PRE–UNITED STATES HISTORY 1600–1699

Volume 5

Arthur Graves

PRE–UNITED STATES HISTORY

1600–1699

VOLUME 5

PRE–UNITED STATES HISTORY

1600–1699

VOLUME 5

Arthur Graves

BIBLIOTEX
Digital Library

Pre–United States History: 1600–1699, Volume 5
by Arthur Graves

www.bibliotex.com

Ebook ISBN: 9781984668295

Published by:
Bibliotex
Canada
Website: www.bibliotex.com

Contents

Chapter 34

Louis Jolliet and Jacques Marquette

Louis Jolliet

Louis Jolliet (September 21, 1645 – after May 1700) was a French-Canadian explorer known for his discoveries in North America. In 1673, Jolliet and Jesuit Father Jacques Marquette, a Catholic priest and missionary, were the first non-Natives to explore and map the Upper Mississippi River.

Early life

Jolliet was born in 1645 in Beaupré, a French settlement near Quebec City to parents Jean Jolliet and Marie D'Abancourt. When he was six years old, his father died; his mother then married a successful merchant named Geoffroy Guillotdit Lavalle until his death in 1665. Shortly after the passing of his mother's second husband, she would marry Martin Prevost until her death in 1678. Jolliet's stepfather owned land on the Ile d'Orleans, an island in the Saint Lawrence River in Quebec that was home to First Nations. Jolliet spent much time on Ile d'Orleans, so it was likely that he began speaking Indigenous languages of the Americas at a young age. Besides French, he also learned English and Spanish. During his childhood, Quebec was the center of the French fur trade. The Natives were part of day-to-day life in Quebec, and Joliet grew up

knowing a lot about them. Jolliet entered a Jesuit school in Quebec as a child and focused on philosophical and religious studies, aiming for priesthood. He also studied music, becoming a skilled harpsichordist and church organist. He received Holy Orders in 1662 but abandoned his plans to become a priest, leaving the seminary in 1667 to pursue fur trading instead.

Exploration of the Upper Mississippi

While Hernando de Soto was the first European to make official note of the Mississippi River by discovering its southern entrance in 1541, Jolliet and Marquette were the first to locate its upper reaches, and travel most of its length, about 130 years later. De Soto had named the river Rio del Espiritu Santo, but tribes along its length called it variations "Mississippi", meaning "Great River" in the Algonquian languages.

On May 17, 1673, Jolliet and Marquette departed from St. Ignace, Michigan with two canoes and five other voyageurs of French-Indian ancestry. The group sailed to Green Bay. They then paddled upstream (southward) on the Fox River to the site now known as Portage,

Wisconsin. There, they portaged a distance of slightly less than two miles through marsh and oak forest to the Wisconsin River. Europeans eventually built a trading post at that shortest convenient portage between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River basins. On June 17, the canoeists ventured onto the Mississippi River near present-day Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.

The Jolliet-Marquette expedition traveled down the Mississippi to within 435 miles (700 km) of the Gulf of Mexico. They turned back north at the mouth of the Arkansas River. By this point, they had encountered natives carrying European goods and worried about a possible hostile encounter with explorers or colonists from Spain. The voyageurs then followed the Mississippi back to the mouth of the Illinois River, which friendly natives told them was a shorter route back to the Great Lakes. Following the Illinois river upstream, they then turned up its tributary the Des Plaines River near modern-day Joliet, Illinois.

They then continued up the Des Plaines River and portaged their canoes and gear at the Chicago Portage. They then followed the Chicago River downstream until they reached Lake Michigan near the location of modern-day Chicago. Father Marquette stayed at the mission of St. Francis Xavier at the southern end of Green Bay, which they reached in August. Joliet returned to Quebec to relate the news of their discoveries.

Later years

Jolliet married Claire-Françoise Byssot de la Valtrie. Like Jolliet, she was Canadian born, a daughter of Francois Byssot de la Riviere and his wife Marie Couillard. Claire Francoise was also a sister of Louise Byssot de la Valtrie, wife of Seraphin de Margane, Seigneur de la Valtrie. In 1680, Jolliet was granted the Island of Antwhere where he created a fort and maintained soldiers. In 1693, he was appointed "Royal Hydrographer", and on April 30, 1697, he was granted a seigneury southwest of Quebec City which he named Jolliest.

In 1694, he sailed from the Gulf of St. Lawrence north along the coast of Labrador as far north as Zoar, a voyage of five and a half months. He recorded details of the country, navigation, the Inuit and their customs. His journal ("Journal de Louis Jolliet allant à la decouverte de Labrador, 1694,") is the earliest known detailed survey of the Labrador coast from the Strait of Belle Isle to Zoar.

In May 1700, Louis Jolliet left for Anticosti Island. He then disappears from the historical record. There is no listing of his death or burial place, and the sole record of his fate is the notation that a mass for his soul was said in Quebec on September 15, 1700.

Legacy

Jolliet's main legacy is most tangible in the Midwestern United States and Quebec, mostly through geographical names, including the cities of Joliet, Illinois; Joliet, Montana; and Joliette, Quebec (founded by one of Jolliet's descendants, Barthélemy Joliette).

The several variations in the spelling of the name "Jolliet" reflect spelling that occurred at times when illiteracy or poor literacy was common and spelling was unstandardized. Jolliet's descendants live throughout eastern Canada and the United States. The Louis Jolliet rose, developed by Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, was named in his honor.

The Jolliet Squadron of cadets at the Royal Military College Saint-Jean in the Province of Quebec was named in his honor.

Joliet Junior College in Joliet, Illinois, is named after the explorer, as are numerous high schools in North America.

A cruise ship sailing out of Quebec City is also named in his honour.

Jolliet appears with Pere Jacques Marquette SJ on a 1968 United States postage stamp honoring their exploratory voyage.

Jacques Marquette

Jacques Marquette S.J. (June 1, 1637 – May 18, 1675), sometimes known as **Père Marquette** or **James Marquette**, was a French Jesuit missionary who founded Michigan's first European settlement, Sault Sainte Marie, and later founded Saint Ignace. In 1673, Marquette, with Louis Jolliet, an explorer born near Quebec City, was the first European to explore and map the northern portion of the Mississippi River Valley.

Early life

Jacques Marquette was born in Laon, France, on June 1, 1637. He came of an ancient family distinguished for its civic and military services. Marquette joined the Society of Jesus at age 17. He studied and taught in France for several years, then the Jesuits assigned him to New France in 1666 as a missionary to the indigenous peoples of the Americas. When he arrived in Quebec, he was assigned to Trois-Rivières on the Saint Lawrence River, where he assisted Gabriel Druillettes and, as preliminary to further work, devoted himself to the study of the local languages and became fluent in six different dialects.

