest to the coastal areas of southwest Munster, this time under the direction of Sir Warham St. Leger of Kent, a close friend of Sidney. Others of the West Country gentry joined them; the leading spokesmen were Gilbert, Sir Peter Carew, Edmund Tremayne, and Richard Grenville. So far most of the colonizers had been lured to Ireland by Sidney or Leicester, and this exclusiveness persisted into the following year when Carew attempted by himself to carve out a colony in the barony of Idrone, in Leinster. After 1568 we notice a wider representation. There is evidence that Cecil was called upon to aid the flagging Munster expedition, and a second effort to colonize northeast Ulster was organized in 1572 by Smith.[5] In 1573 Walter Devereux, first earl of Essex, mobilized the greatest expedition to date in an attempt to establish title to those parts of northeast Ulster not claimed by Smith. The Essex expedition was almost a national effort in that it not only enjoyed the support of the queen and Privy Council, but also in its early stages attracted to its ranks the sons of many aristocratic families.[6] The persons most closely associated with this bloody and financially

[4] For details of those involved with colonization in Ireland see Nicholas P. Canny, "Glory and Gain: Sir Henry Sidney and the Government of Ireland, 1558-1578" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1971), esp. ch. 3. An expanded version of this work will be published by Irish University Press under the title *The Elizabethan Conquest of Ireland: A Pattern Established 1565-76*.

[5] Quinn, "Smith and Colonial Theory," Am. Phil. Soc., *Procs.*, LXXXIX (1945), 543-560, and Mary Dewar, *Sir Thomas Smith: A Tudor Intellectual in Office* (London, 1964).

[6] For a list of those involved in the Essex expedition see S.P. 63/41, fol. 64, Public Record Office.

disastrous campaign were Essex himself, Carew, Gilbert, Sir John Norris, and Edward Barkley. Financial and physical exhaustion forced the abandonment of this expedition in 1576, thus closing a chapter in the history of English colonization in Ireland.

It is apparent that the same names recurred in the successive colonization efforts. The majority of these were from the West Country, and many of them, like Gilbert and Grenville, afterwards became involved in colonization ventures in the New World and again in later plantation attempts in Ireland. Men from the West Country were prominent in all English expansionist ventures of the seventeenth century. Historians have noted this regional aggressiveness,[7] and the continued involvement of West Countrymen with colonization can be partly explained by the fact that so many of them were responsible for expounding a secular ideology to justify colonization in Ireland.

The sites for colonies selected by Sidney were northeast Ulster and southwest Munster. Both of these areas had long been considered by the government to be strategically dangerous, and proposals had earlier been made to remove the Scots settlement from northeast Ulster and to prohibit the arrival of Spanish ships in southwest Munster. Sidney intended to secure these objectives by laying claim to and colonizing extensive territories in both regions, thus disturbing the indigenous population as well as the foreign intruders. His decision was determined in part by the fact that those areas were inhabited by Gaelic Irish rather than by Old English. This distinction manifested itself again when the government restricted the claims of St. Leger in Munster to lands held by Gaelic lords.[8] The rationale behind this was Sidney's assertion that the Gaelic Irish were unreliable and could be subdued only by force, while the Old English could be brought to civility by persuasion. Sidney thus justified colonization on the grounds of strategic necessity and expediency, but this did not satisfactorily explain either how the crown could establish legal title to the lands in question or how the indigenous population might be removed from their lands

[7] Karl S. Bottigheimer, *English Money and Irish Land: The 'Adventurers' in the Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland* (Oxford, 1971), 65-66, 158-160; for West Countrymen in America, especially Virginia, see the many books on the subject by A. L. Rowse, and Rabb, *Enterprise and Empire*.

[8] Letter of the lords of the Privy Council, Mar. 1569, in David Beers Quinn, *The Voyages and Colonising Enterprises of Sir Humphrey Gilbert*, II (Hakluyt Society, *Publications*, 2d Ser., LXXXIII-LXXXIV [London, 1940]), 494-496. See *ibid.*, 493-494, for the petition to the Privy Council.

to make room for colonies of Englishmen. The answers to these questions, derived from experience in Ireland and ideologically articulated by the colonizers and their spokesmen, would prove readily applicable to other peoples in other places, not merely beyond the Irish Sea but beyond the Atlantic Ocean.

The first of these problems presented little difficulty to the English legal mind. England, after all, had established title to most of Ireland by right of conquest during the Norman offensive of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Although the native Irish had reoccupied much of this land in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, they had never established legal title to it and could therefore be considered trespassers on land that really belonged to the crown or to the descendants of the original conquerors. It was by right of conquest by his ancestors, for example, that Carew claimed title to lands in Ireland.[9] Again it was by right of inheritance from the long extinct line of the earls of Ulster that the queen claimed the lands of that province. Smith for example was granted title to lands in Ireland as "parcel of the county of Ulster in Ireland" to hold from the crown as heir to the earldom of Ulster by service of a knight's fee, and Essex likewise sought a patent for "the dominion of Clandeboy [etc.] . . . in the earldom of Ulster."[10] There was in fact only one attempt to colonize lands to which legal title had not been established, that of St. Leger in southwest Munster, and in that case it was hoped to have the Munster lords who resisted attainted as rebels. The accepted legality was, in the words of Spenser, that "all is the conqueror's as Tully to Brutus saith."[11]

Although the legal question involved in establishing title to land was easily answered to the satisfaction of the queen's, and England's, conscience, the treatment of the indigenous population was another matter. The Normans had driven off merely the ruling elite from the lands they conquered and had retained the majority of the inhabitants as tenants and cultivators. The Old English, the descendants of the

[9] John Vowell [Hooker], *The Life of Sir Peter Carew*, in J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen, eds., *Calendar of the Carew Manuscripts, preserved in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth, 1515-1624* (London, 1867-1873).

[10] Smith's patent was granted on Nov. 16, 1571; see [N. J. Williams, ed.], *Calendar of the Patent Rolls, preserved in the Public Record Office* (London, 1966), V, patent no. 2167. The draft patent was granted to Essex in May 1573; see Brewer and Bullen, eds., *Calendar of Carew Manuscripts*, 441-442.

[11] Spenser, *Ireland*, ed. Renwick, 9.

earlier conquerors, followed the same pattern. They clearly regarded the struggle in Ireland as a conflict between cultures, Gaelic and English, but while they considered the Gaelic system of government to be tyrannical, hence barbarous, they did not consider those living under Gaelic rule to be incapable of being civilized. On the contrary, they held that once the Gaelic chieftains were overthrown and Gaelic law abolished, the native inhabitants, thus liberated from thralldom, would be accepted as subjects under English law. Even the statutes of Kilkenny (1366), which some historians have labeled apartheid legislation, allowed for a procedure by which Irishmen could be granted exactly the same legal status as English subjects. The fact that native Irish in the sixteenth century were being freely accepted as tenants to land within the Pale proves the persistence of these attitudes among the Old English.[12]

The queen seems to have accepted this view of the matter. She recognized that the Scots who inhabited lands in northeast Ulster were interlopers and not her subjects, and could therefore be forcibly removed with impunity. She directed, however, that the native Irish population there should be "well used," and on the subject of the Essex enterprise she stated specifically that "our meaning is not that the said Erle nor any of his company shall offend any person that is knowne to be our good subject."[13] Both Smith and Essex promised to observe this instruction, but Essex's assurance that he would not "imbrue" his "hands with more blood than the necessity of the cause requireth" was somewhat short of convincing.

Essex did follow the queen's instructions by concentrating his energies against the Scots settlement in Ulster. It was with the intention of breaking their power that he mobilized the nocturnal expedition to Rathlin Island in 1574, which succeeded in slaughtering the entire population of the island to the number of six hundred people.[14] The earl was

[12] For the statutes see Geoffrey Hand, "The Forgotten Statutes of Kilkenny: A Brief Survey," *Irish Jurist*, N.S., I (1966), 299-312, esp. 299; Terence de Vere White, *Ireland* (London, 1968); J. A. Watt, *The Church and the Two Nations in Medieval Ireland* (Cambridge, 1970), ix, 200-215. On the Irish tenants in the Pale see Nicholas P. Canny, "Hugh O'Neill, and the Changing Face of Gaelic Ulster," *Studia Hibernica*, X (1970), 25-27.

[13] Queen to William Fitzwilliam, July 17, 1573, Carte MSS. 56, no. 260, Bodleian Library, Oxford University.

[14] Essex to Privy Council, July 13, 1575, S.P. 63/52, no. 78, P.R.O., and Essex to the queen, July 1575, in Walter Bourchier Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex in the Reigns of Elizabeth, James I, and Charles I, 1540-1646*, I (London, 1853), 113-117.

frustrated by the queen's directive that he should not molest the Gaelic Irish inhabitants of Ulster, and when the local chieftain, Sir Brian McPhelim O'Neill, broke his compact with Essex he considered "all this to fall out to the best . . . so in the manner of their departure and breach of their faiths they have given me just cause to govern such as shall inhabit with us in the most severe manner, which I could not without evil opinions have offered if their revolt had not been manifest." One of the lieutenants of the expedition, Edward Barkley, was glad of the opportunity to extend stern rule over the Ulster Irish, who, he wrote, would be commanded by the queen or starve. Barkley gave a graphic description of how Essex's men had driven the Irish from the plains into the woods where they would freeze or famish with the onset of winter, and concluded with the smug observation: "how godly a dede it is to overthrowe so wicked a race the world may judge: for my part I thinke there canot be a greater sacryfice to God."[15]

The most extreme action of the enterprise took place at a Christmas feast in 1574, where O'Neill, his wife, and his kinsmen were seized by Essex, later to be executed in Dublin, and two hundred of O'Neill's followers were killed. This massacre went beyond the queen's original instructions, but it is significant that the attitude of the London government had hardened sufficiently to countenance the actions of Essex. The queen even commended his service in Ulster and was satisfied that her instructions had been complied with, "because we do perceive that, when occasion doth present, you do rather allure and bring in that rude and barbarous nation to civility and acknowledging of their duty to God and to us, by wisdom and discreet handling than by force and shedding of blood; and yet, when necessity requireth, you are ready also to oppose yourself and your forces to them whom reason and duty cannot bridle."[16] It appears, therefore, that the Essex experience had convinced the queen and her advisors that the Irish were an unreasonable people and that they, no less than the Scots intruders in Ulster, might be slaughtered by extralegal methods.

Similar extreme action was taken by Gilbert against those who

[15] See Devereux, *Lives of Devereux*, I, 30-31, for Essex to Burghley, July 20, 1573, and *ibid.*, 37-39, for Essex to Privy Council, Sept. 29, 1573. Barkley to Burghley, May 14, 1574, S.P. 63/46, no. 15, P.R.O.

[16] R. Bagwell, *Ireland under the Tudors, with a Succinct Account of the Early History* (London, 1885-1890), II, 288-289, and queen to Essex, July 13, 1574, in Devereux, *Lives of Devereux*, I, 73-74.

opposed the colonization effort in Munster. When the expected resistance occurred, Gilbert was, in October 1569, appointed military governor of Munster with almost unrestricted power of martial law.[17] Thereafter war in Munster became total war, and Gilbert extended his action to "manne, woman and childe," so "the name of an Inglysh man was made more terryble now to them than the syght of an hundryth was before."[18] The pamphleteer, Thomas Churchyard, who accompanied Gilbert to Munster, justified the slaughter of noncombatants on the grounds of expediency. Their support, he claimed, was essential to sustain the rebels "so that the killyng of theim by the sworde was the waie to kill the menne of warre by famine." Even in granting mercy to former rebels, Gilbert displayed the utmost cruelty and inhumanity. All who submitted were compelled to demean themselves utterly before him, to take an oath of loyalty to the queen, and to provide pledges and recognizances as assurance of their future loyalty. The impact of Gilbert's severity is brought home by Churchyard's graphic description of his practice:

> that the heddes of all those (of what sort soever thei were) which were killed in the daie, should be cutte of from their bodies and brought to the place where he incamped at night, and should there bee laied on the ground by eche side of the waie ledyng into his owne tente so that none could come into his tente for any cause but commonly he muste passe through a lane of heddes which he used *ad terrorem*, the dedde feelyng nothyng the more paines thereby: and yet did it bring greate terrour to the people when thei sawe the heddes of their dedde fathers, brothers, children, kinsfolke and freinds, lye on the grounde before their faces, as thei came to speake with the said collonell.

Churchyard recognized that some would criticize this conduct, but he justified it by asserting that the Irish had been first in committing atrocities and more especially on the grounds of efficiency: "through the terrour which the people conceived thereby it made short warres."[19]

The significant factor is that both Essex and Churchyard, in acknowledging the possibility of criticism of their actions, were admitting that what they were about was innovative. The Norman lords were not known to have committed such atrocities in Ireland, and there is no evidence that systematic execution of noncombatants by martial law was practiced in any of the Tudor rebellions in England. It is obvious that Gilbert and Essex believed that in dealing with the native Irish population they were absolved from all normal ethical restraints. The questions that we must pose are how, at the mid-sixteenth century, the Irish, a people with whom the English had always had some familiarity, came to be regarded as uncivilized, and what justifications were used for indiscriminate slaying and expropriation.

One important consideration is that this was probably the first time since the original Norman conquest that large numbers of Englishmen had come into direct confrontation with the Gaelic Irish in their native habitation.[20] Various lords justices had first been screened through the English Pale and thus had been prepared for the cultural shock of encountering the native Irish. Few English emissaries had actually penetrated deep into the Gaelic areas, and no lord deputy had ever made such comprehensive tours through the country as Sidney. Even more to the point is the fact that such colonizers as the younger Smith, Essex, and St. Leger went directly by ship to the proposed site of the colony and thus did not experience the gradual acclimation that an approach through the Pale would have effected.

Another important consideration is the peculiar nature of Catholicism in Gaelic Ireland. That the Irish were Christian was never doubted by the Normans or their successors, but it was always recognized that Christianity in Gaelic Ireland did not fully conform to Roman liturgical practice, and that many pre-Christian traditions and customs were only slightly veneered by Christianity. Criticism of unorthodox practices was frequent but deviance of this nature was not uncommon in medieval Europe, and two systems—an episcopal church on English lines in the Pale and environs, and an Irish-speaking, loosely structured church in the Gaelic areas—continued to tolerate each other's presence.[21]

[17] Sidney and Council to Privy Council, Oct. 26, 1569, S.P. 63/29, no. 70, P.R.O.
[18] Sidney to Cecil, Jan. 4, 1570, S.P. 63/30, no. 2, P.R.O.
[19] Thomas Churchyard, *A Generall rehearsall of warres and joyned to the same some tragedies and epitaphes* (London, 1579), QI-RI.

[20] Witness the wonder caused by the appearance of Shane O'Neill at Queen Elizabeth's court as reported in William Camden, *Annales rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum, regnante Elizabeth ad annum salutis M.D. LXXIX* (London, 1615), 69-70.
[21] See John Bossy, "The Counter-Reformation and the People of Catholic Ireland," *Historical Studies*, VIII (1971), 155-169, and "The Counter-Reformation and the People of Catholic Europe," *Past and Present*, No. 47 (May 1970), 51-70.

This arrangement was accepted by the Old English but not by those adventurers who joined Sidney in Ireland. These were, for the most part, extreme Protestants; many of them, like Carew, had fled England in Queen Mary's reign and associated themselves with the exiled English divines on the continent.[22] They were hypercritical of Catholicism in the Pale, but religious observance in Gaelic Ireland was so remote from anything they had previously experienced that they branded the native Irish as pagan without question.

The groundwork for this view had been laid by the Old English who over the centuries had attributed to the Gaelic Irish certain vices which, they claimed, were fostered by Gaelic law. The most famous of such indictments was the "counter-remonstrance" of 1331, but the accusations were regularly repeated down through the years, even into the sixteenth century. A Palesman was clearly the author of the unpublished pamphlet, "On the Disorders of the Irishry" (1572), in which all the customary criticisms were leveled at the native Irish and Gaelic law was declared "contrary to God his lawe and also repugnant to the Queens Majesties lawes." Even more severe was the assertion that the "outwarde behavyor" of the Irish made it "seme" that "they neyther love nor dredd God nor yet hate the Devell, they are superstycyous and worshippers of images and open idolaters." The author was probably aware that much of what he said was rhetorical, and clearly his purpose was to impress upon the government the idea that the Old English were the only true representatives of civility in Ireland and therefore deserved support. Literature of this nature served, however, to prepare the minds of Englishmen for the worst, and many of these who came to Ireland saw what they had been conditioned to expect.[23]

What the English adventurers encountered in the remote areas of Ireland was taken as confirmation of the assertions of the Old English, leading many to despair of Christianity there. Tremayne found religion "totally lacking" in Munster and refused to declare the Irish "ether Papists nor Protestants but rather such as have nether feare nor love of God in their harts that restreyneth them from ill. Thei regarde no othe, thei blaspheme, they murder, commit whoredome, hold no wedlocke, ravish, steal and commit all abomination without scruple of conscience." The most startling features were the decay of the churches,

[22] Christina Hallowell Garrett, *The Marian Exiles: A Study in the Origins of Elizabethan Puritanism* (Cambridge, 1966 [orig. publ. 1938]).

[23] Watt, *Church and Medieval Ireland*, 183-197, and "On the Disorders of the Irishry," S.P. 63/1, nos. 72, 73, P.R.O.

which Tremayne found were "onlie like stables," and the ignorance of the "priests and ministers of their owne race werse than shepherds."[24] Sidney, a moderate Protestant, wrote an equally astonished report of the state of religion in Munster in 1567:

> Swerlie there was never people that lived in more miserie than they doe, nor as it should seme of wourse myndes, for matrimonie emongs them is no more regarded in effect than conjunction betwene unreasonable beastes, perjurie, robberie and murder counted alloweable, finallie I cannot finde that they make anny conscience of synne and doubtless I doubte whether they christen there children or no, for neither finde I place where it should be don, nor any person able to enstruct them in the rules of a Christian, or if they were taught I cannot see they make any accompte of the woorlde to com.[25]

The clear implication is that Sidney considered himself to be dealing with people who were essentially pagans. He, like Spenser, was arriving at the conclusion that while the Irish professed to be Catholics they had no real knowledge of religion: "They are all Papists by their profession [wrote Spenser], but in the same so blindly and brutishly informed for the most part as that you would rather think them atheists or infidels."[26]

The English adventurers of the 1560s and 1570s thus had little difficulty in satisfying themselves that the Gaelic Irish were pagans, and this became an accepted tenet of all Englishmen. Lord Deputy Mountjoy, for example, was convinced that "the poore people of" Ulster "never had the meanes to know God," and he described one of the Gaelic chieftains of Ulster as "proud, valiant, miserable, tyrannous, unmeasurably covetous, without any knowledge of God, or almost any civility."[27] That such views could be offered without explanation in 1602 is a measure of the success of the colonizers of the previous generation in propagating them.

We must now ask why it was so important to the English adventurers to convince themselves that the Irish were pagan. The first point to note is that the English recognized a distinction between Christianity and civilization, and believed that a people could be civilized without being made Christian but not christianized without first being

[24] Tremayne, Notes on Ireland, June 1571, S.P. 63/32, no. 66, P.R.O.

[25] Sidney to the queen, Apr. 20, 1567, S.P. 63/20, no. 66, P.R.O.

[26] Spenser, *Ireland*, ed. Renwick, 84.

[27] Fynes Moryson, *An Itinerary: Containing His Ten Yeeres Travell through the Twelve Dominions of Germany, Bohmerland . . . Ireland* (1617) (Glasgow, 1907), II, 381; III, 208-209.

made civil. It was admitted that the Romans had been civilized despite being pagans, and sixteenth-century Englishmen were not ignorant of the existence of civilizations beyond the boundaries of Christian Europe. Supremacy was claimed for western civilization because it combined the benefits of Christianity with those of civility. To admit that the native Irish were Christian would, therefore, have been to acknowledge them as civilized also. By declaring the Irish to be pagan, however, the English were decreeing that they were culpable since their heathenism was owing not to a lack of opportunity but rather to the fact that their system of government was antithetical to Christianity. Once it was established that the Irish were pagans, the first logical step had been taken toward declaring them barbarians. The English were able to pursue their argument further when they witnessed the appearance of the native Irish, their habits, customs, and agricultural methods.

We must bear in mind that of the group of adventurers who flocked to Ireland many were widely travelled and some well read. There is evidence that a few of the West Countrymen had fought on the Continent, even against the Turks in Hungary, while others had visited the New World.[28] All were interested in travel and adventure, and through their exploits and reading of travel literature, such as the English translation of Johann Boemus (1555), they had familarized themselves with the habits of peoples who were considered barbarians by European standards.[29] It was natural that they should now strive to assimilate the Irish into their general conception of civilization. One early example of this was Sidney's comparing the Ulster chieftain Shane O'Neill with Huns, Vandals, Goths, and Turks.[30] Sidney was well versed in travel literature, and it is significant that the translator Thomas Hacket, in dedicating one of his works to Sidney, associated Sidney's task in Ireland with that of the Spaniards in the New World when he praised "such as have invented good lawes and statutes for the brideling of the barbarous and wicked, and for the maintayning and defending of the just."[31]

[28] For the careers of many of those mentioned see Churchyard, *General rehearsall*.

[29] Joannes Boemus, *The Fardel of facions, conteining the aunciente maners, customes, and Lawes of the peoples enhabiting the two partes of the earth, called Affrike and Asie*, trans. W. Waterman (London, 1555). See also Margaret T. Hodgen, *Early Anthropology in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (Philadelphia, 1964), esp. ch. 3.

[30] Sidney to Leicester, Mar. 1, 1566, S.P. 63/16, no. 35, P.R.O.

[31] André Thevet, *The new found worlde, or Antarticke*, trans. T. Hacket (London, 1568).

What is significant is that many of the colonizers came to Ireland with a preconception of what a barbaric society was like, and they found features in Gaelic life to fit this model. The ultimate hallmark of barbarism was the practice of cannibalism. While the Irish were seldom accused of cannibalism, Sidney referred to Shane O'Neill as "that canyball," and Sir John Davies, some fifty years later, asserted that those living under Gaelic rule "were little better than Cannibals who do hunt one another."[32] In addition, the English took the Irish practice of transhumance as proof that the Irish were nomads, hence barbarians. In the travel literature that was read by sixteenth-century Englishmen nomadic people were considered to be at the opposite pole of civilization from themselves. Boemus, for example, found the Scythians and their offshoot, the Tartarians, to be the most barbarous people in the world because they "neither possessed any grounds, nor had any seats or houses to dwell in, but wandered through wilderness and desert places driving their flockes and heardes of beasts before them."[33] This view became entrenched in the English mind and was repeated in the introduction of almost every sixteenth-century pamphlet dealing with travel and exploration. This explains why the practice of transhumance so readily caught the Englishman's attention in Ireland.

Smith, who sponsored a colony in Ireland even though he never visited the country himself, was particularly vehement against the "idle followyng of heards as the Tartarians, Arabians and Irishe men doo," thus categorizing the Irish with those whom he considered to be at the lowest level of civilization. Spenser went so far as to take the practice of transhumance as proof that the Gaelic Irish were descended from the Scythians. There was a custom in Ireland, said Spenser, "to keep their cattle and to live themselves the most part of the year in bollies [summer-quarters] pasturing upon the mountain and waste wild places, and removing still to fresh land as they have depastured the former; the which appeareth plain to be the manner of the Scythians as ye may read in Olaus Magnus et Johannes Boemus, and yet is used amongst all the Tartarians and the people about the Caspian sea which are naturally Scythians." Here was evidence to satisfy Spenser, and

[32] John Davies, *A Discovery of the True Causes why Ireland was never Entirely subdued, nor brought under obedience of the Crowne of England until the beginning of the happy reign of King James*, in Henry Morley, ed., *The Carisbrooke Library*, X (London, 1890), and Sidney to Leicester, Mar. 1, 1566, S.P. 63/16, no. 35, P.R.O.

[33] Joannes Boemus, *The Manners, Lawes, and Customes of all Nations . . .* (London, 1611), 106.

probably his readers, that the Irish were indeed barbarians. He was further convinced by Gaelic dress, hairstyle, and weapons, all of which he found to be "proper Scythian, for such the Scyths used commonly, as we may read in Olaus Magnus."[34] The Irish were also declared to be exceedingly licentious. Incest was said to be common among them, and Gaelic chieftains were accused of debauching the wives and daughters of their tenants.

The Irish appeared therefore not only as pagan but also as barbaric. Gilbert certainly treated them as if they were a lower order of humanity, and Carew considered one of his purposes in Ireland to be "the suppressing and reforming of the loose, barbarous and most wicked life of that savage nation." Barnaby Rich, a friend of Churchyard, argued against those who thought English conduct in Ireland "too seveare" by pointing out that the Irish preferred to "live like beastes, voide of lawe and all good order," and that they were "more uncivill, more uncleanly, more barbarous and more brutish in their customs and demeanures, then in any other part of the world that is known."[35]

So persuaded, Englishmen produced a moral and civil justification for their conquest of Ireland. Although most of the colonizers avowed that their long-term purpose was to convert the Irish to Christianity, they made no effort to accomplish this end, contending that conversion was impossible as long as the Irish persisted in their barbarous way of life. All were agreed that their immediate object should be the secular one of drawing the Irish to civility. Proclaiming this responsibility, Smith asserted that God "did make apte and prepare this nation . . . to inhabite and reforme so barbarous a nation as that is, and to bring them to the knowledge and lawe were both a goodly and commendable deede, and a sufficient work of our age," adding that it was England's civic duty to educate the Irish brutes "in vertuous labor and in justice, and to teach them our English lawes and civilitie and leave robbyng and stealing and killyng one of another." In Smith's view, the English were the new Romans come to civilize the Irish, as the old Romans had once civilized the ancient Britons: "This I write unto you as I do understand by histories of thyngs by past, how this contrey of England, ones as uncivill as Ireland now is, was by colonies

[34] J. Boemus, *A Letter Sent by J. B. . . .* (London, 1572), C. 1, and Spenser, *Ireland*, ed. Renwick, 49, 50, 54, 56.

[35] Vowell, *Peter Carew*, in Brewer and Bullen, eds., *Calendar of Carew Manuscripts*, civ; Barnaby Rich, *Allarme to England, foreshadowing what perils are procured, where the people live without regarde of Martiall lawe* (London, 1578), D. 2, and *A Short Survey of Ireland, truely discovering who it is that hath so armed the hearts of that people, with disobedience to their Princes* (London, 1609), 2.

of the Romaynes brought to understand the lawes and orders of thanncient orders whereof there hath no nacon more streightly and truly kept the mouldes even to this day then we, yea more than thitalians and Romaynes themselves."[36]

In accepting this idea, Smith was totally abandoning the notion of the Old English that the native Irish were enslaved by their lords and were crying out for liberation. The Irish, in his view, were indeed living under tyranny but were not yet ready for liberation since they were at an earlier stage of cultural development—the stage at which the English had been when the Romans had arrived. They needed to be made bondsmen to enlightened lords who would instruct them in the ways of civil society. In his major writing, *De Republica Anglorum*, Smith claimed superiority for England over all other nations, even the ancient Romans, on the grounds that bondsmen were by the sixteenth century virtually unknown in England.[37] He recommended that the Irish should be made subservient to the colonizing English so that through subjection they could come to appreciate civility and thus eventually achieve freedom as the former English bondsmen had done.

It is probable that the Roman parallel was used by Smith to justify his own actions in Ireland. This approach had already been taken by writers of the Italian Renaissance, such as Machiavelli, who contrasted medieval "barbarism" with old Roman "civilization" in order to justify the eradication of the last vestiges of that barbarism. This antimedievalism was easily transmitted by English Renaissance scholars, such as Smith, and further transformed when applied to the Irish who were considered even more "barbarian" than their medieval monkish counterparts. This helps explain why the Roman allusion appears so frequently in sixteenth-century writing on Ireland. Spenser repeated almost verbatim the sentiments of Smith when he remarked that "the English were at first as stout and warlike a people as ever were the Irish and yet you see are now brought to that civility that no nation in the world excelleth them in all goodly conversation."[38]

Almost fifty years later, Davies, urging completion of the conquest of Ireland, alluded to the Roman general Julius Agricola who had civilized "our ancestors the ancient Britons"—a "rude and dispersed"

[36] Boemus, *Letter sent to J. B.*, C. 6, and Smith to Fitzwilliam, Nov. 8, 1572, Carte MSS. 57, no. 236.

[37] Thomas Smith, *De Republica Anglorum: A Discourse on the Commonwealth of England* (1685), ed L. Ashton (Cambridge, 1906), 130-131.

[38] Spenser, *Ireland*, ed. Renwick, 11.

people, "and therefore prone upon every occasion to make war."[39] It was only by retaining such a concept that cultivated men could allow themselves to bring other people to subjection, which was one purpose of English colonization in Ireland. Thus Walter, earl of Essex, assured the Privy Council that he "never mente to unpeople the cuntrie Clandyboy of their naturall inhabitauntes, but to have cherished them so farre fourthe as they woulde live quiett and deutifull." It was his intention to eliminate the military caste in Gaelic Ulster by having them "executed by martiall lawe whensoever they be founde ydell and weaponed." Otherwise he wanted the natives retained as cultivators of the soil, "and the more Irishe the more profitable so as the Englishe be hable to master them."[40] Smith also envisaged the Irish husbandmen continuing to occupy land in his colony and even being instructed in the English methods of cultivation. This was to be done, however, under the strict supervision of those who would undertake the task of colonizing. It was no part of his plan that any native Irish should "purchase land, beare office, be chosen of any jurie or admitted witnes in any reall or personall action, nor be bounde apprentice to any science or arte that may indomage the Queenes Majesties subjectes hereafter." They were to be allowed to "beare no kind of weapon nor armoure," and the only benefits he had to offer them were that their "plowinge and laboure" would be "well rewarded with great provision," and that they would be free from "coyne, lyverye or any other exaction."[41] What Smith and Essex wanted to accomplish was to drive out the ruling elite and retain the majority of the population as docile cultivators. Smith, and later Spenser and Davies, pointed to Roman precedent to justify this policy. They thought the example pertinent because England was now the new Rome, the center of civilization.

We can see clearly that Smith had developed a sense of cultural process which could be used as a rationale for reducing the Irish to servitude and, if they resisted, for killing and dispossessing them. No other colonist in Ireland articulated this view as clearly as he, but there

[39] Davies, *Discovery*, 272-273.

[40] Essex to Privy Council, undated, Add. MSS. 48015, fols. 305-314, British Library (formerly British Museum).

[41] "Petition of Thomas Smythe and his Associates," c. 1570, in C. L. Kingsford, ed., *Report on the Manuscripts of Lord de L'Isle and Dudley preserved at Penshurst Place* (Historical Manuscripts Commission, *19th Report* [London, 1934]), II, 12-15, and Smith to Fitzwilliam, May 18, 1572, in *Calendar State Papers Foreign, 1583, and Addenda 1547-83*, 49-50.

is evidence that all had a sense of cultural superiority to the Irish. Essex professed his mission to be "grounded on Her Majesty's commiseration of the natural born subjects of this province, over whom the Scots did tyrannise," but when the same subjects refused to accept the substitution of a new form of slavery for the old, he had no scruples about slaughtering them.[42]

Sidney, too, seems to have had a vague sense of cultural process and at least approached a concept of cultural classification when he observed and compared the three segments of society that confronted him in Ireland—the Gaelic world, feudal Ireland, and the "civilized" society of the Pale. It was clear to the lord deputy that Irish feudal society was preferable to that of Gaelic Ireland, but he was equally conscious that feudal society in Ireland was more independent and authoritarian than its English counterpart and was still at a stage of development beyond which England had advanced. Even more emphatic on this point, Gilbert condemned the independence of the Irish feudal lords, warning against the danger to a prince whose "subjectes greatly followed for themselves, as may partlie appear by Nevell earll of Warruicke, by the prynce of Orrainge in the lowe countryes, and by the Faccions betwene the howsse of Bourbon and Gwysee in France."[43] It seemed to Gilbert that the Irish feudal lords were at a stage of development similar to that prevailing in France and the Netherlands but through which England had passed. Others saw this as an intermediary stage between total license, as in Gaelic Ireland, and final, if reluctant, acceptance of a centralized state, as in England. We get an example of this thinking in 1607 from Davies, the then attorney-general for Ireland, in his recommendation that Hugh O'Neill, earl of Tyrone, be deprived of control of his tenants and reduced "to the moderate condition of other lords in Ireland and in England at this day." Davies reminded his readers that "when England was full of tenants-at-will our barons were then like the mere Irish lords, and were able to raise armies against the crown; and as this man was O'Neal in Ulster, so the Earl of Warwick was O'Nevill in Yorkshire, and the Bishopric and Mortimer was the like in the Marches of Wales."[44]

The evidence is admittedly scattered and no individual writer stuck

[42] Essex to Burghley, Sept. 10, 1573, in Devereux, *Lives of Devereux*, I, 34-36.

[43] See Gilbert's discourse on Ireland, Feb. 1, 1574, Add. MSS. 48017, fols. 136-143.