Explorations

- In 1668, Marquette was moved by his superiors to missions farther up the Saint Lawrence River in the western Great Lakes region. That year he helped Druillettes found the mission at Sault Ste. Marie in present-day Michigan. Other missions were founded at Saint Ignace in 1671 (Mission Saint-Ignace) and at La Pointe on Lake Superior in present-day Wisconsin. At La Pointe, he encountered members of the Illinois tribes, who told him about the important trading route of the Mississippi River. They invited him to teach their people, whose settlements were mostly farther south. Because of wars between the Hurons at La Pointe and the neighboring Lakota people, Marquette left the mission and went to the Straits of Mackinac; he informed his superiors about the rumored river and requested permission to explore it. Leave was granted, and in 1673 Marquette joined the expedition of Louis Jolliet, a French-Canadian explorer. They departed from Saint Ignace on May 17, with two canoes and five voyageurs of French-Indian ancestry. They sailed to Green Bay and up the Fox River, nearly to its headwaters. From there, they were told to portage their canoes a distance of slightly less than two miles through marsh and oak plains to the Wisconsin River. Many years later, at that point, the town of Portage, Wisconsin was built, named for the ancient path between the two rivers. They ventured forth from the portage, and on June 17, they entered the

Mississippi near present-day Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin. The Joliet-Marquette expedition traveled to within 435 miles (700 km) of the Gulf of Mexico but turned back at the mouth of the Arkansas River. By this point, they had encountered several natives carrying European trinkets, and they feared an encounter with explorers or colonists from Spain. They followed the Mississippi back to the mouth of the Illinois River, which they learned from local natives provided a shorter route back to the Great Lakes. They reached Lake Michigan near the site of modern-day Chicago, by way of the Chicago Portage. In September, Marquette stopped at Saint Francis Xavier mission in present-day Green Bay, Wisconsin, while Jolliet returned to Quebec to relate the news of their discoveries.

Marquette and his party returned to the Illinois territory in late 1674, becoming the first Europeans to winter in what would become the city of Chicago. As welcomed guests of the Illinois Confederation, the explorers were feasted *en route* and fed ceremonial foods such as sagamite.

Death

In the spring of 1675, Marquette traveled westward and celebrated a public Mass at the Grand Village of the Illinois near Starved Rock.

A bout of dysentery he had contracted during the Mississippi expedition sapped his health. On the return trip to Saint Ignace, he died at 37 years of age near the modern town of

Ludington, Michigan. After his death, natives from the Illinois Confederation returned his bones to the chapel at Mission Saint-Ignace.

A Michigan Historical Marker at this location reads:

Father Jacques Marquette, the great Jesuit missionary and explorer, died and was buried by two French companions somewhere along the Lake Michigan shore on May 18, 1675. He had been returning to his mission at St. Ignace, which he had left in 1673, to go exploring in the Mississippi country. The exact location of his death has long been a subject of controversy. A spot close to the southeast slope of this hill, near the ancient outlet of the Pere Marquette River, corresponds with the death site as located by early French accounts and maps and a constant tradition of the past. Marquette's remains were reburied at St. Ignace in 1677.

Adjacent to gravesite of Marquette on State Street in downtown Saint Ignace, a building was constructed that now houses the Museum of Ojibwa Culture.

However, a Michigan Historical Marker in Frankfort, MI reads:

Marquette's Death: On May 18, 1675, Father Jacques Marquette, the great Jesuit missionary and explorer, died and was buried by two French companions somewhere along the Lake Michigan shore of the Lower Peninsula. Marquette had been returning to his mission at St. Ignace, which he had left in 1673 to go on an exploring trip to the Mississippi and the Illinois country. The exact location of Marquette’s death has long been a subject of controversy. Evidence presented in the 1960s indicates that this site, near the natural outlet of the

Betsie River, at the northeast corner of a hill which was here until 1900, is the Marquette death site and that the Betsie is the Rivière du Père Marquette of early French accounts and maps. Marquette's bones were reburied at St. Ignace in 1677.

Legacy

Places

- Marquette County, Michigan; Marquette County, Wisconsin
- Several communities, including: Marquette, Michigan; Marquette, Wisconsin; Marquette, Iowa; Marquette, Illinois; Marquette Heights, Illinois; Pere Marquette Charter Township, Michigan; and Marquette, Manitoba
- Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wisconsin
- Marquette Island in Lake Huron
- Lake Marquette in Minnesota; Marquette Lake in Quebec
- Pere Marquette River and Pere Marquette Lake, which drain into Lake Michigan at Ludington, Michigan
- Marquette River in Quebec; Pere Marquette River in Michigan
- Pere Marquette Park in Milwaukee, WI
- Pere Marquette State Park near Grafton, Illinois
- Marquette Park, Chicago, Illinois
- Marquette Park, Gary, Indiana
- Pere Marquette Beach, a public beach in Muskegon, Michigan

- Pere Marquette State Forest, in Michigan
- The Pere Marquette Railway
- "Cité Marquette," former US-City-Base (1956–1966) built by Americans based on the NATO Air Force Base in Couvron (38th Bombardment Wing), Laon, France (his birthplace).
- Marquette Transportation Company, a towboat company using a silhouette of the Pere in his canoe as their emblem.
- Marquette Building in Chicago; Marquette Building in Detroit; Marquette Building in Saint Louis, Missouri; Pere Marquette Hotel in Peoria, Illinois
- Marquette Avenue, a large street in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Monuments

Marquette is memorialized by various statues, monuments, and historical markers:

- Father Marquette National Memorial near Saint Ignace, Michigan
- Chicago Portage National Historic Site, along with Louis Jolliet, near Lyons, Illinois
- Statues have been erected to Marquette various locations, including at Detroit, Michigan; Fort Mackinac, Michigan; Marquette, Michigan; Milwaukee, at Marquette University; Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin, Utica, Illinois; Laon, France; the National Statuary Hall of the United States Capitol; the Quebec Parliament Building

- The Legler Branch of the Chicago Public Library displays "Wilderness, Winter River Scene," a restored mural by Midwestern artist R. Fayerweather Babcock. The mural depicts Marquette and Native Americans trading by a river. Commissioned for Legler Branch in 1934, the mural was funded by the Works Projects Administration.

Marquette has been honored twice on postage stamps issued by the United States:

- A one-cent stamp in 1898, part of Trans-Mississippi Issue, which shows him on the Mississippi River; This is the first time a Catholic priest is honored by the U.S. Postal Department.
- A 6-cent stamp issued September 20, 1968, marking the 300th anniversary of his establishment of the Jesuit mission at Sault Ste. Marie.