[44] Davies to Salisbury, July 1, 1607, in C. W. Russell and J. P. Prendergast, eds., *Calendar of the State Papers for Ireland 1606-8* (London, 1873), 213.

consistently to one point of view, but we can state confidently that the old concept of the Irish as socially inferior to the English was being replaced with the idea that they were culturally inferior and far behind the English on the ladder of development. The colonizers were assisting in the development of a concept of historical process and cultural development, as the widening of the horizons of the articulate citizen of sixteenth-century England, both intellectually and geographically, slowly eroded the old idea of a static world.[45] It was only natural that the aggressive men who sought their fortunes in Ireland should try to fit Gaelic society into their expanding world view. But what provided Englishmen with a growing confidence and pride spelled disaster for Gaelic Ireland, which was now seen as a cultural throwback that must be painfully dragged to modernity. In the minds of these adventurers it no longer held true, as it had under the statutes of Kilkenny of 1366, that an Irishman could be accepted under English law. To do so, said Spenser, would be as absurd as to "transfer the laws of the Lacedemonians to the people of Athens." Laws, according to Spenser, "ought to be fashioned unto the manners and condition of the people to whom they are meant, and not to be imposed upon them according to the simple rule of right, for then . . . instead of good they may work ill, and pervert justice to extreme injustice." The central theme of Spenser's *Ireland* was that "the common law . . . with the state of Ireland peradventure it doth not so well agree, being a people altogether stubborn and untamed." The Gaelic law, which Spenser saw as fashioned to the manner and condition of the people, could not, however, be tolerated, since it was opposed to all civility. The only solution was to forbid the practice of Gaelic law and subject the Irish by force so that they could then by "moderation" be brought "from their delight of licentious barbarism unto the love of goodness and civility."[46]

It is only when we appreciate this reasoning that we can fully understand the attitudes and policies of Sidney and his adherents in Ireland. The lord deputy was critical of feudal society there, but argued that it was capable of being reformed and made to conform to the English model of civility. In the words of William Gerrard, one of Sidney's subordinates, the native Irish could be subdued only by arms, while the "degenerate" Old English could be improved by "the rodd

[45] On the emergence of the concept of process in England see A. B. Ferguson, "Circumstances and the Sense of History in Tudor England: The Coming of the Historical Revolution," Medieval and Renaissance Studies, *Proceedings*, III (1967).

[46] Spenser, *Ireland*, ed. Renwick, 10-11.

of justice" for "in theim yet resteth this instincte of Englishe nature generally to feare justice."[47] Sidney was more moderate in holding that even those areas of Gaelic Ireland which were within easy reach of Dublin and had had some contact with civility were amenable to justice: extreme action was reserved for Gaelic Ulster and the Gaelic areas of southwest Munster.

The English Privy Council seems to have reasoned similarly, as is suggested by their confining of St. Leger's claims to the Gaelic areas of Munster. Fitzwilliam, who was generally a moderate, admitted that "nothing but feare and force can teach dutie and obedience" to this "rebellious people." The same view was held by Sir John Perrott, who prided himself on his stern rule while lord president in Munster and concluded that "there ys no waye better then to make those wylde people . . . to feare, so they be not kepte in servile feare." Essex, too, "put litell difference betweene the Irishe and the Scott saving that the Skott is the less ill of disposition, more inclinable to civility though more dangerous."[48] The Irish were thus categorized as the most barbarous of peoples, and Englishmen argued that it was their duty and responsibility to hold them down by force so that through subjection they could achieve liberty.

We should not attribute to the English complete originality in this. Many of the conclusions at which they were arriving about the Irish had already been reached by the Spaniards with respect to the Indians. J. H. Elliott has argued that the Spaniards had come to consider the indigenous population of the New World as culturally inferior to themselves and, like the Elizabethans in Ireland, were approaching a concept of cultural classification.[49] It can be established that many of the English associated with colonization were familiar with Spanish thinking, and it is quite probable that their attitudes and actions were influenced by Spanish precedents.

The most potent Spanish influence was undoubtedly communicated by Richard Eden's partial translation of Peter Martyr Anglerius's *De Orbe Novo*. Eden was well known to the group of West Country adventurers who came to Ireland in the 1560s, and Smith had been Eden's tutor at Cambridge, which is sufficient reason to assume his

[47] "Gerrard's Notes," Irish Manuscripts Commission, *Analecta Hibernica*, II (1931), 95-96.

[48] Fitzwilliam to queen, Sept. 15, 1572, S.P. 63/37, no. 59; Perrott to Smith, Jan. 28, 1573, S.P. 63/39, no. 16; Essex to Ashton, June 1, 1575, S.P. 63/52, no. 5, P.R.O.

[49] Elliott, *Old World and the New*, 39-51.

familiarity with the translation. Sidney was also acquainted with the work and may have had more direct acquaintance with Spanish colonial theory while in Spain, 1553-1556, in Queen Mary's service.[50] In any event it is difficult to imagine how any of the adventurers in Ireland could have been ignorant of Eden's work. It is more than likely that Champernoun, St. Leger, and the others saw themselves as *conquistadores* subduing the barbaric and pagan Irish, just as their Spanish counterparts were bringing the Indians to subjection.

Smith certainly recognized that his venture in Ireland was being compared by others with colonization in the New World. He voiced no objection, other than the fear that his exploit would be tainted by association with the none-too-successful Anglo-French venture of 1563, and that he and his son would be "accompted deceivers of men and enterprysers of Stowelies [Stukeley's] voiage of Terra Florida, or a lattarye as som evill tongues did terme it." Essex acknowledged a parallel with Spain and expected "that within two yeares, you shall make restraint for the Englishe to come hither [to Ireland] without license as at this date it is in Spaine for going to the Indyes."[51] Leicester, who also appears to have been influenced by Spanish thinking, admitted that his attitude toward the Irish was affected by the information he had of the treatment meted out to other "barbarous" peoples. He argued that since the Irish were "a wild, barbarous and treacherous people, I would deall as I have hard and redd of such lyke how they have byn used." In this he was, seemingly, suggesting that since the native Irish were barbarians there was no reason why the Spanish precedent should not be followed. Leicester's many statements make it clear that he favored a tough policy for Ireland; his sentiments came remarkably close to those of Eden who recommended that Englishmen emulate the example of the Spaniards in the New World.[52] If, however, Leicester was in fact influenced by the Spanish experience, he acknowledged the debt by implication rather than overtly. Less hesitantly and despite their hatred of the Spaniards, other Englishmen occasionally cited Spanish actions to justify their own extreme measures in Ireland. Davies, for

[50] Petrus Martyr Anglerius, *The Decades of the newe worlde or West India*, trans. Richard Eden (London, 1555); Elliott, *Old World and New*, 91; Quinn, "Ireland and Expansion," *Hist. Studies.*, I (1958), 26.

[51] Smith to Fitzwilliam, Carte MSS. 57, no. 227, and Essex to Privy Council, Add. MSS. 48015, fols. 305-314.

[52] Leicester to Fitzwilliam, Aug. 24, 1572, Carte MSS. 57, no. 227, and Anglerius, *Decades of the newe worlde*, trans. Eden, preface. For other extreme statements by Leicester see Carte MSS. 56, nos. 39, 97.

example, in defending the transplantation of natives during the course of the Ulster plantation, cited the precedent of "the Spaniards [who] lately removed all the Moors out of Granada into Barbary without providing them with any new seats there."[53] It is evident, therefore, that the English were aware of the severity of the Spaniards in dealing with those who did not measure up to their standards of civility, and it appears that this knowledge strengthened the English in their conviction that they were justified in their own harsh treatment of the native Irish.

The events of 1565-1576 in Ireland have a significance in the general history of colonization that transcends English and Irish history. The involvement in Irish colonization of men who afterwards ventured to the New World suggests that their years in Ireland were years of apprenticeship. Quinn has established that the use of a propaganda campaign to muster support for a colony and the application of the joint-stock principle to colonization were both novel techniques which were employed none too successfully in Ireland, but without which the English could hardly have pursued successful colonization in the New World.[54] An even more significant break with the past was the change in attitude toward the native Irish, and this too was to have consequences in the history of American colonization.

It has been noted how Sidney and his adherents fitted the native Irish into their mental world picture. Certain traits of the Gaelic way of life, notably the practice of transhumance, were accepted as evidence that the Irish were barbarians, and the English thus satisfied themselves that they were dealing with a culturally inferior people who had to be subdued by extralegal methods. Many of the English colonizers were at first unsure of themselves and looked to Roman practice for further justification for their actions. The Roman example seems to have been abandoned as unnecessary by the colonizers who ventured to North America, but not so the concept of cultural evolution that had been sharpened as a result of their Irish experience. Writers such as Thomas Hariot, who had Irish as well as American experience, frequently compared the habits of the Gaelic Irish with those of the Indians. Contemporary observers like Theodore De Bry claimed to see a resemblance between the ancient Britons and the Indians drawn by the artist John

[53] Davies to Salisbury, Nov. 8, 1610, in Sir John Davies, *Historical Tracts* (Dublin, 1787).

[54] See the works of Quinn, as cited in n. 1.

White, thus implying that they considered the Indians, like the Irish, to be at the same primitive level of development as the ancient Britons had been.[55] It appears therefore that the Irish experience confirmed and reinforced the English notion of barbarism and that those, such as Gilbert, Raleigh, and Frobisher, who had experience in both spheres had little difficulty in applying that notion to the indigenous population of the New World.[56]

We find the colonists in the New World using the same pretexts for the extermination of the Indians as their counterparts had used in the 1560s and 1570s for the slaughter of numbers of the Irish. The adventurers to Ireland claimed that their primary purpose was to reform the Irish and, in the words of Smith, "to reduce that countrey to civilitie and the maners of England." It is evident, however, that no determined effort was ever made to reform the Irish, but rather that at the least pretext—generally resistance to the English—they were dismissed as a "wicked and faythles peopoll" and put to the sword.[57] This formula was repeated in the treatment of the Indians in the New World. At first the English claimed their mission to be that of civilizing the native inhabitants, but they quickly despaired of achieving this purpose. When relations between the English and the Indians grew tense, emphasis was given to the barbaric traits of the native population. After the Indian insurrection of 1622 we find the colonizers exulting in the fact that they were now absolved from all restraints in dealing with the Indians.[58] We also find the same indictments being brought against the Indians, and later the blacks, in the New World that had been brought against the Irish. It was argued that the Indians were an unsettled people who did not make proper use of their land and thus could be justly deprived of it by the more enterprising English. Both Indians and blacks, like the Irish, were accused of being idle, lazy, dirty, and licentious, but

[55] Quinn, *Elizabethans*, 106-122, and Paul H. Hulton and David Beers Quinn, *The American Drawings of John White, 1577-1590, with Drawings of European and Oriental Subjects* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1964).

[56] Quinn, *Raleigh and Empire*, and Jones, *Strange New World*, esp. ch. 5.

[57] Smith to Fitzwilliam, Nov. 8, 1572, S.P. 63/39, no. 30, and Barkley to Burghley, May 14, 1574, S. P. 63/46, no. 15, P.R.O.

[58] Gary B. Nash, "The Image of the Indian in the Southern Colonial Mind," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., XXIX (1972), 197-230, and Roy Harvey Pearce, *The Savages of America: A Study of the Indian and the Idea of Civilization*, rev. ed. (Baltimore, 1965), esp. 4-16.

few serious efforts were made to draw any of them from their supposed state of degeneracy.[59]

We have here a few of the lessons that the English gained from their Irish experience and later applied in the New World. Equally significant are the lessons that they failed to learn. The sixteenth-century colonizer was a proud disdainful person, but he was also insecure and needed to remind himself constantly of his own superiority by looking to the imputed inferiority of others. Those who came to Ireland had a preconceived idea of a barbaric society and they merely tailored the Irishman to fit this ideological strait jacket. There were, of course, many aspects of Gaelic life that did not so easily fit this model, but the English refused to make any adjustment, lest, perhaps, it disturb their own position at the top of the ladder of cultural development.

The most flagrant example of this blindness and obstinacy was the belief, retained in despite of all evidence, that "barbaric" societies were invariably divided into two neat categories—the barbarous tyrants or "cruell cannibales" and the meek laborers whom they held in utter bondage.[60] Tremayne's censures were reserved for the ruling caste in Ireland who, he claimed, had "mor authoritie than any lord over bondmen." Rich agreed with this and thought England's role in Ireland should be to defend the poor tenants from the "thraldome" to which they were being subjected by those "helhounds" of lords whose only ethic was to "defend me and spend me." Even Essex claimed this to be his mission in Ireland, and Smith idealized "the churle of Ireland as a very simple and toylesome man desiring nothing but that he may not bee eaten out with" Irish exactions.[61] It was of course some of these "simple and toylesome" men, whom the younger Smith had taken into his service, who murdered him, but not even this could disabuse the English. Spenser could still state emphatically that "there are two sortes of people in Ireland to be considered of . . . the one called the kerne,

[59] Nash, "Indian in the Southern Mind," *WMQ*, 3d Ser., XXIX (1972), 197-230; Pearce, *Savages of America*, 4-16; Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black: American Attitudes toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1968). See also P. E. H. Hair, "Protestants as Pirates, Slavers, and Proto-missionaries: Sierra Leone, 1568-1582," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, XXI (1970), 203-224, esp. 221-223.

[60] Anglerius, *Decades of the newe worlde*, trans. Eden, preface, 172.

[61] Tremayne, Notes on the Reformation of the Irish, June 1571, S.P. 63/32, no. 66, P.R.O.; Rich, *Allarme to England*, E. 1; Essex to Privy Council, Add. MSS. 48015, fols. 305-314; Boemus, *Letter*, B. 1.

the other the chorle. The kerne bredd up in idleness and naturally inclined to mischiefs and wickednesse, the chorle willing to labour and take pains if he might peaceably enjoy the fruites thereof."[62]

Spenser might have been speaking of the Indians because, as Edmund S. Morgan has shown, the English in the New World used the same form of categorization and displayed the same reluctance to learn from experience. Morgan suggests that this blindness to reality can be explained by wishful thinking on the part of the English who expected to find a ready work force in America. There is certainly some truth to this as can be seen in Smith's desire, like that of the English in Virginia, to retain the supposedly docile natives as "fermors or copieholders" in his colony. The retention of such a myth in the face of adversity must, however, be taken as indicating the colonist's insecurity: he needed to think of himself as setting out on a crusade, bringing the "gentle government" of the English to the oppressed. If he was to admit that the oppressed did not exist or were not anxious to avail themselves of English justice, then the colonist's *raison d'être* was called in question.[63]

The intent of this article has been to furnish an insight into the mind of the English colonist. At the outset the English were somewhat unsure of themselves and went to great lengths to establish the inferiority of others so as to provide a justification for acts of aggression. It can be seen also that the experience gained by the Elizabethans in Ireland opened their minds to an understanding of process and development, thus enabling them to arrive at a concept of cultural evolution. Other Europeans, notably the Renaissance theorists of Italy and France, had advanced the notion of social superiority, but it was only those who came into contact with "barbaric" peoples who drew practical conclusions from the idea in order to provide moral respectability for colonization.

[62] Spenser, *Ireland*, ed. Renwick, 179.

[63] Smith to Fitzwilliam, Nov. 8, 1572, Carte MSS. 57, no. 236, and Edmund S. Morgan, "The Labor Problem at Jamestown, 1607-18," *American Historical Review*, LXXVI (1971), 595-611.

Weights and Measures in the Colonial Sugar Trade: The Gallon and the Pound and Their International Equivalents

John J. McCusker*

So Wir hetten einen Glauben
Gott und Grechtigkait vor augen,
Ein Ehl, Gewicht, Maß, Münk, oñ Gelt
So stünd es wol in dieser welt.[1]

GREAT BRITAIN is going metric. The United States must do so also, sooner or later, finally following the urgings of such early leaders as Thomas Jefferson. Before the end of the twentieth century, the use of the metric system will no doubt have become universal. The economic historian wishes this had happened centuries ago because one of his most perplexing problems rises, in the words of James Madison, from "the inconvenience of . . . using different

* Mr. McCusker, a member of the Department of History of the University of Maryland, wishes to acknowledge the generous aid of Kenneth E. Carpenter, curator of the Kress Library of Business and Economics, and to express his gratitude for assistance from the Institute of Early American History and Culture, the Council on Research in Economic History, the Smithsonian Institution, the General Research Board of the University of Maryland, and the American Philosophical Society.