Chapter 35

King Philip's War

King Philip's War (sometimes called the **First Indian War**, **Metacom's War**, **Metacomet's War**, **Pometacomet's Rebellion**, or **Metacom's Rebellion**) was an armed conflict in 1675–1678 between indigenous inhabitants of New England and New England colonists and their indigenous allies.

The war is named for Metacom, the Wampanoag chief who adopted the name Philip because of the friendly relations between his father Massasoit and the *Mayflower* Pilgrims. The war continued in the most northern reaches of New England until the signing of the Treaty of Casco Bay in April 1678.

Massasoit had maintained a long-standing alliance with the colonists. Metacom (c. 1638–1676) was his younger son, and he became tribal chief in 1662 after Massasoit's death. Metacom, however, forsook his father's alliance between the Wampanoags and the colonists after repeated violations by the colonists. The colonists insisted that the peace agreement in 1671 should include the surrender of Native guns; then three Wampanoags were hanged in Plymouth Colony in 1675 for the murder of another Wampanoag, which increased the tensions. Native raiding parties attacked homesteads and villages throughout Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Maine over the next six months, and the Colonial militia retaliated. The Narragansetts remained neutral, but several individual Narragansetts participated in raids of colonial strongholds and militia, so colonial leaders deemed them to be

in violation of peace treaties. The colonies assembled the largest army that New England had yet mustered, consisting of 1,000 militia and 150 Native allies, and Governor Josiah Winslow marshaled them to attack the Narragansetts in November 1675. They attacked and burned Native villages throughout Rhode Island territory, culminating with the attack on the Narragansetts' main fort in the Great Swamp Fight. An estimated 600 Narragansetts were killed, and the Native coalition was then taken over by Narragansett sachem Canonchet. They pushed back the colonial frontier in Massachusetts Bay, Plymouth, and Rhode Island colonies, burning towns as they went, including Providence in March 1676. However, the colonial militia overwhelmed the Native coalition and, by the end of the war, the Wampanoags and their Narragansett allies were almost completely destroyed. On August 12, 1676, Metacom fled to Mount Hope where he was killed by the militia.

The war was the greatest calamity in seventeenth-century New England and is considered by many to be the deadliest war in Colonial American history. In the space of little more than a year, 12 of the region's towns were destroyed and many more were damaged, the economy of Plymouth and Rhode Island Colonies was all but ruined and their population was decimated, losing one-tenth of all men available for military service. More than half of New England's towns were attacked by Natives. Hundreds of Wampanoags and their allies were publicly executed or enslaved, and the Wampanoags were left effectively landless.

King Philip's War began the development of an independent American identity. The New England colonists faced their

enemies without support from any European government or military, and this began to give them a group identity separate and distinct from Britain.

Historical context

Plymouth Colony was established in 1620 with significant early help from local Natives, particularly Squanto and Massasoit. Subsequent colonists founded Salem, Boston, and many small towns around Massachusetts Bay between 1628 and 1640, during a time of increased English immigration. The colonists progressively expanded throughout the territories of the several Algonquian-speaking tribes in the region. Prior to King Philip's War, tensions fluctuated between Native tribes and the colonists, but relations were generally peaceful.

The Rhode Island, Plymouth, Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, and New Haven colonies each developed separate relations with the Wampanoags, Nipmucs, Narragansetts, Mohegans, Pequots, and other tribes of New England, whose territories historically had differing boundaries.

Many of the neighboring tribes had been traditional competitors and enemies. As the colonial population increased, the New Englanders expanded their settlements along the region's coastal plain and up the Connecticut River valley. By 1675, they had established a few small towns in the interior between Boston and the Connecticut River settlements.

The Wampanoag tribe under Metacomet's leadership had entered into an agreement with the Plymouth Colony and believed that they could rely on the colony for protection.

However, in the decades preceding the war, it became clear to them that the treaty did not mean that the Colonists were not allowed to settle in new territories.

Failure of diplomacy

Metacomet became sachem of the Pokanoket and Grand Sachem of the Wampanoag Confederacy in 1662 after the death of his older brother Grand Sachem Wamsutta (called "Alexander" by the colonists), who had succeeded their father Massasoit (d. 1661) as chief. Metacomet was well known to the colonists before his ascension as paramount chief to the Wampanoags, but he distrusted the colonists.

The Plymouth colonists had passed laws making it illegal to have commerce with the Wampanoags. They learned that Wamsutta had sold a parcel of land to Roger Williams, so Governor Josiah Winslow had Wamsutta arrested, even though Wampanoags who lived outside of colonist jurisdiction were not accountable to Plymouth Colony laws. Metacomet began negotiating with the other Algonquian tribes against the Plymouth Colony soon after the death of his father and his brother.

Population

The population of New England colonists totaled about 65,000 people. They lived in 110 towns, of which 64 were in the Massachusetts Bay colony, which then included the southwestern portion of Maine. The towns had about 16,000 men of military age who were almost all part of the militia, as universal training was prevalent in all colonial New England

towns. Many towns had built strong garrison houses for defense, and others had stockades enclosing most of the houses. All of these were strengthened as the war progressed. Some poorly populated towns were abandoned if they did not have enough men to defend them.

Each town had local militias based on all eligible men who had to supply their own arms. Only those who were too old, too young, disabled, or clergy were excused from military service. The militias were usually only minimally trained and initially did relatively poorly against the warring Natives, until more effective training and tactics could be devised. Joint forces of militia volunteers and volunteer Native allies were found to be the most effective. The Native allies of the colonists numbered about 1,000 from the Mohegans and Praying Indians, with about 200 warriors.

By 1676, the regional Native population had decreased to about 10,000 (exact numbers are unavailable), largely because of epidemics. These included about 4,000 Narragansetts of western Rhode Island and eastern Connecticut, 2,400 Nipmucs of central and western Massachusetts, and 2,400 combined in the Massachusett and Pawtucket tribes living around Massachusetts Bay and extending northwest to Maine. The Wampanoags and Pokanokets of Plymouth and eastern Rhode Island are thought to have numbered fewer than 1,000. About one in four were considered to be warriors. By then, the Natives had almost universally adopted steel knives, tomahawks, and flintlock muskets as their weapons. The various tribes had no common government. They had distinct cultures and often warred among themselves, although they all spoke related languages from the Algonquian family.

The trial

John Sassamon was a Native convert to Christianity, commonly referred to as a "praying Indian." He played a key role as a "cultural mediator," negotiating with both colonists and Natives while belonging to neither party. He was an early graduate of Harvard College and served as a translator and adviser to Metacomet. He reported to the governor of Plymouth Colony that Metacomet planned to gather allies for Native attacks on widely dispersed colonial settlements.

Metacomet was brought before a public court, where court officials admitted that they had no proof but warned that they would confiscate Wampanoag land and guns if they had any further reports that he was conspiring to start a war. Not long after, Sassamon's body was found in the ice-covered Assawompset Pond, and Plymouth Colony officials arrested three Wampanoags on the testimony of a Native witness, including one of Metacomet's counselors. A jury that included six Native elders convicted the men of Sassamon's murder, and they were executed by hanging on June 8, 1675 (O.S.), at Plymouth.

Southern theater, 1675

Raid on Swansea

A band of Pokanokets attacked several isolated homesteads in the small Plymouth colony settlement of Swansea on June 20, 1675. They laid siege to the town, then destroyed it five days later and killed several more people. On June 27, 1675, a full eclipse of the moon occurred in the New England area, and

various tribes in New England thought it a good omen for attacking the colonists. Officials from the Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies responded quickly to the attacks on Swansea; on June 28, they sent a punitive military expedition that destroyed the Wampanoag town at Mount Hope in Bristol, Rhode Island.

The war quickly spread and soon involved the Podunk and Nipmuc tribes. During the summer of 1675, the Natives attacked at Middleborough and Dartmouth, Massachusetts (July 8), Mendon, Massachusetts (July 14), Brookfield, Massachusetts (August 2), and Lancaster, Massachusetts (August 9). In early September, they attacked Deerfield, Hadley, and Northfield, Massachusetts.

Siege of Brookfield

Wheeler's Surprise and the ensuing Siege of Brookfield were fought in August 1675 between Nipmuc Natives under Muttawmp and the colonists of Massachusetts Bay under the command of Thomas Wheeler and Captain Edward Hutchinson. The battle consisted of an initial ambush on August 2, 1675, by the Nipmucs against Wheeler's unsuspecting party. Eight men from Wheeler's company died during the ambush: Zechariah Phillips of Boston, Timothy Farlow of Billerica, Edward Coleborn of Chelmsford, Samuel Smedly of Concord, Shadrach Hapgood of Sudbury, Sergeant Eyres, Sergeant Prichard, and Corporal Coy of Brookfield. Following the ambush was an attack on Brookfield, Massachusetts, and the consequent besieging of the remains of the colonial force. The Nipmuc forces harried the settlers for two days, until they were driven off by a newly arrived force of colonial soldiers under

the command of Major Simon Willard. The siege took place at Ayers' Garrison in West Brookfield, but the location of the initial ambush was a subject of extensive controversy among historians in the late nineteenth century.

The New England Confederation comprised the Massachusetts Bay Colony, Plymouth Colony, New Haven Colony, and Connecticut Colony; they declared war on the Natives on September 9, 1675. The Colony of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations tried to remain neutral, but much of the war was fought on Rhode Island soil; Providence and Warwick suffered extensive damage from the Natives.

The next colonial expedition was to recover crops from abandoned fields along the Connecticut River for the coming winter and included almost 100 farmers and militia, plus teamsters to drive the wagons.

Battle of Bloody Brook

The Battle of Bloody Brook was fought on September 12, 1675, between militia from the Massachusetts Bay Colony and a band of Natives led by Nipmuc sachem Muttawmp. The Natives ambushed colonists escorting a train of wagons carrying the harvest from Deerfield to Hadley. They killed at least 40 militia men and 17 teamsters out of a company that included 79 militia.

Attack on Springfield

The Natives next attacked Springfield, Massachusetts, on October 5, 1675, the Connecticut River's largest settlement at the time. They burned to the ground nearly all of Springfield's

buildings, including the town's grist mill. Most of the Springfielders who escaped unharmed took cover at the house of Miles Morgan, a resident who had constructed one of the settlement's few fortified blockhouses. A Native servant who worked for Morgan managed to escape and alerted the Massachusetts Bay troops under the command of Major Samuel Appleton, who broke through to Springfield and drove off the attackers.

Morgan's sons were famous Native fighters in the territory. His son Peletiah was killed by Natives in 1675. Springfielders later honored Miles Morgan with a large statue in Court Square.

The Great Swamp Fight

On November 2, Plymouth Colony governor Josiah Winslow led a combined force of colonial militia against the Narragansett tribe. The Narragansetts had not been directly involved in the war, but they had sheltered many of the Wampanoag fighters, women, and children. Some of their warriors had participated in several Native attacks. The colonists distrusted the tribe and did not understand the various alliances. As the colonial forces went through Rhode Island, they found and burned several Native towns which had been abandoned by the Narragansetts, who had retreated to a massive fort in a frozen swamp. The cold weather in December froze the swamp so that it was relatively easy to traverse. The colonial force found the Narragansett fort on December 19, 1675, near present-day South Kingstown, Rhode Island; they attacked in a combined force of Plymouth, Massachusetts, and Connecticut militia numbering about 1,000 men, including about 150 Pequots and Mohegan Native allies. The fierce battle that followed is known

as the Great Swamp Fight. It is believed that the militia killed about 600 Narragansetts. They burned the fort (occupying over 5 acres (20,000 m) of land) and destroyed most of the tribe's winter stores.

Most of the Narragansett warriors escaped into the frozen swamp. The colonists lost many of their officers in this assault; about 70 of their men were killed and nearly 150 more wounded. The rest of the colonial assembled forces returned to their homes, lacking supplies for an extended campaign. The nearby towns in Rhode Island provided care for the wounded until they could return to their homes.

Mohawk intervention

In December 1675, Metacomet established a winter camp in Schaghticoke, New York. His reason for moving into New York has been attributed to a desire to enlist Mohawk aid in the conflict. Though New York was a non-belligerent, Governor Edmund Andros was nonetheless concerned at the arrival of the Wampanoag sachem. Either with Andros' sanction, or of their own accord, the Mohawk—traditional rivals of the Algonquian people—launched a surprise assault against a 500-warrior band under Metacomet's command the following February. The "ruthless" *coup de main* resulted in the death of between 70 and as many as 460 of the Wampanoag. His forces crippled, Metacomet withdrew to New England, pursued "relentlessly" by Mohawk forces who attacked Algonquian settlements and ambushed their supply parties.

Over the next several months, fear of Mohawk attack led some Wampanoag to surrender to the colonists, and one historian

described the decision of the Mohawk to engage Metacomet's forces as "the blow that lost the war for Philip".