[1] Renerus Budelius, *De monetis, et re numaria* (Cologne, 1591). Budelius quoted this as an ancient and venerable saying ("vetus est et elegans dictum"). He translated it, somewhat loosely, as "Una fides, pondus, mensura, moneta sit una, Et status illæsus totius orbis erit." Whereas his interpretation suggests that one faith, one system of weights and measures, and one money would render the world whole, his dictum in fact stipulates that the acceptance of one creed, one god, and one law is the prerequisite for any universal system of weights and measures, numbering, and money. This article incorporates an argument that, in practice, commerce is a unifying force, at least with regard to weights and measures.

To take their place there will come the fat rumped jeerers,
after crushing them, their culture, and their cities,
laden all with packs of plates and brass and pewter,
with shaven jaws and English and braggart accent.

Every dowdy then will wear a cape of beaver
and don a gown of silk from poll of head to ankle.
All our castles will be held by clownish upstarts
crowded full with veterans of cheese and pottage.

What mental agony would Dáibhí have felt if he had known then that within a year the 'fat rumped jeerers' would take over, not only the castles, but the entire land of Ireland with the exception of the province of Connaught and Co. Clare, into whose confines they would order the Irish to move on pain of death, giving them the choice between 'Hell or Connaught!'. In 1649 Oliver Cromwell had told the Irish: 'We are come to ask an account of the innocent blood that hath been shed, and to endeavour to bring to an account all who by appearing in arms shall justify the same.' The account was about to be settled with a terrible vengeance.

'There is no laughter at children's doings'

The country which Charles Fleetwood had come to govern had been devastated by eleven years of vicious and bloody warfare. It was a country which had lost over a third of its population by war, pestilence and famine. Colonel Richard Lawrence, the governor of Waterford, recalled in 1655:

About the year 1652 and 1653 the plague and famine had so swept away whole counties that a man might travel twenty or thirty miles and not see a living creature, either man, beast or bird, they being either all dead or had quit those desolate places; or soldiers would tell stories of the place where they saw a smoke; it was so rare to see either smoke by day or fire or candle by night. And when we did meet with two or three poor cabins, none but very aged men and women and children, and those, like the prophet, might have complained: We are become as a bottle in the smoke; our skin is black like an oven, because of the terrible famine. I have seen those miserable creatures plucking stinking, rotten carrion out of a ditch, black and rotten, and been credibly informed that they dug corpses out of the grave to eat.

The new Physician-General of the Army, Dr. William Petty, wrote that the inhabitants of Thomond, Upper Ormond, and several other parts of the country 'were necessitated by hunger to eat their garrans [small horses] and plough horses and to buy and steal from one another the worst kind of horse to eat'. On May 12, 1653, the Commissioners reported on 'the great multitude of poor swarming in all parts of the nation . . . frequently some are found feeding on carrion and weeds and some starved in the highways, and many times poor children who have lost their parents, or who have been deserted by them, are found exposed to, and some of them fed upon, by ravening wolves and other beasts and birds of prey'.

According to Petty '. . . about 504,000 of the Irish perished and were wasted by the sword, plague, famine, hardships and banishment between the 23rd October, 1641, and the same day in 1652'.

October 23, 1641, had been the day on which the Irish had risen in arms against the English administration. Their aim was simple: to drive out the English and Scottish colonists, regain the land that had been confiscated from them and establish the independence of their country. From 1172 until the reign of the Tudors, the conquerors and colonists that England had sent into Ireland had been gradually assimilated into the Irish nation. Despite attempts to impose the English language, customs and laws, the Irish showed a remarkable resilience and capacity for survival and were able to induce the settlers to adopt their language, customs and laws in spite of the severe punishments threatened from England. The Master of the Court of Wards, Sir William Parsons, had declared: 'We must change their course of government, apparel, manner of holding land, language and habit of life. It will be otherwise impossible to set up in them obedience to the laws and to the English empire.' The first serious attempt to do so was made by Mary Tudor in the province of Leinster. English colonists formed settlements, driving out the native Irish from their lands. They agreed to become colonists on condition they 'should use for the most the English tongue, habit and government' and make no appeal to the native Irish Brehon Laws. This colonisation

was then extended to Munster and threatened in Connaught. But within a few years the Lord Chancellor, Sir Robert Gerard, writing in 1578, reported that 'all the English, and the most part with delight, even in Dublin, speak Irish'. In 1600 Fynes Moryson, an official arriving from England, complained that even the 'English-Irish', as he termed the colonists, would not speak English with him in Dublin.

Clearly the Tudor attempt at colonisation had failed. But a change began with the accession of James I, which coincided with the defeat of Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone, and his Irish armies which had fought for eight years against the armies of Elizabeth I. Following this defeat, English common law began to be enforced throughout the country, displacing the old Brehon system, and a sterner policy of colonisation was followed in which English and Scots took over confiscated lands, particularly in Ulster. Aindrias Mac Marcais summed up the despair of the people when he wrote

Gan gaire fa ghniomhradh leinbh

There is no laughter at children's doings,
Music is prohibited, the Irish language is in chains.

In spite of the conquest and colonisation the Irish were far from subdued. The clans remained loyal to their chieftains and the scattered nomadic septs lived in the shelter of the hills, bogs and vast forests, raiding the colonists' settlements with the approval of the entire native population. The colonists, however, were pushing the Irish further and further into the bogs while they took over the rich, low-lying, springy meadowland and introducing to it breeds of cattle from England, while the herds of lean, shaggy Irish cattle began to decrease for want of suitable pasture.

The clan system was gradually being eroded. Absolute private ownership in land had been alien to the Irish communal way of life. Land had been the common property of all the clan, and each clansman was allotted land for his personal use but he could not dispose of it without the consent of his clan, even the disposal of cattle or other goods needed such approval. All chieftains were elected by the clansmen on two basic qualifications: one, they had to be capable of carrying out the job involved, and, secondly, were therefore usually

elected from one particular family acquainted with the problems a chief would encounter. The feudal principle of primogeniture was unknown in Irish law. The Brehon system put the basis of power in the decisions of the people made at the clan assemblies. The philosophy was expressed in the old saying *'Is treise tuath no tighearna'*—a people is stronger than a lord. The law provided for election to every office with the addition that the most worthy be elected. It was therefore difficult for a chief to usurp his power for he was so limited and hemmed in by his office and so dependent on his clan that it was easier for him to promote the clan welfare and conform to the intention of the law than to become either negligent or despotic. The chief was president of the clan assembly, commander of its forces in war and a judge of its courts. But gradually through the years, as the influence of the colonists was felt, many clans became feudalised. In 1585 the Connaught chiefs, frightened by the colonisation policy, decided to swear allegiance to Elizabeth I as a feudal monarch, introducing rents and claiming full ownership of their clan lands in total contradiction to the Irish social system. Other chiefs held out. Morrogh O'Flaherty, who died in 1593, made a will recommending his successor as chief and dividing the clan lands between his sons as he feared, rightly, that the Irish law would be superseded by that of the English law of primogeniture. Nevertheless, Dubhaltach Mac Firbisigh of Lecan, writing in 1650, when compiling a dictionary of Brehon Laws, claimed that he still knew many chieftains at that time who ruled their clans according to the Brehon system.

The English and Scottish colonisation in the early seventeenth century had witnessed the proscription of the ancient bardic schools, the universities, and the academies of Irish literary and poetical activity. But this suppression had released hidden springs of new poetical expression in Irish. Poets still used old metres but new concepts and loosened measures began to take shape. These were known as *amhrán* (song) based on musical stress and did not depend on the strict counting of syllables, nor were the new poets shackled by an elaborate system of vowel and consonant correspondences as were the bardic metres. A new and vigorous folk

As to the rebels was the scourge or rod
Of the Almighty. He by good advice
Did kill the Nitts, that they might not grow lice.

Sir Hardress Waller, who had been born in Kent, settled in Ireland in 1630, marrying the daughter of Sir John Dowdall of Kilkenny. He acquired an estate at Castletown, Co. Limerick. During the years of the Confederacy he had fought under Inchiquin when Inchiquin favoured the Parliamentarian side. In December, 1648, Waller had acted as Colonel Pride's assistant in the seizure and expulsion of the Presbyterian members of Parliament. He was one of Charles I's judges and had signed the King's death warrant. Henry Cromwell wrote to his father:

I have observed him to bear your Highness' pleasure so evenly, that I am more moved with that his quiet and decent carriage that I could by any clamour or importunity to give him recommendation.

On August 15, 1649, Oliver Cromwell, Lord Lieutenant and commander of the Army of the English Commonwealth in Ireland, stepped ashore from the frigate *John* in the estuary of the Liffey. He bore a typical English racial contempt for the Irish and to him the situation was a black and white one—innocent, honest English colonists had been slaughtered by the treacherous, uncivilised Irish. His knowledge of the Irish insurrection was taken from the propaganda pamphlet histories with all their distortions of Irish atrocities against the colonists. According to Cromwell:

... Englishmen had good inheritances which many of them purchased with their money, they or their ancestors from many of you and your ancestors. They had good leases from Irishmen for a long time to come; great stocks therefrom; houses and plantations created at their cost and charge. They lived peaceably and honestly among you; you had equal benefit of the protection of England with them, and equal justice from the laws—saving what was necessary for the State, for reasons of State, to put upon some few people apt to rebel upon the imaginations of such as you. You broke the union. You, unprovoked, put the English to the most unheard of and most barbarous massacre without respect of sex or age, that ever the sun beheld, and at a time when Ireland was in perfect peace, and when, through the example of English industry, through commerce and traffic, that which was in the natives' hands was better to them than if all Ireland had been in their possession and not an Englishman in it; and yet then I say, was this unheard of villainy perpetrated by your instigation who boast of peacemaking and unity against the common enemy ...

It was a ludicrous farrago but it represented Cromwell's sincere belief and made his actions during the terrible military campaign that proceeded more understandable.

The campaign opened with the siege of Drogheda. On September 10, 1649, he called upon the town to surrender and Sir John Aston, the Royalist commander, refused. The Cromwellian artillery opened up a bombardment. The next day the town fell and Cromwell reported: 'Our men getting up to them, were ordered by me to put them all to the sword ... I forbade them to spare any that were in arms in the town.' Cromwell let his troops plunder the town and seek out, in particular, Catholic priests and execute them. The pillage went on all through the night of the 11th/12th and by next morning only two strong points remained. These pockets of resistance were soon overcome. 'When they submitted,' wrote Cromwell, 'their officers were knocked on the head; and every tenth man of the soldiers killed; and the rest were shipped for Barbados. The soldiers in the other Tower were all spared, as to their lives only; and shipped likewise for the Barbados.' Some 3,500 men, women and children had been killed. Cromwell felt it was a 'righteous judgement of God upon these barbarous wretches, who have imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood'. Ironically, well over half the Drogheda garrison were English Catholics and Royalists and the others were mainly Anglo-Irish Royalists. It was highly improbable that any man in Drogheda had a hand in the 1641 insurrection. But Cromwell believed the lesson of Drogheda 'will tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future, which are the satisfactory grounds to such actions, which otherwise cannot but work remorse and regret'.

In this Cromwell was right. The Royalist-Confederate alliance evacuated Trim and Dundalk and Colonel Robert Venables was despatched to Ulster to support Sir Charles Coote. Carlingford and Newry surrendered, leaving Cromwell to advance on Wexford, which he reached on October 1. After unsatisfactory parleys Cromwell's artillery opened up on October 11. Wexford was defended by Colonel David Sinnott and 3,000 men. After a barricade defence in the

town's market place, Cromwell's forces smashed resistance and slaughtered over 1,500 soldiers and civilians.

A small garrison was left in Wexford and Cromwell turned on New Ross, defended by Lucas Taafe, brother of Lord Taafe. After an artillery bombardment Taafe agreed to vacate the town. The English under his command decided to join the Commonwealth army.

Malaria and dysentery, as well as plague, the spotted fever, were taking its toll of the Commonwealth army. Oliver himself fell ill with malaria and his second in command Michael Jones died in Dublin of the plague in December. Ireton was immediately appointed Cromwell's deputy. Illness also took its toll of the Irish leaders. On November 6 at Cloughoughter in Co. Cavan, Eoin Ruadh O'Neill died. It was a terrible blow to the Irish for O'Neill was perhaps the only Irish commander with personality and competence to inspire his ill-clad and ill-fed troops to face Cromwell. The Lord Lieutenant, meanwhile, spent Christmas resting at Youghal, Co. Cork, and on January 29, 1650, began an early spring campaign by marching on Kilkenny. During the spring months the Commonwealth army broke down Irish resistance throughout the country. Kilkenny fell in March.

The English Parliament now required Cromwell's presence in London and Ireton was appointed commander in his place. Lieutenant General Ludlow was to arrive in January, 1651, to be Ireton's second in command. He brought with him a female relative of his who had been a colonist and had been driven out of Ireland in 1641 with her children during the early days of the uprising. Ludlow took his views from her and her family, who were wiped out by the plague within days of returning to Ireland. Ludlow accepted all the tales of Irish barbarism, even 'that they roasted men and ate them to supply their necessities'.

On May 26, 1650, Cromwell embarked on the frigate *President Bradshaw* and, after a rough passage, arrived at Bristol five days later. He was received as a conquering hero; in Ireland he had become the devil personified.

The forty-year-old Major General Ireton now faced renewed activity by the Irish in Ulster. Bishop Emer MacMahon had gathered an army of 4,000 infantry and 400

cavalry. Sir Charles Coote's forces could not get to grips with MacMahon who was displaying a considerable flair for military strategy. Finally, in the middle of June, 1650, the two armies clashed at Scarrifhollis, on a hillside overlooking the western shore of Lough Swilly. Coote managed to break the Irish and the bulk of the Irish leaders were hunted down and executed, including Henry O'Neill, the only son of Eoin Ruadh. Sir Phelim O'Neill managed to escape but MacMahon was caught and executed. The last sizeable field army that the Irish possessed was gone, although a small army of 2,000 foot and 700 horse, commanded by Lord Clanricarde, held Tyrrells pass.

Ireton had turned on Carlow and was mopping up isolated garrisons. He took command of the siege of Waterford, which was still holding out, and at the end of July the city asked for terms. It surrendered on August 10. Ireton reported: 'There marched out about 700 men, well armed, and townsmen more numerous than we believed, and the town better fortified in all parts and more difficult to attempt than our forces conceived, there being many stores sufficient to have maintained them a longer time.' On August 17 Duncannon surrendered and Waterford harbour was now open to the English navy.

The end of resistance by the Royalist-Confederate alliance was in sight and Ormonde decided it was time to quit the country. He issued a commission to Lord Clanricarde to act as his deputy and left in a fast sloop of four guns on December 11 from Geneinagh, a little port in Co. Clare. Twelve years were to pass before Ormonde returned to Ireland. In the spring of 1651 Clanricarde tried to reconstitute the Irish armies but the offensive was entirely with the Commonwealth forces.

In June Ireton was before Limerick, where, supported by the navy, which landed stores and artillery at the Shannon Estuary, he set up several artillery pieces. On June 19 he summoned the commander Hugh O'Neill to surrender. When his terms were refused, twenty-eight field guns opened up on the Castle, which covered Thomond Bridge, and Ireton's mortars harassed the town. On June 20 the Castle was destroyed. Limerick doggedly held out, hoping that

winter would come. Some Irish boasted that while the English 'laboured to beat them out with bomb shells . . . they would beat them away with snow balls'. A few civilians tried to leave town but Ireton had them hanged as examples; they included a young girl whose father tried to redeem her life for his own.

Fresh English troops were pouring into the country as reinforcements. On April 18, 1651, the English Parliament had passed 'An Act for the Imprestment of Soldiers for the Service of the Commonwealth in Ireland'. The Act was made because 'of great necessity, considering the great preparation now making by the malignant Papish and ill affected party to this Commonwealth'. It provided for the conscription of 10,000 men and those who refused to serve would be punished by three months' imprisonment. On October 27 Limerick, weakened by death, by bombardment and plague, not to mention hunger, surrendered. The original garrison of 2,000 was reduced to 1,200 and over 5,000 townspeople had lost their lives. The Irish garrison began to march out of the town to surrender. 'As they were marching out,' observed Ludlow, 'two or three of them fell down dead of the plague. Several of them also lay unburied in the churchyard.' Some of the Irish leaders, including Major General Purcell, were immediately executed, although Ireton spared the life of the commanding officer, Hugh O'Neill. Ireton's attitude was clear. According to Ludlow, he stated 'that Ireland being a conquered country, the English nation might with justice assert their right of conquest . . .'

Ireton decided to cross into Co. Clare and subdue the Irish garrisons there, at the same time offering Galway, the sole remaining city in the hands of the Irish, identical terms to those offered to Limerick on November 7. Ludlow had captured Clare Castle but soon after had fallen ill with a cold. Ireton also caught the cold and returned to Limerick to recuperate. Oliver's youngest son, Henry, now twenty-three years old and serving as a Captain with Sir Hardress Waller against Lord Muskerry in Cork and Kerry, had arrived in Limerick to report to Ireton. He found the Commander-in-Chief ill with 'a very great cold' but refusing to go to bed until he had heard a case 'touching an officer of the army

who was accused of some violence done to the Irish'. Weakened by his condition, Ireton caught the plague and by November 27 he was dead. Ludlow, the staunch republican, wrote:

> Some of General Cromwell's relations who were not ignorant of his vast designs now on foot, caused the body to be transported to England and solemnly interred at Westminster in a magnificent monument at public charge . . .

Ludlow was now acting commander-in-chief in Ireland and began to make preparations for the final phase of the conquest.

'the Gaels are being wasted'

Ireland's economy now lay in ruins. In the early years of the Confederate Government there had been a growth towards prosperity. The old impoverished landowning classes had mortgaged their property to the growing Irish middle class who, precluded from practising the 'professions of the gentry' by English law, found themselves in an equivalent situation to European Jews, indulging in trade and moneylending. They had thus become a strong factor in building up a stable Irish economy.

The most serious loss to Ireland was the decrease of her population. According to Petty's reckoning the population of Ireland in 1641 had been 1,448,000 of which 616,000 had perished by 1652. Of these 504,000 were natives and 112,000 were colonists and English troops. Within another few years Petty was to reckon that a further 40,000 young Irishmen, remnants of the Irish armies, had sought service in other European countries and that another 100,000 Irish men, women and children had been transported to the colonies in the Americas.

Ordinary agriculture had been suspended. Naas, the centre of a rich farming country with access to the great market of Dublin, could not boast one tilled field in 1652. Within a decade the diet of the Irish had changed drastically. Before

the insurrection they had had an abundance of milk, butter, sour curds, oatmeal, oaten bread, and plenty of meat. They were also addicted to meat puddings. Potatoes had been introduced into Ireland about the turn of the century by people returning from voyages to the Americas. The first written reference to the potato was made in 1606 at Comber, Co. Down. Dr. Petty reported that by 1660 the potato had become the staple diet of the Irish. 'Their food is bread and cakes, whereof a penny serves a week for each—potatoes from August till May . . . as for flesh they seldom eat it.' The change over to the potato had been made out of necessity. The destruction of agriculture was a deliberate policy of the Commonwealth Army and had been deliberately conceived by Cromwell as part of his campaign. It was strikingly illustrated by the lists of 'military weapons' issued from the army stores at Waterford. They included eighteen dozen scythes with handles and wings, forty reaping hooks and whetstones and rub stones. In 1651 the Governor of Dublin, Colonel John Hewson, wrote to the Commissioners saying that his soldiers 'doth now intend to make use of scythes and sickles that were sent over in 1649, with which they intend to cut down the corn growing in these parts'. With their crops being cut down and burnt, as Ludlow had done throughout the Wicklow mountains, the Irish were forced to rely on the potato which, lying hidden underground, could be harvested only when it was wanted for eating while the rest could stay hidden from the soldiers' wanton destruction.

Badly hit also were the cattle. As the English soldiers destroyed the Irish herds, the Irish retaliated by destroying English herds. So great was the cattle slaughter that Dr. Petty reported that in 1652 cattle had to be imported into Ireland from Wales. He calculated the Irish herds to be worth £4 million in 1641 while in 1652 they had decreased to £½ million. That same year of 1652 a proclamation was published prohibiting the slaying of sheep and lambs, and which referred to the country being rife with starvation and plague. Birds were killed and eaten when possible and even the traditional Irish belief in misfortune coming to those who killed swans was ignored.

For those who had money, even money had become a

problem. The Confederacy had issued its own coins of silver and copper. Much coinage was carried abroad by exiles and by 1651 there was a great shortage of money in Ireland. In 1652 a number of London merchants were circulating worthless money in the country—some of them were caught and executed for fraud. Neither was Ireland in a position now to produce her own coin for the once valuable silver and lead mines, especially the one at Dunally, Co. Tipperary, the success of which had been a project that Charles I had kept a close eye on, had been devastated and were no longer operating.

As for Irish shipping, during the years of the Confederacy it had been expanding and was becoming a thriving business; now there were no Irish ships to speak of. Ireland was not allowed free trade with England, although, in 1652, it was allowed this with Scotland and the Isle of Man. The situation became worse than it was for merchants in the colonies. The 'Act for the increase of Shipping and encouragement of the Navigation of this Nation' passed in the English Parliament on October 9, 1651, provided that goods from the Plantations be imported into Ireland only in English ships. Within a year Irish shipping had disappeared from the seas. Even the fishing industry was destroyed as the fish could only be imported to England in English ships.

The vast woods, which had always been a feature of the Irish landscape and a safe retreat for many hard-pressed men fighting an incessant guerilla warfare with the colonists, were beginning to thin drastically. They began to suffer under the Elizabethan colonisation when they were systematically destroyed as affording places of refuge to Irish insurgents. In 1609 an inducement offered to the citizens of London to colonise Ulster was the great store of timber promised for ship-building there. By 1610 the colonists found the forests of Ulster were mainly wasted and turned to Munster. Most ships at the time were built from Irish wood. The dangers of this policy were seen as early as 1611 when an 'Act for the Preservation of Timber' was put before Parliament but not passed. The chief offender was 'The Great Earl of Cork', Richard Boyle, an adventurer from Canterbury, who had arrived in Ireland in June, 1588, aged twenty-two years old,

with the clothes on his back and the sum of £27 3s, as well as a diamond ring and a gold bracelet given to him by his mother. He had secured a post as deputy to Sir John Crofton, Escheater General of Ireland, and begun to enrich himself in the process of carrying out his official duties of investigating forfeited lands and lapsed titles. He was twice imprisoned for embezzlement before the Irish uprising of 1598 forced him to flee to England. He was soon back in Ireland as owner of the 42,000-acre estate previously owned by Walter Ralegh. By the time the Irish uprising of 1642 broke out Boyle, who had been rewarded with the title Earl of Cork, had iron foundries in the Blackwater Valley exporting bar iron and artillery, smelted lead at Minehead, worked silver at Ardmore, engaged in woollen weaving at Clonakilty and Capoquin, and linen production at Youghal as well as the reckless felling of forests for timber to keep his industries running.

To make matters worse, soldiers deliberately destroyed as much of the woods as they could. Gerard Boate, who published a book entitled *Ireland's Natural History* in London in 1652, dedicated to Oliver Cromwell and Charles Fleetwood, wrote:

> ... the English, having settled themselves in the land, did by degrees greatly diminish the woods in all the places where they were masters, partly to deprive the thieves and rogues, who used to lurk in the woods in great numbers, of their refuge and starting holes and partly to gain the greater scope of profitable lands. For the trees being cut down, the roots stubbed up, and the land used and tilled according to exigency, the woods in most parts of Ireland may be reduced not only to very good pasture, but also to excellent arable and meadow [lands].
>
> Whole shiploads sent into foreign countries yearly: which as it brought great profit to the proprietaries, so the felling of so many thousands of trees every year as were employed that way, did make a great destruction of the woods in tract of time. As for Charcoal, it is incredible what quantity thereof is consumed by one iron works in a year, and whereas there was never an iron works in Ireland before, there hath been a very great number of them erected since the last Peace in sundry parishes of every province, the which to furnish constantly with charcoals, it was necessary from time to time to fell an infinite number of trees all the lopings and windfalls being not sufficient nor in the least manner.

As well as sickness, disease and starvation, yet another danger threatened. The war conditions had proved favourable to the existence, and increase in numbers, of wolf-packs, which could even be found on the outskirts of Dublin. In December, 1652, a public wolf hunt was organised in Castleknock and rewards were posted ranging up to £6 per head for a bitch. The export of wolf hounds with those leaving Ireland to go into exile was now strictly forbidden on account of their usefulness. Lady Marion Clotworthy, wife of Sir Hugh, a Presbyterian colonist, recounted a story that while walking alone along the shores of Lough Neagh she was attacked by a wolf. She had given herself up as lost when a wolf hound leapt from the forest and attacked the wolf, killing it after a fierce struggle. The hound was wounded in the affair and Lady Marion took it home and cared for it.

While the Confederate government had demanded freedom of religious worship, particularly the freedom of Catholics from the penal laws, the religious situation now worsened. Until 1641 the Catholics had been mainly tolerated in spite of the penal laws. On December 8, 1641, the English Parliament had issued a declaration saying it would not tolerate Catholicism in Ireland or in any of the English dominions. In 1650 the Protestant Bishop of Clogher, Dr. Henry Jones, ordered all Catholics to quit the city on pain of death, they were not to be found within two miles of its walls nor were they to harbour priests. In a reply to an Irish petition Oliver Cromwell issued a declaration 'in Answer to the Acts of the Popish Clergy at Clonmacnoise', printed in Cork in 1650. He declared that while Parliament held power the Mass (Catholicism) would not be tolerated. Priests were killed on many occasions when they surrendered and £20 was offered to any who would capture them. On October 4, 1650, the Commissioners issued orders for the suppression of Catholicism and on December 25 of that year all the English statutes against Catholics were brought into force. A general reward of £5 per priest was agreed upon. During 1651 there were fifteen recorded executions of Franciscans, Augustinians and Dominicans. Many priests went into hiding or exile. Father Nugent, a Capuchin, wrote on June 30, 1651, from Waterford, that he passed freely about the city, in disguise, being the gardener to the chief Protestant there, Colonel Richard Lawrence, the governor of the city.

might agree to colonise the land within a fixed number of years. On May 12, Weaver found himself chairman of the Committee of Parliament for the Planting of Ireland. The Committee suggested that the financiers be given land in the provinces of Leinster and Munster provided they, on their part, undertook to colonise it within three years from September 29, 1653, with Protestants of any nation, except Ireland, in a manner to be directed by Parliament. The financiers would also be entitled to forfeited houses in walled towns at easy rates on long leases. A further meeting was fixed for Thursday, May 20, at 3 p.m. in the Speakers' Chamber. The financiers were still not happy with the proposals. They feared attacks by Tories and also pointed out that labour was scarce. They also observed that it would take 40,000 labourers and families to make the colonisation effective and that no housing had been provided nor guards against Tory raids. To attempt colonisation under the conditions suggested by the Committee would destroy the scheme before it had a chance of success.

In spite of the lengthy series of meetings and disagreements, the general principle of confiscation was never in doubt. The Committee of Parliament for the Planting of Ireland felt the first step to take was to draw up a bill listing the offences which would 'qualify' for confiscation of property or even loss of life. The bill was presented to Parliament and passed on August 12 as *An Act for the Settling of Ireland*. The preamble to the Act stated:

> WHEREAS the Parliament of England, after the expense of much blood and treasure for the suppression of the horrid rebellion in Ireland, have by the good hand of God upon their undertaking, brought that affair to such an issue, as that a total reducement and settlement of that nation may win God's blessing be speedily effected, to the end therefore that the people of that nation may know that *it is not the intention of the Parliament to extirpate that whole nation*, but that mercy and pardon both as to life and estate, may be extended to all husbandmen, ploughmen, artificers and others of the inferior sort, in manner as is hereafter declared, the submitting themselves to the Parliament of the Commonwealth of England and living peaceably and obediently under their government, and that others also of higher rank and guilty may know the Parliament's intention concerning them, according to the respective demerits and considerations under which they fall, be it enacted . . .

The Act listed ten categories. Those people who fell under the first five could expect no mercy—they were to be hanged with the confiscation of all their property. These were: persons who had 'contrived, advised, counselled, promoted and acted in the rebellion, murders or massacres' and those who had assisted 'by bearing arms or contributing men, arms, horses, plate, money, victuals or other furniture or habiliments of war' unless such things were taken by force; priests, particularly Jesuits, who had abetted the war; 106 prominent persons mentioned by name; those who had killed Englishmen, and their accessories, except those who had enlisted in the Irish Army and killed enlisted men on the opposing side; those persons who did not surrender within 28 days of the publication of the Act. It was estimated that at least 100,000 people fell under these first five categories.

Those who fell under the final five categories were subject to confiscation of their property but no loss of life. These were: those who held high civil or military office but were too young to take part in the beginning of the insurrection. These were to be banished and estates forfeited, though a third of the value of their estates would be granted to their wives and children 'in such places in Ireland as the Parliament, in order to the more effectual settlement of the peace of this nation, shall think fit for the purpose'. The seventh category listed those not covered by former categories who had borne arms against the Commonwealth, and those who had borne arms after November 10, 1642, as regular soldiers, would, if they surrendered within 28 days, receive one third of the value of their estates in a place in Ireland to be nominated by the Parliament. Category 8 referred to those who, between October 1, 1641, and March 1, 1650, had not maintained 'constant good affection' to Parliament. These were to receive two-thirds of the value of their estates also in an area to be nominated later. Protestants who failed to show 'good affection', 'constant good affection' not being required, would forfeit only one-fifth of their property but could retain the remainder wherever it was situated. Category 9 referred to persons who had no estate or personal property above £10. These could be pardoned provided they did not qualify in the first five clauses. The tenth and final category stipulated

The Institute of Early American History and Culture
is sponsored jointly
by The College of William and Mary in Virginia
and The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation.

Seeds of Extinction

JEFFERSONIAN PHILANTHROPY AND THE AMERICAN INDIAN

by Bernard W. Sheehan

Published for the Institute of Early American History
and Culture at Williamsburg, Virginia
by The University of North Carolina Press
Chapel Hill

1973

over any particular chief or chiefs—if it has been acquired by bribery, not worth a rush."[35]

The ineffectiveness of bribery, because the corrupted chiefs could not control their people, became even more apparent in later years. But the policy remained part of the governmental means of influencing the tribes, a legacy of the habit of manipulation.

5

When Jefferson spoke of incorporating the Indian, he had in mind not only social union with the white man but also biological amalgamation. More than once he told the Indians: "Your blood will mix with ours; and will spread, with ours, over this great island." He wrote to Hawkins, in language that broadly assumed the desirability of an eventual racial union: "The ultimate point of rest and happiness for them is to let our settlements and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix, and become one people. Incorporating themselves with us as citizens of the United States, this is what the natural progress of things will of course, bring on, and it will be better to promote than retard it." Intermarriage might be specifically promoted, but more likely it would follow the course of nature, reflecting and accelerating the union of the two societies.[36]

Intermixing on a scale that might have produced a blending of white and red never took place. Jeffersonian opinion almost universally recommended the policy, but philanthropists tended to live at a comfortable distance from the point of contact between the two societies. The mechanism of cultural transference required that whites go into the Indian country to deliver their message. Their numbers remained small. Though marriages between whites and natives occurred regularly, they never reached a mass scale. When the whites did move into the Indian territory en masse, conflict resulted instead of the peaceful amalgamation that had been hoped for. Under the circumstances, racial mixture could not have solved the problem of Indian-white relations, though it seemed to most

35. Hawkins to David D. Mitchell, Nov. 16, 1812, Hawkins Papers; James Barbour to Thomas H. Benton and Louis McLane, May 15, 1826, *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, II, 665; Andrew Jackson to John C. Calhoun, Aug. 24, 1819, Letters Received, Sec. War (M-271), Roll 2: 1181–1182. For evidence that Jackson did not always act the way he talked, see Wilkins, *Cherokee Tragedy*, 94–96. Pickering to Henry Knox, Aug. 10, 1791, Pickering Papers, LX, 115½–116.

36. Padover, ed., *Complete Jefferson*, 503, 505–506, 509; Jefferson to Benjamin Hawkins, Feb. 18, 1803, Lipscomb and Bergh, eds., *Writings of Jefferson*, X, 363.

observers the best evidence of the gradual intermeshing of the savage with civilization.