Native campaign

Natives attacked and destroyed more settlements throughout the winter of 1675–1676 in their effort to annihilate the colonists. Attacks were made at Andover, Bridgewater, Chelmsford, Groton, Lancaster, Marlborough, Medfield, Medford, Portland, Providence, Rehoboth, Scituate, Seekonk, Simsbury, Sudbury, Suffield, Warwick, Weymouth, and Wrentham, including modern-day Norfolk and Plainville. The famous account written and published by Mary Rowlandson after the war gives a colonial captive's perspective on the conflict.

Southern theater, 1676

Lancaster raid

The Lancaster raid in February 1676 was a Native attack on the community of Lancaster, Massachusetts. Philip led a force of 1,500 Wampanoag, Nipmuc, and Narragansett Natives in a dawn attack on the isolated village, which then included all or part of the neighboring modern communities of Bolton and Clinton. They attacked five fortified houses. The house of the Rev. Joseph Rowlandson was set on fire, and most of its occupants were slaughtered—more than 30 people. Rowlandson's wife Mary was taken prisoner, and afterward wrote a best-selling captivity narrative of her experiences. Many of the community's other houses were destroyed before the Natives retreated northward.

Plymouth Plantation Campaign

- The spring of 1676 marked the high point for the combined tribes when they attacked Plymouth Plantation on March 12. The town withstood the assault, but the Natives had demonstrated their ability to penetrate deep into colonial territory. They attacked three more settlements; Longmeadow (near Springfield), Marlborough, and Simsbury were attacked two weeks later. They killed Captain Pierce and a company of Massachusetts soldiers between Pawtucket and the Blackstone's settlement. Several colonial men were tortured and buried at Nine Men's Misery in Cumberland as part of the Natives' ritual torture of enemies. They also burned the settlement of Providence to the ground on March 29. At the same time, a small band of Natives infiltrated and burned part of Springfield while the militia was away.

The settlements within the modern-day state of Rhode Island became a literal island colony for a time as the settlements at Providence and Warwick were sacked and burned, and the residents were driven to Newport and Portsmouth on Rhode Island. The Connecticut River towns had thousands of acres of cultivated crop land known as the bread basket of New England, but they had to limit their plantings and work in large armed groups for self-protection. Towns such as Springfield, Hatfield, Hadley, and Northampton, Massachusetts, fortified themselves, reinforced their militias, and held their ground, though attacked several times. The small towns of Northfield, Deerfield, and several others were

abandoned as the surviving settlers retreated to the larger towns. The towns of the Connecticut colony were largely unharmed in the war, although more than 100 Connecticut militia died in their support of the other colonies.

Attack on Sudbury

The Attack on Sudbury was fought in Sudbury, Massachusetts, on April 21, 1676. The town was surprised by Native raiders at dawn, who besieged a local garrison house and burned several unoccupied houses and farms. Reinforcements that arrived from nearby towns were drawn into ambushes by the Natives; Captain Samuel Wadsworth lost his life and half of a 70-man militia in such an ambush.

Battle of Turner's Falls

On May 18, 1676, Captain William Turner of the Massachusetts Militia and a group of about 150 militia volunteers (mostly minimally trained farmers) attacked a Native fishing camp at Peskeopscut on the Connecticut River, now called Turners Falls, Massachusetts. The colonists killed 100–200 Natives in retaliation for earlier Native attacks against Deerfield and other settlements and for the colonial losses in the Battle of Bloody Brook. Turner and nearly 40 of the militia were killed during the return from the falls.

The colonists defeated an attack at Hadley on June 12, 1676 with the help of their Mohegan allies, scattering most of the Native survivors into New Hampshire and farther north. Later that month, a force of 250 Natives was routed near Marlborough, Massachusetts. Combined forces of colonial

volunteers and their Native allies continued to attack, kill, capture, or disperse bands of Narragansetts, Nipmucs, and Wampanoags as they tried to plant crops or return to their traditional locations. The colonists granted amnesty to those who surrendered or who were captured and showed that they had not participated in the conflict. Captives who had participated in attacks on the many settlements were hanged, enslaved, or put to indentured servitude, depending upon the colony involved.

Second Battle of Nipsachuck

The Second Battle of Nipsachuck occurred on July 2, 1676 and included a rare use of a cavalry charge by the English colonists. In the summer of 1676, a band of over 100 Narragansetts led by female sachem Quaiapen returned to northern Rhode Island, apparently seeking to recover cached seed corn for planting. They were attacked by a force of 400, composed of 300 Connecticut colonial militia and about 100 Mohegan and Pequot warriors, and Quaiapen was killed along with the leaders as they sought refuge in Mattekonnit (Mattity) Swamp in what is now North Smithfield, while the remainder of the survivors were sold into slavery.

Battle of Mount Hope

Metacomet's allies began to desert him, and more than 400 had surrendered to the colonists by early July. Metacomet took refuge in the Assowamset Swamp below Providence, and the colonists formed raiding parties of militia and Native allies. Metacomet was killed by one of these teams when he was tracked down by Captain Benjamin Church and Captain Josiah

Standish of the Plymouth Colony militia at Mount Hope in Bristol, Rhode Island. He was shot and killed by a Native named John Alderman on August 12, 1676. Metacomet's corpse was beheaded, then drawn and quartered, a traditional treatment of criminals in this time period. His head was displayed in Plymouth for a generation.

Captain Church and his soldiers captured Pocasset war chief Anawan on August 28, 1676, at Anawan Rock in Rehoboth, Massachusetts. He was an old man at the time, and a chief captain of Metacomet. His capture marked the final event in King Philip's War, as he was also beheaded.

Northern Theater (Maine and Acadia)

Before the outbreak of war, English settlers in Maine and New Hampshire lived peaceably with their Wabanaki neighbors. Colonists engaged in fishing, harvesting timber, and trade with Natives. By 1657 English towns and trading posts stretched along the coast eastward to the Kennebec River. These communities were scattered and lacked fortifications. The defenseless posture of English settlements reflected the amicable relationship between Wabanakis and colonists to that time.

Upon hearing news of the Wampanoag attack on Swansea, colonists in York marched up the Kennebec River in June 1675 and demanded that Wabanakis turn over their guns and ammunition as a sign of goodwill. Apart from being an affront to their sovereignty, Natives depended on their guns to hunt. After handing over some of their weapons, many Wabanakis starved the following winter. English colonists exacerbated

tensions by shooting at Penobscots in Casco Bay and drowning the infant son of PequawketsagamoreSquando. Impelled by hunger and English violence, Wabanakis began raiding trading posts and attacking settlers.