The marriage of John Rolfe and Pocahontas constituted the great archetype of Indian-white conjugal union. Without accepting the kind of cosmic symbolism seen by Vachel Lindsay in his "Our Mother, Pocahontas," Jeffersonian writers generally approved the alliance and regretted only that this initial transaction had not become a widespread practice. An early interpretation worried about an Indian princess marrying beneath her station, but there had never been much concern for Rolfe's racial integrity in mingling his blood with an Indian's. Proverbially, Virginians proudly claimed an ancestral link with the Indian maid. John Randolph considered his reputed connection a bright star in his family's past. Even Jefferson, though he was little inclined to celebrate the virtues of his forebears, spoke approvingly of a remote ancestral association with the Indian princess. He told Samuel Whitcomb, who visited him in 1824, that once in conversation with an Indian chief he had proudly informed the native that both his daughters had married descendants of Pocahontas. Samuel Stanhope Smith spoke of two youths at the College of New Jersey "of one of the first families in the state of Virginia" who were fourth-generation descendants of Pocahontas, "a high spirited and generous woman." Environmental conditioning had altered what remained of their Indian appearance, but one retained the "dark and vivid eye that has distinguished the whole family, and rendered some of them remarkably beautiful."[37]

Authorities took few steps to foster intermarriage. The British announced in 1719 that they would give ten pounds and fifty acres in Nova Scotia to any Englishman who would marry an Indian girl or any English girl who would marry an Indian man. Only a few claimed the bounty. In 1784 Patrick Henry introduced a bill in the Virginia House of Delegates allowing for free education, tax relief, and bounties for children to anyone who would marry an Indian. It would have been difficult to promote intermarriage as a positive

37. Stith, *History of First Discovery of Virginia*, 142; "Copy of an Interview with Thomas Jefferson by My Father, the Late Samuel Whitcomb, Formerly of Dorchester, Mass., June 1, 1824," Jefferson Papers, Alderman Lib., Univ. of Va., Charlottesville; Smith, *Essay on Variety*, 19–20. Benjamin Latrobe read a paper before the American Philosophical Society, Feb. 18, 1803, entitled, "Account of the descendants of Pocahontas, daughter of Powhatan, king or chief of the tribe of Powhatan, who inhabited the country about the falls of the James River, Va.," Am. Phil. Soc., *Procs.*, XXII (1885), 333. Richard Beale Davis, *Intellectual Life in Jefferson's Virginia, 1790–1830* (Chapel Hill, 1964), 313–319.

policy. Philanthropists encouraged it, but they probably did no more than follow the practice of life on the frontier, where it remained a common phenomenon.[38]

The French reputation for Indian diplomacy and for success in bringing civilization into the wilderness stemmed in part from their willingness to mix freely with the tribes. The English trader, however, maintained a reputation of sorts. Henry M. Brackenridge recorded a conversation with an Arikara: "Seeing the chief one day in a thoughtful mood, I asked him what was the matter—'I was wondering' said he 'whether you white people have any women amongst you.' I assured him in the affirmative. 'Then' said he, 'why is it that your people are so fond of our women, one might suppose they had never seen any before?' " In a more serious vein, Zebulon Pike said of the trading population at Prairie du Chien: "Their mode of living had obliged them to have transient connexion with the Indian women; and what was at first policy is now so confirmed by habit and inclination, that it is become (with a few exceptions) the ruling practice of all the traders; and, in fact, almost one half of the inhabitants under 20 years have the blood of the aborigines in their veins." The many half bloods in important tribal positions furnished evidence enough of the traders' willingness to intermix. Sir William Johnson, Lachlan McGillivray, William Wells, and Timothy Barnard were but a few who fathered children by native women.[39]

Conceived of as an instrument of civilization, intermarriage had few racial obstacles to surmount. A Virginia correspondent of the *Analectic Magazine* set the issue to rest in 1818. "Differences of colour in the human race," he wrote with respect to Indian-white amalgamation, "does not excite so unconquerable an aversion as the owners of negro slaves imagine." Of course, proposals for intermarriage with the Indians had a long history among the Virginians. Robert Beverley cited a long list of misfortunes that might have

38. Edmund S. Morgan, "The American Indian: Incorrigible Individualist," in *The Mirror of the Indian . . .* (Providence, 1958), 10; Robert McColley, *Slavery and Jeffersonian Virginia* (Urbana, 1964), 138; Imlay, *Topographical Description*, 296.

39. Flint, *Recollections*, 163–164; H. M. Brackenridge, *Views of Louisiana; Together with a Journal of a Voyage up the Missouri River, in 1811* (Ann Arbor, 1966 [orig. publ., Pittsburgh, 1814]), 258; Jackson, ed., *Journals of Pike*, I, 198; Benjamin Bissell, *The American Indian in English Literature of the Eighteenth Century* (New Haven, 1925), 37–38, n. 2; Joseph A. Parsons, "Civilizing the Indians of the Old Northwest, 1800–1810," *Indiana Magazine of History*, LVI (1960), 208; Deposition of Abram Mordecai, Jan. 10, 1825, Timothy Barnard Papers, Dept. of Archives and History, Atlanta, Ga.

been avoided had the two peoples intermarried early. Wars would not have been the usual method of Indian-white intercourse, and those Indian tribes now decimated would be thriving in health and vigor, but more important, "in all Likelihood, many, if not most, of the *Indians* would have been converted to Christianity by this kind Method." William Byrd made an even stronger case for intermarriage. If the colonists had really been serious about civilizing the Indians, he wrote, no more opportune method could be found than a general physical union. "For, after all that can be said, a sprightly Lover is the most prevailing Missionary that can be sent amongst these, or any other Infidels." Benjamin Rush later added a further item to the advantages of intermarriage. Not only would the natives benefit by the acquisition of civilized ways, but intermixture might improve the intellectual capacity of the race. "The mulatto has been remarked, in all countries, to exceed, in sagacity, his white and black parent. The same remark has been made of the offspring of the European, and North American Indian."[40]

The theme persisted and, if anything, became more closely allied with the civilizing plan. Morse, for example, though he favored intermarriage, had doubts about its feasibility until a sufficient number of Indians had been educated. He agreed that many white men of respectable talents had already married native women. He thought that more than half the Cherokees and substantial numbers of the other southern tribes who had been in contact with the whites were of mixed blood. Whatever obstacles still remained would be removed by an effective education program among the tribes. Once accomplished, "*then* let intermarriage with them become general, and the end which the Government has in view will be completely attained. They would then be literally of one blood with us, be merged in the nation, and saved from extinction." The American Board also saw the uses of intermarriage. Milo Hoyt, the son of one of its missionaries, married one of the native converts and proposed, with the blessing of his superiors, to establish himself in the Indian country and become the leaven for the gradual transformation of the tribes.[41]

In the right place and between the right people, intermarriage

40. "Reflections on the Institutions of the Cherokee Indians," *Analectic Mag.*, XII (1818), 54; Beverley, *History and Present State of Virginia*, ed. Wright, 38–39; W. K. Boyd, ed., *Byrd's Histories of the Dividing Line*, 3–4, 120–122; Rush, "On the Influence of Physical Causes," in *Sixteen Introductory Lectures*, 117.

41. Morse, *Report on Indian Affairs*, 73–75; *Panoplist*, XVI (1820), 558. See also William H. Crawford to the Senate, Mar. 13, 1916, *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, II, 28.

could be a very good thing indeed—but not always. The famous incidents at the mission school in Cornwall, Connecticut, added new meaning to the question. Two full-blood Cherokees married white girls, and the town uproar forced the American Board, otherwise in favor of intermarriage, to repudiate the practice and finally to close the school. But the case was clear. Intermarriage took place between white men and Indian women. Hence the subtle defenses of civilized superiority would be maintained, the father presumably would bring into the wilderness the ways of civilization. The most publicized unions between white female and Indian male had taken place in captivity, which meant the subjection of the white and the preservation of savagery. As a means of fostering civilization, intermarriage had to be part of the white man's expanding way of life. The surrender of his women to the savage scarcely conformed to the necessary pattern. Of course, neither of the two young men from Cornwall, John Ridge and Elias Boudinot, could be called savages, yet they came from an alien people still under the tuition of the white man's society. They could not qualify as equals in Connecticut.[42]

The doctrine that savagery would persist and even spread unless civilization opposed it cast some doubt on the utility of intermarriage. The facts were plain. Traders and other likely prospects established their connections with native women in the Indian

42. Daniel S. Butrick to Jeremiah Evarts, Nov. 21, 1824, ABC 18.3.1.IV: 1; Catalogue of the Foreign Mission School, letter of June 17, 1825, signed by Lyman Beecher *et al.*, ABC, North American Indians, Miscellaneous, Vol. I, doc. 75; Butrick to ———, Sept. 27, 1825, ABC 18.3.1.IV: 1–4. Hermann Vaill, an American Board missionary related by marriage to Harriet Gold (the wife of Elias Boudinot), protested that he favored intermarriage as a matter of principle but opposed this marriage because he feared that it would have an adverse effect on the Cornwall school. He explicitly denied that his opposition carried any racial connotations, but saw fit to add in a letter admonishing Harriet: "[I] hope that you will be the instrument for accomplishing much in behalf of that People whom I suppose you now consider as *your Nation*." There was apparently some concern in his mind that in becoming part of the Indian nation, the girl would abandon the effort to civilize the Cherokees. Hermann Vaill to Harriet Gold, Mar. 3, 1826, Aug. 22, 1823, and June 29, 1825, and Vaill to Mary W. Brinsmade, Aug. 2, 1825, Vaill Collection (microfilm), Yale University. For an account stressing racial tension, see Wilkins, *Cherokee Tragedy*, chap. 6. *Niles' Weekly Register*, XXVIII (1825), 298, defended the Gold-Boudinot marriage, referred to the frequent boasts of whites with Indian blood, and hoped that Harriet Gold would "teach the Indians to make butter and cheese—how to spin, make clothes, etc. and become the parent of children, taught by her to read and write, and think and reflect on things of deep interest to them and all the human family." According to the *Cherokee Phoenix* (New Echota, Ga.), May 24, 1828, in 1825 there were 147 white men and 73 white women married to Cherokees in a total population of 13,563.

country. Frequently men of a primitive cast and unsettled habits, they manifested little interest in the issue of their relationships. Moreover, in the Indian family, children followed the lineage of the mother. These circumstances, together with the persistent rumors that civilization tended to crumble in the primeval forest, worked to counter the faith in intermarriage as an instrument of civilization. The actions of the Indians themselves also became important. Especially in the South, after civilization had made significant advances, loyalty to the tribal nation took on new meaning. The Indians rejected civilized ways that required its abandonment. In these circumstances, intermarriage no longer served philanthropic purposes.[43]

Hawkins's experience illustrated both sides of the intermarriage problem. When he entered the Indian country in the 1790s, he held a high opinion of intermarriage, and he intended to promote it at his agency as an important part of the civilizing plan. But he quickly found that it did not necessarily raise the level of Creek society. Some of the artisans at the agency married Creek women and, by Hawkins's account, soon found themselves under the tyranny of balky squaws and with no control over their children. Besides, the Indians held them in contempt for their inability to control their wives. Nothing in the situation aided the spread of civilization. Hawkins had married a white woman, and he decreed that his retainers should follow his lead. He forbade intermarriage at the Creek agency. Once the civilizing program had produced some results, however, he changed his mind. The native women, he reported, "have recently made propositions to me to submit themselves and children to be governed by white men if I will rescind the order. I have some young girls of good families raised under my own roof to usefulness, with whom I shall begin the experiment a new with the smiths and strikers in the public service or such young men as I can get to marry them, and settle out on farms at such places as I shall direct."[44]

The spell of intermarriage as a means of civilization or as the end of the civilizing process remained sufficiently strong to overcome most hesitations about its utility. Consumed by the need for human unity, expressed in one sense as civilizing the native, philanthropists

43. Harriss, ed., *Lawson's History of North Carolina*, 195–196; Ninian Edwards to William H. Crawford, Nov. 1815, *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, II, 64; Creek Laws, June 12, 1818, Letters Received, Sec. War (M-271), Roll 2: 773–774; John Ridge to Gallatin, Gallatin Papers, Box 64–3, fol. 42.
44. Benjamin Hawkins to Thomas Jefferson, July 11, 1803, Jefferson Papers.

continued to hope for the absorption of the Indian as a physical entity. There could be no greater victory for civilization and progress. As an indirect way of bringing the two societies together, intermarriage seemed the most natural and least manipulative method of all.

6

An irony always lay at the heart of philanthropic optimism. Even the signs of realism in Jeffersonian thought became in actuality manifestations of humanitarian naïveté. The Indian could certainly be cajoled, cozened, and bamboozled into a position somewhat closer to civilization, and because he faced annihilation as an alternative, one might well overlook the superciliousness of such manipulation. Yet with the end of the process in racial amalgamation only a distant hope, the irony in Jeffersonian philanthropy became more poignant. The intensive use of manipulation could not compensate for the limited results obtained from the direct program of civilization. The amalgamation of the two societies never took place.

In part the problem could be attributed to a lapse in logic. It did not follow from the Indian's adoption of some of the white man's ways, farming, home manufacture, and political organization, that he would then automatically be melded with the white into one society. The civilized native should have ceased being an Indian, but he did so only in part; native society changed drastically, but it remained discernible as native society. It did not disappear within the enveloping folds of the white man's world. Because the philanthropist doubted that a straight presentation of the advantages of civilization would convince the Indian to commit cultural suicide, he accompanied his missionary activity with a plethora of strategems designed to accomplish his end without the Indian's conscious assent. The Indian accommodated him in little ways, but he never took the final step into cultural and racial oblivion.

Manipulated, coddled, and trampled upon, the Indian proved less able to meet the demands of progress. Philanthropy was premised on the Indian's willing acceptance of civilization, but the policy of indirection supposed either his lack of capacity or his refusal to do so. Humanitarians looked forward to the time when the tribesman would take his place in the civilized world in full possession of the self-esteem and autonomy so prized by white men. Yet in resorting to a policy that began by denying the Indian the opportunity to make his own way in the world, they not only contributed

to the breakdown of the tribal order but created a native population constitutionally incapable of making the transition to civilization. Finally, philanthropic manipulation made enemies of the new leadership that came forward in many of the tribes after the War of 1812. Most Indians had a very clear idea of the identity of their enemies, but philanthropic policy often made it difficult for them to distinguish their friends. Whatever realistic hope could be held out for incorporation, it required the maintenance of friendship and trust between the two peoples. The objective difficulties of Indian-white relations allowed little enough room for either; manipulation did much to eliminate them entirely.

The policy of indirection was more than a reaction to the failure of the civilizing plan. It could be seen as closely allied to the white man's effort to conquer the native tribes. Stubborn Indians who stood in the way of progress would ultimately be forced to yield. But for all the vast resources expended in destroying the tribes militarily, the government and its philanthropic allies also invested considerable energy in maneuvering them into a condition congenial to American policy. And yet there were real differences between open warfare and even the worst sort of intimidation. In the 1790s the civilizing program was initiated as an alternative to frontier conflict. Philanthropists supported war when necessary, but they conceived of it as evidence of the failure of their program. For all its defects, manipulation could not be separated from the larger civilizing effort; at least it held out some hope for success. Open conflict represented the antithesis of civilized life.

The one-sidedness of the description made the traders carry the guilt of civilization. As with the frontiersmen, they became major villains in the philanthropists' attempt to clear themselves of blame for the failure of the civilizing plan and the apparent breakdown of tribal society. Zebulon Pike described his astonishment at finding how greatly the Indians feared the whites. More than once in his explorations, Indians paddled well out of their way to avoid meeting him. "It appears evident to me that the Traders have taken great pains to impress on the minds of the Savages, an idea of our being a very vindictive, ferocious and War like people." This misapprehension, spread by the traders for their own profit, will be dispelled "when they find, that our conduct towards them is guided by magnanimity and justice; instead of operating in an injurious manner, it will have the effect of making them reverence, at the same time they fear us."[18] Pike would not forego the advantages of fear. Sufficient that he attributed its crasser applications to the traders.

Even if McKenney had succeeded in sending the traders into the Indian country armed with all the ameliorative compulsions of missionaries, the great disparity between the two societies would have persisted. The traders' vices had been no less responsible for the decline of the tribal order than the conflict between distinct cultures that possessed different conceptions of reality. Operating on the principles of supply and demand, the trader presented the Indian with a foreign world, to which he adjusted at the price of internal tension. One of Jedidiah Morse's correspondents commented on the Indian's incomprehension of the commercial nexus. "If you speak to an Indian upon the subject of their Great Father, the President, supplying them with goods from his factories, he will say at once, 'You are a *pash-i-pash-i-to* (a fool) our Great Father is certainly *no trader;* he has sent these goods to be *given* to us, as presents; and his Agents are endeavoring to cheat us, by *selling* them for our peltries.' " But condemnations of the trader's viciousness generally took no cognizance of his role as the transmitter of an alien mode of life. One of Robert Rogers's noble savages intoned a profounder truth:

---

tist memorial quoted by Prucha, *American Indian Policy,* 71; Clinton, "Discourse Delivered before the New-York Historical Society," N.-Y. Hist. Soc., *Colls.,* II (1814), 84; Morse, *Report on Indian Affairs,* 40; Senate Document 47, 16th Congress, 1st Session, Feb. 16, 1820, ser. 26.

18. Jackson, ed., *Journals of Pike,* I, 22.

We're poison'd with the Infection of our Foes,
Their very Looks and Actions are infectious,
And in deep Silence spread Destruction round them.[19]

4

The impact of the white man's vices and the total effects of his culture on the tribes raised questions of moral intent. The white man could be blamed for debauching the natives or even for gradually overwhelming them with civilized ways, but he could not be blamed for spreading European diseases that worked a more immediate and a wider devastation among the tribes. The conviction that the Indian suffered whenever the two societies came together, whether from violence or the deterioration of internal stress, became more credible from the knowledge of the effects of European diseases. Aside from those who held that civilization would spread across the continent more quickly in the presence of fewer Indians, most whites in the Jeffersonian age regretted that new diseases had done the native population grave injury.

European diseases, such as the mysterious plague that appeared in New England in 1618, attacked the native population even before the settlers landed in great numbers. The white man's arms could never have cleared the continent for settlement as quickly as new infections devastated tribe after tribe. Before the European invasion, the North American Indians enjoyed immunity from many of the malignant disorders that had ravaged the civilized world for centuries: smallpox and measles and, very likely, tuberculosis, malaria, yellow fever, typhoid, and typhus. The various venereal infections may have originated in either Europe or America. At least it is certain that, besides the general effects of the white man's cultural penetration of the native's world, civilization brought with it a number of physical disabilities, especially smallpox, which had a disastrous impact on the Indian populations and contributed substantially to the eventual disintegration of tribal society.[20]

19. Morse, *Report on Indian Affairs,* 41, 57; James Bowdoin to Franklin, Nov. 12, 1753, Labaree *et al.,* eds., *Franklin Papers,* V, 111–112; *The Memoirs of Lieut. Henry Timberlake . . .* (London, 1765), 62–63; Harper, ed., *Bartram's Travels,* 255–258; Rogers, *Ponteach,* 224.

20. Percy Moreau Ashburn, *The Ranks of Death: A Medical History of the Conquest in America,* ed. Frank D. Ashburn (New York, 1947), *passim;* E. Wagner Stearn and Allen E. Stearn, *The Effect of Smallpox on the Destiny of the Amerindian* (Boston, 1945), 13–20; John Duffy, *Epidemics in Colonial America* (Baton Rouge, 1953), 224; Duffy, "Smallpox and the Indians in the

As a common disease among the whites and a major killer of Indians, smallpox caused much concern and experimentation in the centers of medical knowledge. The tribesmen seemed particularly susceptible to it. "The Indians of America," wrote Franklin, "suffer extreamely by this Distemper when it gets among them." In addition, Clinton and many others contended that the radical therapy used by the native practitioners increased the death rate in the tribes. For smallpox the natives recommended immersion in a cold bath, after which, so the story went, the patient invariably died.[21] Well knowing the weakness of the Indians, the English proposed to introduce smallpox among them during Pontiac's uprising. Since it already raged among the northwestern Indians, this early example of germ warfare proved superfluous, but it demonstrated that civilization possessed an incomparable ally for use against its primitive enemy.[22]

Few observers missed an opportunity to note the suffering smallpox caused among the Indians. Lawson recorded that the disease, aggravated by the native treatment, spread unchecked among the North Carolina Indians and that it frequently swept away whole towns. "Neither do I know any Savages," he wrote, "that have traded with the English but what have been great Losers by this Distemper." Adair told of the Cherokee disaster in 1738, when the "Guineamen" from Charlestown brought smallpox into their towns in infected goods. Within a year, they lost half their numbers. On his travels in the Northwest, Jonathan Carver found a Fox village of fifty lodges deserted. Half the inhabitants had been carried off by smallpox; the rest had fled into the woods. Heckewelder reported a conversation with a chief in which the native described the annihilation of the Nanticokes as a result of maladies contracted from the white man. In his report of 1822, Morse emphasized the dire effects of smallpox on the western Indians: "In 1802, it swept off half the population from the Missouri to New Mexico, in the region of the Pawnees, and west to the Rocky Mountains: and the Ottawas, at L'Abre Croche, about the year 1799, lost half their number by the same disease." Smallpox even appeared in the relatively untraveled parts of the continent. Lewis and Clark found it among the Mandans and also on the West Coast. Lewis reported in his *Journal:* "The small pox has destroyed a great number of the natives in this quarter, it prevailed about 4 years since among the Clatsops and destroy[ed] several hundred of them, four of their chiefs fell victims to its ravages. . . . I think the late ravages of the small pox may well account for the number of remains of villages which we find deserted on the river and Sea coast in this quarter."[23] The evidence abounds, consequently, that the whites fully understood the seriousness of the disease for the natives; moreover, many whites accepted a measure of responsibility for its spread.

American Colonies," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine,* XXV (1951), 324–325. For a different version, see William Christie MacLeod, *The American Indian Frontier* (London, 1928), 40.

21. Labaree *et al.*, eds., *Franklin Papers,* III, 445; Clinton, "Discourse Delivered before the New-York Historical Society," N.-Y. Hist. Soc., *Colls.,* II (1814), 87–88; also Harriss, ed., *Lawson's History of North Carolina,* 5–6.

22. Bernhard Knollenberg, "General Amherst and Germ Warfare," *MVHR,* XLI (1954), 489–494.

Probably in 1837, a correspondent sent Gallatin a description of the terrible conditions among the western tribes. Smallpox had always been a frightful menace, but now, curiously, with their population thinned out, the situation seemed worse. War, famine, and all other causes of death combined could not be compared to smallpox. In 1802 three-fourths of the different tribes along the Mississippi and the Missouri had perished. Now a new generation repeated the experience. Again the sedentary Mandans bore the brunt. The scourge arrived in July, and when the writer passed in October,

> the scene was horrible—the large level prairie surrounding the Village had been converted into one great grave yard, whilst hundreds of (loathsome) carcasses (which had not received the rites of sepulture), lay mouldering on the surface of the earth, emitting fetid exhalations which poisoned the surrounding atmosphere—and made it quite sickning even at the distance of several miles.
>
> A desperate phrenzy seems to have seized the few survivors in order to escape a loathsome lingering death—put an end to their own lives—some by throwing themselves from a high rocky precipice which stands near the village, others by drowning, hanging etc.—Thirty one Mandans only were living at the time I passed their villages.

It spread thence to other tribes; few who contracted it survived. The tribal order broke down, and new leaders arose who blamed the whites and exhorted the Indians to seek revenge.

The same correspondent also reported that the Blackfeet had been decimated. Believing themselves attacked by a demon, they

23. Harriss, ed., *Lawson's History of North Carolina,* 24; Adair, *History of American Indians,* 232; Carver, *Three Years Travels,* 30; Heckewelder, "Account of the Indian Nations," Am. Phil. Soc., *Trans. of Hist. and Lit. Comm.,* I (1819), 75; Morse, *Report on Indian Affairs,* 92; Thwaites, ed., *Journals of Lewis and Clark Expedition,* I, 109–110, 220, IV, 50; Jefferson, *Message from the President,* 14, 18, 20.

sacrificed several thousand of their best horses for his appeasement. When that expedient failed, they turned out in full battle array to challenge their illusive tormenter, but he could not be found. Many then despaired and committed suicide. Gallatin's informant believed that seventeen thousand Indians had perished in the previous three months.[24]

Whatever the white man's sense of responsibility, he could do little to save the natives. Once deposited in the New World, the disease took its natural course. Even for the white man, only an immunity cultivated over generations of endemic contact could be considered effective. Without this barrier, the Indians suffered accordingly. Adair tried to save lives by moderating the severities of native medicine and by successfully instructing the Indians in the use of quarantine. Jefferson favored vaccination and sought to spread the practice among the tribes. When Little Turtle, a Miami chief, came east with a delegation in 1797, he arranged for Benjamin Rush to vaccinate the chief and his companions. He directed Lewis and Clark to carry a specimen of the "kinepox" on their expedition and to take the opportunity to show the Indians how to use it. The War Department supplied a quantity of vaccine for the Long expedition to distribute along the Missouri in 1819, though unfortunately it was ruined in an accident. The injury to the tribes, however, had already been done. Considering the state of medical knowledge at the time, no mere desire to help could have saved the Indians from smallpox.[25]

Civilization may have been recognized as the ultimate source of smallpox, but the connection seemed less obvious and more tenuous than with the various venereal disorders. These infections probably caused fewer deaths, but they were more patently social and hence more illustrative of the effects of civilization on the Indians. Syphilis, especially, carried with it melancholy connotations of moral and social disintegration.

The Jeffersonian generation did not solve the problem of the origins of the venereal diseases. With a certain relish for the justice

24. Gallatin Papers, Box 65, N.-Y. Hist. Soc. See also John Bradbury, *Travels in the Interior of America . . .* (Liverpool, 1817); Isaac McCoy, "Report on the Country Reserved for the Indians West of the Mississippi," House Doc. 172, 22d Cong., 1st Sess., Mar. 16, 1832, ser. 220.

25. Adair, *History of American Indians*, 259, 339; Edwin T. Martin, *Thomas Jefferson: Scientist* (New York, 1961), 41; Stern and Stern, *Effect of Smallpox on Amerindian*, 56–58; Corner, ed., *Autobiography of Rush*, 240–241. See also Jackson, ed., *Letters of Lewis and Clark Expedition*, 64; Thwaites, ed., "James's Account of S. H. Long's Expedition," in *Early Western Travels*, XV, 202.

of the transaction, such European writers as Raynal and Robertson maintained that the Indians transmitted them to the whites. In the New World, Lawson came to a similar conclusion. Yet the eminent medical authority of the age, Benjamin Rush, believed that venereal ailments originated with the Europeans, an opinion concurred in by Carver and Heckewelder. On one point everyone agreed: no matter what their origin, these afflictions took a heavy toll of Indian lives. Some of the most provocative evidence came from Lewis and Clark, who found traces on their expedition. The illnesses seemed especially serious in the Far West. They found them also among the Shoshonees, which caused Lewis to conclude that they were native to the country. Despite confusion over their origins, white men generally treated the presence of venereal infections among the tribes as further evidence of native decline for which civilization could be held responsible.[26]

Besides the obvious physical manifestations, Jeffersonian observers also recognized the broader consequences of the spread of venereal diseases. Of course, no one directly related the decline in native population, the reduction in the birth rate, and the increase in anxiety to the incidence of syphilis and gonorrhea among the Indians. Enough that Jeffersonians perceived dimly that these maladies generally accompanied a moral collapse in the tribes. In an exchange with Charles Willson Peale over a minor incident, Jefferson disclosed the intensity of his own feelings on the subject.

26. Raynal, *Philosophical and Political History*, trans. Justamond, II, 363; Robertson, *History of America*, II, 82–83; Harriss, ed., *Lawson's History of North Carolina*, 14–15; Rush, "Inquiry into the Natural History of Medicine among the Indians," in *Medical Inquiries*, 3d ed., I, 117; Carver, *Three Years Travels*, 257; Heckewelder, "Account of the Indian Nations," Am. Phil. Soc., *Trans. of Hist. and Lit. Comm.*, I (1819), 215, 255; Thwaites, ed., *Journals of Lewis and Clark Expedition*, I, 248, 279, II, 373, III, 186, 232, 240, IV, 16; Jackson, ed., *Letters of Lewis and Clark Expedition*, 506. For the origin of syphilis, see Samuel Eliot Morison, *Admiral of the Ocean Sea: A Life of Christopher Columbus* (Boston, 1942), II, 193–218; he contends that the disease was probably endemic among the Indians and was transmitted by them to Europe where it became epidemic. See also Wm. Allen Pusey, *The History and Epidemiology of Syphilis* (Springfield, Ill., 1933), chap. 1; Paul S. Martin *et al.*, *Indians before Columbus: Twenty Thousand Years of North American History Revealed by Archeology* (Chicago, 1947), 267, 353; and Gerbi, *La disputa del nuevo mundo*. For the argument that syphilis originated in Europe, see Ashburn, *Ranks of Death*, chap. 11; Duffy, "Smallpox and the Indians in the American Colonies," *Bull. Hist. Med.*, XXV (1951), 325; MacLeod, *American Indian Frontier*, 40; Alfred W. Crosby, Jr., "The Early History of Syphilis: A Reappraisal," *Am. Anthro.*, N.S., LXXI (1969), 218–227. Whatever the origin, once the initial infection had begun, reinfection from either white or Indian undoubtedly took place. Thus it is easy to see why the blame was placed, quite accurately, on both sides.

Peale reported from Philadelphia that a delegation of Indians from beyond the Mississippi "had been with the women of bad fame in the lower part of the town and contracted the venereal disease." He suggested to Jefferson the importance of curing them before they returned home. Jefferson agreed to take the proper measures, but the arch obscurity of his language revealed a profound prudishness. Instead of frankly recognizing an important problem for the tribes, he seemed more concerned with guarding the precious delicacy he insisted upon in all sexual matters. Venereal diseases evoked in his mind images of moral decay about which he would speak only with reluctance and circumlocution.[27]

5

Alcohol held a special place in the history of tribal disintegration. Seemingly the most innocent of commodities, the Indian tribes paid dearly for its introduction into the New World. Without the startling finality of smallpox, it set in train the process of lingering devastation that not only wore on the physical health of the natives but attacked the very coherence of their social order. In epidemic force it ravaged tribe after tribe until the drunken, reprobate Indian became a fixture in American folklore.

John Heckewelder told a classic story that he claimed had long been cherished by the Delawares. As he described the scene, a party of white men had just landed on Manhattan Island (the name was derived from the Indian word meaning "the island where we all became intoxicated"), led by a man of impressive bearing, elaborately attired in bright red. The Indians called him the Mannitto (a sort of god) and watched intently as a servant filled his glass with an unknown substance.

> He drinks—has the glass filled again, and hands it to the chief standing next to him. The chief receives it, but only smells the contents and passes it on to the next chief, who does the same. The glass or cup thus passes through the circle, without the liquor being tasted by any one, and is on the point of being returned to the red clothed Mannitto, when one of the Indians, a brave man and a great warrior, suddenly jumps up and harangues the assembly on the impropriety of returning the cup with its contents. It was handed to them by the Mannitto, that they should drink out of it, as he himself had done. To follow his example would be pleasing to him; but to return what he had given them might provoke his wrath, and bring destruction on them. And since the orator believed it for the good of the nation that the contents offered them should be drunk, and no one else would do it, he would drink it himself, let the consequence be what it might; it was better for one man to die, than that a whole nation should be destroyed. He then took the glass, and bidding the assembly a solemn farewel at once drank up its whole contents. Every eye was fixed on the resolute chief, to see what effect the unknown liquor would produce. He soon began to stagger, and at last fell prostrate on the ground. His companions now bemoan his fate, he falls into a sound sleep, and they think he has expired. He wakes again, jumps up and declares, that he has enjoyed the most delicious sensations, and that he never before felt himself so happy as after he had drunk the cup. He asks for more, his wish is granted; the whole assembly then imitate him and all became intoxicated.[28]

The anecdote contained an ominous portent of the Indian's later experience. Ignorant of intoxicating beverages, he approached the drink warily, but he soon took it down with eagerness and suffered its baneful effects. In addition, once presented with the liquor, he showed his perplexity in the face of civilization: he wished to please because he perceived the strength of the whites and because he feared the consequences of opposition.

In this first meeting, the brittleness of the tribal order became evident. Premonitions of insecurity and tension impressed themselves on the Indian, but he took the first of many drinks anyway, and he liked what he tasted. Soon his appetite for liquor would become inordinate. Civilized observers agreed that the Indian would drink large quantities whenever he could obtain it; that he drank compulsively for the sole purpose of getting drunk; that he lost control of his actions when he drank; and that he willingly surrendered valuable possessions to obtain liquor. Rum, whiskey, and brandy assumed major importance in trade between white and Indian and were critical factors in the decline of native society. The disintegrated Indian became preeminently the drunken Indian.[29]

27. William Bartram, "Observations on the Creek and Cherokee Indians," American Ethnological Society, *Transactions*, III (1853), 43–44; Blasingham, "Depopulation of the Illinois Indians," *Ethnohistory*, III (1956), 385; Peale to Jefferson, Feb. 10, 1807, and Jefferson to Peale, Feb. 13, 1807, Jackson, ed., *Letters of Lewis and Clark Expedition*, 373–374.