Under the leadership of Androscoggin sagamoreMoggHegon and Penobscot sagamoreMadockawando, Wabanakis annihilated English presence east of the Saco River. Three major campaigns (one each year) were launched by the Natives in 1675, 1676, and 1677, most of which led to a massive colonial response. Richard Waldron and Charles Frost led the English colonial forces in the northern region. Waldron sent forces that attacked the Mi'kmaq in Acadia.

Throughout the campaigns, MoggHegon repeatedly attacked towns such as Black Point (Scarborough), Wells, and Damariscove, building a Native navy out of the approximately 40 sloops and a dozen 30-ton ships previously armed by militia. Maine's fishing industry was completely destroyed by the Wabanaki flotilla. Records from Salem record 20 ketches stolen and destroyed in one raid in Maine.

Colonial responses to Wabanaki attacks generally failed in both their objectives and accomplishments. Likely upon learning that Mohawks had agreed to enter the war on New England's side, Wabanakis sued for peace in 1677. The official fighting ended in the northern theater with the Treaty of Casco (1678). The treaty allowed English settlers to return to Maine and acknowledged Wabanaki triumph in the conflict by requiring each English family to pay Wabanakis a peck of corn each year as tribute.

By the end of the war, the Northern Campaigns saw approximately 400 settlers die, Maine's fishing economy eviscerated, and the Natives maintaining power in eastern and northern Maine. There is not an accurate account of the number of Natives who died, but it is thought to be between 100 and 300.

Role of Dedham

During the war, men from Dedham went off to fight and several died. More former Dedhamites who had moved on to other towns died than men who were still living in the community, however. They included Robert Hinsdale, his four sons, and Jonathan Plympton who died at the Battle of Bloody Brook. John Plympton was burned at the stake after being marched to Canada with Quentin Stockwell.

Zachariah Smith was passing through Dedham on April 12, 1671 when he stopped at the home of Caleb Church in the "sawmill settlement" on the banks of the Neponset River. The next morning he was found dead, having been shot. A group of praying Indians found him and suspicion fell on a group on non-Christian Nipmucs who were also heading south to Providence.

This was the "first actual outrage of King Phillip's War." One of the Nipmucs, a son of Matoonas, was found guilty and hanged on Boston Common. For the next six years his head would be impaled on a pike at the end of the gallows as a warning to other native peoples. Dedham then readied its cannon, which had been issued by the colony in 1650, in preparation for an attack that never came.

After the raid on Swansea, the colony ordered the militias of several towns, including Dedham, to have 100 soldiers ready to march out of town on an hour's notice. Captain Daniel Henchmen took command of the men and left Boston on June 26, 1675. They arrived in Dedham by nightfall and the troops became worried by an eclipse of the moon, which they took as a bad omen. Some claimed to see native scalplocks and bows in the moon. Dedham was largely spared from the fighting and was not attacked, but they did build a fortification and offered tax cuts to men who joined the cavalry.

Plymouth Colony governor Josiah Winslow and Captain Benjamin Church rode from Boston to Dedham to take charge of the 465 soldiers and 275 cavalry assembling there and together departed on December 8, 1675 for the Great Swamp Fight. When the commanders arrived, they also found "a vast assortment of teamsters, volunteers, servants, service personnel, and hangers-on." Dedham's John Bacon died in the battle.

During the battle in Lancaster in February 1676, Jonas Fairbanks and his son Joshua both died. Richard Wheeler, whose son Joseph was killed in battle the previous August, also died that day. When the town of Medfield was attacked, they fired a cannon as a warning to Dedham. Residents of nearby Wrentham abandoned their community and fled for the safety of Dedham and Boston.

Pomham, one of Phillip's chief advisors, was captured in Dedham on July 25, 1676. Several Christian Indians had seen his band in the woods, nearly starved to death. Captain Samuel Hunting led 36 men from Dedham and Medfield and

joined 90 Indians on a hunt to find them. A total of 15 of the enemy were killed and 35 were captured. Pomham, though he was so wounded he could not stand, grabbed hold of an English soldier and would have killed him had one of the settler's compatriots not come to his rescue.

John Plympton and Quentin Stockwell were captured in Deerfield in September 1677 and marched to Canada. Stockell was eventually ransomed and wrote an account of his ordeal, but Plympton was burned at the stake.

Aftermath

Southern New England

The war in southern New England largely ended with Metacomet's death. More than 1,000 colonists and 3,000 Natives had died. More than half of all New England towns were attacked by Native warriors, and many were completely destroyed. Several Natives were enslaved and transported to Bermuda, including Metacomet's son, and numerous Bermudians today claim ancestry from the Native exiles. Members of the sachem's extended family were placed among colonists in Rhode Island and eastern Connecticut. Other survivors joined western and northern tribes and refugee communities as captives or tribal members. Some of the Native refugees returned to southern New England. The Narragansetts, Wampanoags, Podunks, Nipmucks suffered substantial losses, several smaller bands were virtually eliminated as organized bands, and even the Mohegans were greatly weakened.

The Colony of Rhode Island was devastated by the war, as its principal city Providence was destroyed. Nevertheless, the Rhode Island legislature issued a formal rebuke to Connecticut Governor John Winthrop on October 26, scarcely six months after the burning of the city—although Winthrop had died. The "official letter" places blame squarely on the United Colonies of New England for causing the war by provoking the Narragansetts.

Sir Edmund Andros had been appointed governor of New York in 1674 by the Duke of York, who claimed that his authority extended as far north as Maine's northern boundary. He negotiated a treaty with some of the northern Native bands in Maine on April 12, 1678. Metacomet'sPennacook allies had made a separate peace with the colonists as the result of early battles that are sometimes identified as part of King Philip's War. The tribe nevertheless lost members and eventually its identity as the result of the war.

Plymouth Colony

Plymouth Colony lost close to eight percent of its adult male population and a smaller percentage of women and children to Native warfare or other causes associated with the war. Native losses were much greater, with about 2,000 men killed or who died of injuries in the war, more than 3,000 dying of sickness or starvation, and another 1,000 Natives sold into slavery and transported to other areas, first to British-controlled islands in the Caribbean such as Jamaica and Barbados, then, as captives from the war were banned for further sale, Natives were sold to non-British markets in Spain, Portugal, the Azores, and Madeira. About 2,000 Natives escaped to other

tribes to the north or west; they joined continued Native attacks from those bases well into the next century. Historians estimate that, as a result of King Philip's War, the Native population of southern New England was reduced by about 40 to 80 percent.

Northern New England

In northern New England, conflict continued for decades in Maine, New Hampshire, and northern Massachusetts. Wabanakis gradually entered the French orbit as English incursions on their territory continued. There were six wars over the next 74 years between New France and New England, along with their respective Native allies, starting with King William's War in 1689. (See the French and Native Wars, Father Rale's War, and Father Le Loutre's War.) The conflict in northern New England was largely over the border between New England and Acadia, which New France defined as the Kennebec River in southern Maine. Many colonists from northeastern Maine and Massachusetts temporarily relocated to larger towns in Massachusetts and New Hampshire to avoid Wabanaki raids.

Chapter 36

Bacon's Rebellion

Bacon's Rebellion was an armed rebellion held by Virginia settlers that took place from 1675 to 1676. It was led by Nathaniel Bacon against Colonial Governor William Berkeley. It was the first rebellion in the North American colonies in which discontented frontiersmen took part (a somewhat similar uprising in Maryland involving John Coode and Josias Fendall took place shortly afterward).

The alliance between European indentured servants and Africans (a mix of indentured, enslaved, and free Black People) disturbed the colonial upper class. They responded by hardening the racial caste of slavery in an attempt to divide the two races from subsequent united uprisings with the passage of the Virginia Slave Codes of 1705. While the farmers did not succeed in their initial goal of driving the Native Americans from Virginia, the rebellion resulted in Berkeley being recalled to England.

Prelude

Starting in the 1650s, colonists began squatting on Northern Neck frontier. Secocowon (then known as Chicacoan), Doeg, Patawomeck and Rappahannock natives began moving into the region as well and joined local tribes in defending their land and resources. In July 1666, the colonists declared war on them. By 1669, colonists had patented the land on the west of the Potomac as far north as My Lord's Island (now Theodore

Roosevelt Island in Washington, DC). By 1670, they had driven most of the Doeg out of the Virginia colony and into Maryland—apart from those living beside the Nanzatico/Portobago in Caroline County, Virginia.

Motives

Modern historians have suggested that the rebellion was a power play by Bacon against Berkeley and his favoritism towards certain members of the court. While Bacon was on the court, he was not within Berkeley's inner circle of council members and disagreed with him on many issues.

Bacon's followers used the rebellion as an effort to gain government recognition of the shared interests among all social classes of the colony in protecting the "commonality" and advancing its welfare. However, not every class' welfare was looked after in this rebellion. Both Native American women and European women played major roles in Bacon's Rebellion as less noted members of society.

However, the primary disagreement between Bacon and his followers and Berkeley was in how to handle the native Indian population.

Berkeley believed that it would useful to keep some of that population as subjects, stating "I would have preservd those Indians that I knew were hourely at our mercy to have beene our spies and intelligence to find out the more bloudyEnnimies," whereas Bacon found this approach too compassionate, stating: "Our Design... to ruin and extirpate all Indians in General."

Rebellion

Thousands of Virginians from all classes (including those in indentured servitude) and races rose up in arms against Berkeley, chasing him from Jamestown and ultimately torching the settlement. The rebellion was first suppressed by a few armed merchant ships from London whose captains sided with Berkeley and the loyalists. Government forces arrived soon after and spent several years defeating pockets of resistance and reforming the colonial government to be once more under direct crown control.

When Sir William Berkeley refused to retaliate against the Native Americans, farmers gathered at the report of a new raiding party. Nathaniel Bacon arrived with a quantity of brandy; after it was distributed, he was elected leader. Against Berkeley's orders, the group struck south until they came to the Occaneechi people. After convincing the Occaneechi warriors to leave and attack the Susquehannock, Bacon and his men murdered most of the Occaneechi men, women, and children remaining at the village. Upon their return, Bacon's faction discovered that Berkeley had called for new elections to the burgesses to better address the Native American raids.

The recomposed House of Burgesses enacted a number of sweeping reforms (known as Bacon's Laws). (Bacon was not serving his duty in the House; rather, he was at his plantation miles away.) It limited the powers of the governor and restored suffrage to landless freemen.

After passage of these laws, Nathaniel Bacon arrived with 500 followers in Jamestown to demand a commission to lead militia

against the Native Americans. The governor, however, refused to yield to the pressure. When Bacon had his men take aim at Berkeley, he responded by "baring his breast" to Bacon and told Bacon to shoot him. Seeing that the governor would not be moved, Bacon then had his men take aim at the assembled burgesses, who quickly granted Bacon his commission. Bacon had earlier been promised a commission before he retired to his estate if he maintained "good" behavior for two weeks. While Bacon was at Jamestown with his small army, eight colonists were killed on the frontier in Henrico County (from whence he marched) owing to a lack of manpower on the frontier.

On July 30, 1676, Bacon and his army issued the "Declaration of the People". The declaration criticized Berkeley's administration in detail. It leveled several accusations against Berkeley:

- that "upon specious pretense of public works [he] raised great unjust taxes upon the commonality";
- that he advanced favorites to high public offices;
- that he monopolized the beaver trade with the Native Americans;
- that he was pro-Native American.

After months of conflict, Bacon's forces, numbering 300–500 men, moved on Jamestown, which was occupied by Berkeley's forces, besieging the town. Bacon's men captured and burned to the ground the colonial capital on September 19. Outnumbered, Berkeley retreated across the river. His group encamped at Warner Hall, home of the speaker of the House of

Burgesses, Augustine Warner Jr., and caused considerable damage, although the house was left standing.

Before a Royal Navy squadron led by Thomas Larimore could arrive to aid Berkeley and his forces, Bacon died on October 26 from dysentery. John Ingram took over leadership of the rebellion, but many followers drifted away. The rebellion did not last long after that. Berkeley launched a series of successful amphibious attacks across the Chesapeake Bay and defeated the rebels. His forces defeated the small pockets of insurgents spread across Tidewater. Thomas Grantham, captain of the ship *Concord* cruising the York River, used cunning and force to disarm the rebels. He tricked his way into the garrison of the rebellion and promised to pardon everyone involved once they got back onto the ship. However, once they were safely in the hold, he turned the ship's guns on them and disarmed the rebellion. Through various other tactics, the other rebel garrisons were likewise overcome.

Impact

The 71-year-old governor Berkeley returned to the burned capital and a looted home at the end of January 1677. His wife described Green Spring in a letter to her cousin:

It looked like one of those the boys pull down at Shrovetide, and was almost as much to repair as if it had been new to build, and no sign that ever there had been a fence around it...

Bacon's wealthy landowning followers returned their loyalty to the Virginia government after Bacon's death. Governor Berkeley returned to power. He seized the property of several

rebels for the colony and executed 23 men by hanging, including the former governor of the Albemarle Sound colony, William Drummond, and the collector of customs, Giles Bland.