28. Heckewelder, "Account of the Indian Nations," Am. Phil. Soc., *Trans. of Hist. and Lit. Soc.*, I (1819), 56–57, 256.

29. It is generally agreed that the North American Indian had neither fermented nor distilled beverages and, therefore, no experience with the social control of drunkenness. See C. A. Browne, "The Chemical Industries of the American Aborigines," *Isis*, XXIII (1935), 410–411; Weston La Barre, "Native American Beers," *Am. Anthro.*, N.S., XL (1940), 233. There is little information on the reasons for the compulsive drinking habits of the American Indians; Donald Horton, "The Functions of Alcohol in Primitive Societies: A Cross-Culture Study," *Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, IV (1943–1944), 199–320, notes that "the primary function of alcoholic beverages in all societies is the reduction of anxiety." Hallowell, "Some Psychological Characteristics of

Conclusion

The Indian survived. Incorporation presupposed a total change in his way of life, but the tribesman never took more than a small step at a time in the direction of civilization. Even though the aggregate of those steps constituted a serious impairment of the character of tribal life, the tribes still remained, invigorated by the very process that was to spell their destruction. Because the tribesmen never quite lost their perception of themselves as Indians, the humanitarian plan could never be said to have achieved its purpose. Even when most of the outward signs signaled an end to tribal culture and the beginnings of civilized life, the Indians did not seem quite ready to make the transition into unity with the white man's society. Incorporation could take place only when the last vestiges of Indian ways had been erased, a change that would occur only if the tribal society died the physical death that beset individual Indians. Native society could be transformed, but it could not become extinct.

Indian life endured not only because the government and the missionaries failed to accomplish their purpose but because they did all that they could to protect the tribesmen from the assault of the frontier. Left to their own devices, the settlers with their overwhelming power might have succeeded in breaking up the tribal order and scattering the native people before them. The fate of the northeastern tribes, each in its turn worn down by war and contacts with the whites, supplied unmistakable evidence of what lay in store for the southern Indians. Governmental policy in the Jeffersonian period called for the protection of the remaining tribes as a prerequisite for their reception of civilization. And this meant protection from the destructive influences of the frontier. Philanthropic

goodwill could be effective in civilizing the Indians only if it succeeded in preserving them from the impact of the frontier.

Yet this tendency of government and missionary to side with the tribes against the western populace was more illusion than reality. Humanitarian distaste for frontier behavior stemmed, not from any desire to preserve the wilderness, but from an opinion that such behavior was more imitative of savage existence than of the restraint and decorum taught by civilization. Tribal life could derive no comfort from philanthropic solicitude. The civilizing plan was as well designed for the elimination of tribalism as the advance of the frontier was inimical to the life of the Indian. Ultimately, hating Indians could not be differentiated from hating Indianness. If the frontiersman adopted the direct method of murdering Indians, humanitarians were only more circumspect in demanding cultural suicide of the tribes.

This basic unity of civilization in its relation to the native peoples was only dimly perceived in the Jeffersonian period. Most humanitarians saw their own activities as a way of preserving the Indians and as something distinct in its effects from the results of conflict on the frontier. One critic, in reviewing Jedidiah Morse's *Report to the Secretary of War of the United States, on Indian Affairs* in the *North American Review*, went beyond this comforting interpretation. Referring to the desire to save the remaining eastern Indians, he asserted:

> We lament that they have vanished: we would take measures to preserve the present stock. But what is it we would preserve? Their language? that first great bond and symbol of national identity, curious as many of their languages are in their structure, and perhaps the only historical monument of their ancient emigrations, affinities, and fortunes? Would we preserve these? O no. It is recommended at once, to hasten these into oblivion. Dr. Morse, in his appendix, expressly says, "as fast as possible, let Indians forget their own languages, in which nothing is written, and nothing of course can be preserved, and learn ours, which will at once open to them the whole field of useful knowledge." Is it their mode of life, tenure of property in common, their manners, that which makes them in all externals to be what they are: is it these, which we deplore as lost, and would fix and perpetuate where they still exist? No. The whole drift of Dr. Morse's speculations on the subject is to gather the Indians all into convenient settlements, wean them from the chase, teach them individually to hold a farm in fee, and plough and dig it. Is it their national faith, the religion of their fathers, their traditions, that we would cherish and perpetuate among them? Far from it. Their religious conceptions are notoriously of the grossest and most degrading kind, their traditions mere bloody recollections of prisoners scalped and tomahawked. Is there any

thing left then that we wish in fact to preserve? Nothing in the last analysis, but the copper color; and why a civilized, christianized person, speaking our language, subsisting by regular labor, is any better for being copper colored, we cannot see. But some will not leave even this. Dr. Morse quotes a respectable Frenchman, who strongly recommends intermarriages, and is evidently not unfriendly himself to the suggestion; and the advantages are that it will ameliorate the manners of the natives, and *the offspring be nearly white*. All this may be very well, but what becomes in the meantime of the Indians. The very efficacy of this course is to hasten their disappearance.[1]

The ironies were rich. Ultimately, the white man's sympathy was more deadly than his animosity. Philanthropy had in mind the disappearance of an entire race.

Although philanthropists condemned the unbridled behavior of the western settlers, they continued to instill in the native population values similar to those celebrated on the frontier. The sources of order that the native derived from the tribe would be replaced by evangelical religion and secular individualism. Separation of the Indian's person from tribal discipline was the essential step in the civilizing process. In order to tame what he interpreted as the savage impulse, the missionary set the native free of his customary way of life. The Indian did not thence behave differently, not only because he never completely severed his ties with the old order but also because the missionary taught positive virtues of self-control. Yet the fact remained that the philanthropists could not quite disown the success of the frontier even if they found it frequently an obstacle to their own plans.

For similar reasons, the white man's governmental authorities could never muster the will to impose order in the West. Without military force or a bureaucratic structure capable of enforcing humanitarian policies, they could not protect the Indian. Reluctantly, the federal government and an important segment of the humanitarian interest were forced to agree that the frontier white man's time had come. For all of his defects, the settler represented civilization, and the Indian must either join him or retire to the West.

Neither environmentalism nor noble savagism supplied the Jeffersonian era with the means for explaining the actual consequences of Indian-white relations. Why, for example, after the combined impact of the frontier and the philanthropic program, did the Indians change their ways only partially? Why did many natives, instead of thriving on the riches provided by civilized men, fall into

1. *No. Am. Rev.*, XVI (1823), 39–40.

decline? Why did many Indians reject the white man's good offices and elect to defend the tribal order? And why, finally, despite the considerable success of the civilizing effort, did incorporation fail to take place? None of these questions could be answered satisfactorily within the definitions of Jeffersonian thought. All of them testified to the limitations that the persistence of culture imposed on any attempt at social transformation. Environmentalism described the process of change mechanically, with explicit rules of procedure and clearly defined stages of growth. And it left no doubt about the outcome: the Indian would eventually become like the white man. The paradisaic formula invested the outcome with cosmic necessity. Both of these conceptions derived from a priori and unhistorical definitions of human existence; neither accounted for the devastating and paradoxical effects of the white man's society on tribal culture.

In so far as the Jeffersonian observer recognized many of the actual consequences of Indian-white relations, he was justified in attributing them to such impersonal forces as war, disease, and the mysterious chemistry of liquor among the native peoples. All of this heightened the original sympathy that characterized the humanitarian plan. It became as important to save the Indian from vice as it had been to save him from his savage self. Indeed, it was much easier to pity the passive and suffering native than it had ever been to sympathize with the savage warrior or the stubborn pupil. Despite the growing evidence that the civilizing program would not fulfill its promise, philanthropists could propose only more of the same, albeit in a different location. Philanthropy remained true to its principles and even more sympathetic to the plight of the native tribes. "It is impossible," wrote Tocqueville, "to destroy men with more respect to the laws of humanity."[2]

2. Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, eds. J. P. Mayer and Max Lerner (New York, 1966), 312.

Note on Sources

In describing the relationship between ideas and policy, this study relies mainly on publicly articulated conceptions of the Indian in the Jeffersonian era. Hence it makes use of the extensive published literature in books and articles dealing with the Indian and his relationship with civilization. Natural history, travel accounts, and captivity narratives supply the major definitions of tribal life in the Jeffersonian period. Official government materials and the records of missionaries to the tribes provide the basis for associating ideas with specific policies. Personal papers have been used with caution. Much valuable information can be found in private correspondence, but it must be treated in light of the formal conceptions of the native peoples that were critical in the establishment of national policy. In fact, the two sources are not in opposition. One often finds a greater frankness in private correspondence, perhaps more signs of flagging sympathy, but the Jeffersonian generation believed privately what it said publicly.

Thomas Jefferson's views are in print largely in the foundation work of the period, *Notes on the State of Virginia*, ed. William Peden (Chapel Hill, 1955), and in the various editions of his writings: Julian P. Boyd, ed., *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson*, 17 vols. to date (Princeton, 1950–), Paul Leicester Ford, ed., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 10 vols. (New York, 1892–1899), and Andrew A. Lipscomb and Albert Ellery Bergh, eds., *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 20 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1903–1904). A convenient collection of Jefferson's Indian speeches is in Saul K. Padover, ed., *The Complete Jefferson* . . . (New York, 1943), and his correspondence with John Adams may be consulted in the two-volume edition by Lester J. Cappon, *The Adams-Jefferson Letters: The Complete Correspondence Between Thomas Jefferson and*

Abigail and John Adams (Chapel Hill, 1959). For letters not printed in any of these sources, I used the microfilm version of the Jefferson Papers in the Library of Congress and the Coolidge Collection in the Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, both available at the Alderman Library of the University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Washington's views are contained in John C. Fitzpatrick, ed., *The Writings of George Washington from the Original Manuscript Sources, 1745–1799,* 39 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1931–1944), and in C. W. Butterfield, ed., *Washington-Irvine Correspondence: The Official Letters which Passed between Washington and Brig.-Gen. William Irvine and between Irvine and Others concerning Military Affairs in the West from 1781 and 1783* (Madison, 1882). The stereotyped opinions of Franklin are easily consulted in Leonard W. Labaree *et al.,* eds., *The Papers of Benjamin Franklin,* 15 vols. to date (New Haven, 1959–), and in the same editors' *The Autobiography of Benjamin Franklin* (New Haven, 1964). The older version of *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin,* 10 vols. (New York, 1905–1907) was edited by Albert H. Smyth. Julian P. Boyd, ed., *Indian Treaties Printed by Benjamin Franklin, 1736–1762* (Philadelphia, 1938), remains an extraordinary example of how white men who actually knew Indians conceived of them in the traditional formulas. Franklin Bowditch Dexter has edited *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles . . . ,* 3 vols. (New York, 1901) and *Extracts from the Itineraries and Other Miscellanies of Ezra Stiles . . .* (New Haven, 1916). *The Autobiography of Benjamin Rush . . .* (Princeton, 1948), edited by George W. Corner, and the *Letters of Benjamin Rush* (Princeton, 1951), edited by L. H. Butterfield, throw light on the opinions of the Philadelphia doctor. Donald Jackson's collection of *Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, with Related Documents, 1783–1854* (Urbana, 1962) supplements Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., *Original Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, 1804–1806,* 8 vols. (New York, 1904–1905). Jackson's edition of *The Journals of Zebulon Montgomery Pike, with Letters and Related Documents,* 2 vols. (Norman, 1966) is also useful. Material on the frontier point of view can be found in William Henry Smith, ed., *The St. Clair Papers . . . ,* 2 vols. (Cincinnati, 1882); Samuel C. Williams, ed., "The Executive Journal of Gov. John Sevier," East Tennessee Historical Society, *Publications,* Nos. 1–4 (1929–1932); Gayle Thornbrough, ed., *The Correspondence of John Badollet and Albert Gallatin, 1804–1836, Indiana Historical Publications,* XXII (Indianapolis, 1963); and

Logan Esarey, ed., *Messages and Letters of William Henry Harrison,* in the Governors' Messages and Papers Series, *Indiana Historical Collections,* VII, IX (Indianapolis, 1922). Charles Francis Adams, ed., *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams, Comprising Portions of His Diary from 1795 to 1848,* 12 vols. (Philadelphia, 1874–1877), contains occasional but pertinent references. Thomas L. McKenney justifies himself in *Memoirs, Official and Personal; with Sketches of Travels among the Northern and Southern Indians,* 2 vols. (New York, 1846) and *Sketches of a Tour to the Lakes, of the character and customs of the Chippeway Indians, and of incidents connected with the Treaty of Fond du Lac* (Baltimore, 1827).

The richest source of material on Indian affairs can be found in the Records of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (Record Group 75), National Archives, which may be obtained on microfilm. There are letters and reports here by virtually every prominent person (and many more not so prominent) concerned with Indian-white relations in the Jeffersonian period. Dearborn, Coxe, Harrison, Calhoun, Crawford, Barbour, Hawkins, Meigs, Clark, Cass, and McKenney are some whose opinions are recorded in these documents. They form the basis for the examination of public policy contained in this book. The two volumes on *Indian Affairs* in the series of *American State Papers. Documents, Legislative and Executive . . .* (Washington, D.C., 1832–1861) are an extraordinarily well-chosen selection of government material. Clarence E. Carter, ed., *The Territorial Papers of the United States,* 24 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1934—) and James D. Richardson, ed., *A Compilation of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, 1789–1902,* 10 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1913) provide added governmental material on Indian affairs. For the Revolutionary War and Confederation periods, Worthington C. Ford *et al.,* eds., *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789,* 34 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1904–1937), The Papers of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789, available on microfilm, and Edmund C. Burnett, ed., *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress,* 8 vols. (Washington, D.C., 1921–1938) are the basic sources. *Speeches on the Passage of the Bill for the Removal of the Indians, Delivered in the Congress of the United States, April and May, 1830* (Boston, 1830) is a convenient collection of the speeches against the removal bill. The entire debate can be followed in *Register of Debates in Congress,* 21st Congress, 1st Session, 305*ff* and 580*ff*. Reports on Indian affairs can be consulted in the serial set of congressional documents. Much of this material, however, duplicates letters and reports in the National Archives.

Of the vast array of archival material available for the investigation of Indian-white relations, I found the following collections useful for the understanding of philanthropic attitudes toward the Indians. The American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions Papers in the Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., is the single most important source. The American Board was the major philanthropic instrument in the later years of the Jeffersonian era, and its archives contain letters and reports from such important figures as Samuel A. Worcester, Jeremiah Evarts, Cyrus Kingsbury, and Elias Cornelius. The Vaill Collection, Yale University Library, New Haven, Conn., which I read on microfilm, proved revealing for the Gold-Boudinot marriage. Two Moravian missionaries left sophisticated accounts of their knowledge of the natives: John Heckewelder, "An Account of the History, Manners, and Customs, of the Indian Nations, who Once Inhabited Pennsylvania and the Neighbouring States," American Philosophical Society, *Transactions of the Historical and Literary Committee,* I (1819), 1–348, and Archer Butler Hulbert and William Nathaniel Schwarze, eds., "David Zeisberger's History of the Northern American Indians," Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society, *Publications,* XIX (1910), 1–189. The career of the Baptist missionary Isaac McCoy may be traced in Lela Barnes, ed., "Journal of Isaac McCoy . . . ," *Kansas Historical Quarterly,* V (1936), 227–277, 339–337. McCoy's papers (microfilm) are in the Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.

The papers of Benjamin Hawkins, both manuscripts and the large collection of transcripts brought together by Louise F. Hays, in the Georgia Department of Archives and History, Atlanta, contain much information on the early effort to civilize the Cherokees. Published Hawkins material can be found in the *Letters of Benjamin Hawkins, 1796–1806,* Georgia Historical Society, *Collections,* IX (Savannah, 1916), and in his "A Sketch of the Creek Country, in the Years 1798 and 1799," in the same *Collections,* III (Savannah, 1848). Also in the Georgia Department of Archives and History, the Timothy Barnard Papers (manuscripts and transcripts) and a small collection of Return J. Meigs material offer a glimpse of frontier life, as do the Georgia Governor's Letter Books. The Albert Gallatin Papers in the New-York Historical Society, especially boxes 64 through 67 containing his Indian vocabularies, testify to the basic connection between scholarly interest in the tribes and benevolence. Gallatin wrote a summary of his views of the Indians in his "A Synopsis of the Indian Tribes within the United States East of the Rocky Mountains, and in the British and Russian Possessions in North America," American Antiquarian Society, *Archaeologia Americana* (*Transactions and Collections,* II [Worcester, Mass., 1836]), 7–422. The miscellaneous DeWitt Clinton manuscripts also in the New-York Historical Society reveal a similar scholarly and philanthropic interest. I used microfilm of the Timothy Pickering Papers in the Massachusetts Historical Society, edited by Frederick S. Allis and Roy Bartolomei. They reveal a man of broad interest and intelligence and of deep sympathy for the Indians. Volumes 59 through 62 contain the bulk of the Indian material. The sources available in the American Philosophical Society were easily accessible through John F. Freeman, comp., *A Guide to Manuscripts Relating to the American Indian in the Library of the American Philosophical Society* (Philadelphia, 1966), which is Volume LXV of the society's Memoirs. The Miscellaneous Manuscripts Collection there holds the remnants of Jefferson's Indian vocabularies and much material referring to the tribes. Letters by Peter S. Du Ponceau and Caspar Wistar were valuable for information on tribal ethnology.