After an investigative committee returned its report to King Charles II, Berkeley was relieved of the governorship and recalled to England. "The fear of civil war among whites frightened Virginia's ruling elite, who took steps to consolidate power and improve their image: for example, restoration of property qualifications for voting, reducing taxes, and adoption of a more aggressive American Indian policy." "Because the tobacco trade generated a crown revenue of about £5–£10 per laboring man, King Charles II wanted no rebellion to distract the colonists from raising the crop." Charles II was reported to have commented, "That old fool has put to death more people in that naked country than I did here for the murder of my father." No record of the king's comments have been found; the origin of the story appears to have been colonial myth that arose at least 30 years after the events; the king prided himself on the clemency he had shown to his father's enemies. Berkeley left his wife, Frances Berkeley, in Virginia and returned to England; she sent a letter to let him know that the current governor was making a bet that the king would refuse to receive him. However, William Berkeley died in July 1677, shortly after he landed in England.

Indentured servants both black and white had joined the frontier rebellion. Seeing them united in a cause alarmed the ruling class. Historians believe the rebellion hastened the hardening of racial lines associated with slavery, as a way for planters and the colony to control some of the poor.

In order for the Virginia elite to maintain the loyalty of the common planters in order to avert future rebellions, they "needed to lead, rather than oppose, wars meant to dispossess and destroy frontier Indians." This bonded the elite to the common planter in wars against Indians, their common enemy. It also enabled the elites to appease free whites with land. "To give servants greater hope for the future, in 1705 the assembly revived the headright system by promising each freedman fifty acres of land, a promise that obliged the government to continue taking land from the Indians."

Historiography

Historians question whether the rebellion by Bacon against Berkeley in 1676 had any lasting significance for the more-successful revolution a century later. The most idolizing portrait of Bacon is found in *Torchbearer of the Revolution* (1940) by Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, which one scholar in 2011 called "one of the worst books on Virginia that a reputable scholarly historian ever published." The central area of debate is Bacon's controversial character and complex disposition, as illustrated by Wilcomb E. Washburn's *The Governor and the Rebel* (1957). Rather than singing Bacon's praises and chastising Berkeley's tyranny, Washburn found the roots of the rebellion in the colonists' intolerable demand to "authorize the slaughter and dispossession of the innocent as well as the guilty."

More nuanced approaches on Berkeley's supposed tyranny or mismanagement entertained specialist historians throughout the middle of the twentieth century, leading to a diversification of factors responsible for Virginia's contemporary instability.

Wesley Frank Craven in the 1968 publication *The Colonies in Transition* argues that Berkeley's greatest failings took place during the revolt, near the end of his life. Bernard Bailyn pushed the novel thesis that it was a question of access to resources, a failure to fully transplant Old World society to New.

Edmund S. Morgan's classic 1975 *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* connected the calamity of Bacon's Rebellion, namely the potential for lower-class revolt, with the colony's transition over to slavery: "But for those with eyes to see, there was an obvious lesson in the rebellion. Resentment of an alien race might be more powerful than resentment of an upper class. Virginians did not immediately grasp it. It would sink in as time went on."

James Rice's 2012 narrative *Tales from a Revolution: Bacon's Rebellion and the Transformation of Early America*, whose emphasis on Bacon's flaws echoes *The Governor and the Rebel*, integrates the rebellion into a larger story emphasizing the actions of multiple Native Americans, as well as placing it in the context of politics in Europe; in this telling, the climax of Bacon's Rebellion comes with the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688/89.

Legacy

According to the Historic Jamestowne National Park website, "For many years, historians considered the Virginia Rebellion of 1676 to be the first stirring of revolutionary sentiment in [North] America, which culminated in the American Revolution almost exactly one hundred years later. However, in the past

few decades, based on findings from a more distant viewpoint, historians have come to understand Bacon's Rebellion as a power struggle between two stubborn, selfish leaders rather than a glorious fight against tyranny."

Nonetheless, many in the early United States, including Thomas Jefferson, saw Bacon as a patriot and believed that Bacon's Rebellion truly was a prelude to the later American Revolution against the control of the Crown. This understanding of the conflict was reflected in 20th-century commemorations, including a memorial window in Colonial Williamsburg and a prominent tablet in the Virginia House of Delegates chamber of the State Capitol in Richmond, which recalls Bacon as "A great Patriot Leader of the Virginia People who died while defending their rights October 26, 1676." Subsequent to the rebellion, the Virginia colonial legislature enacted Virginia Slave Codes of 1705, which created several strict laws upon people of African background. Additionally, the codes were aimed socially segregate the white and black races.

Use of jimsonweed

Robert Beverley reported, in his 1705 book on the history of Virginia, that some soldiers who had been dispatched to Jamestown to quell Bacon's Rebellion gathered and ate leaves of *Daturastramonium* and spent eleven days acting in bizarre and foolish ways before recovering. This led to the plant being known as Jamestown weed, and later jimsonweed.

Chapter 37

Edmund Andros

Sir Edmund Andros (6 December 1637 – 24 February 1714) was an English colonial administrator in British America. He was the governor of the Dominion of New England during most of its three-year existence. At other times, Andros served as governor of the provinces of New York, East and West Jersey, Virginia, and Maryland.

Before his service in North America, he served as Bailiff of Guernsey. His tenure in New England was authoritarian and turbulent, as his views were decidedly pro-Anglican, a negative quality in a region home to many Puritans. His actions in New England resulted in his overthrow during the 1689 Boston revolt. He became governor of Virginia three years later.

Andros was considered to have been a more effective governor in New York and Virginia, although he became the enemy of prominent figures in both colonies, many of whom worked to remove him from office. Despite these enmities, he managed to negotiate several treaties of the Covenant Chain with the Iroquois, establishing a long-lived peace involving the colonies and other tribes that interacted with that confederacy. His actions and governance generally followed the instructions he was given upon appointment to office, and he received approbation from the monarchs and governments that appointed him.

Andros was recalled to England from Virginia in 1698, and resumed the title of Bailiff of Guernsey. Although he no longer

resided entirely on Guernsey, he was appointed lieutenant governor of the island, and served in this position for four years. Andros died in 1714.

Early life

Andros was born in London on 6 December 1637. Amice Andros, his father, was Bailiff of Guernsey and a staunch supporter of Charles I. His mother was Elizabeth Stone, whose sister was a courtier to the king's sister, Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia. Although it has been claimed that Andros was present at the surrender in 1651 of Guernsey's Castle Cornet, the last royalist stronghold to surrender in the English Civil War, there is no firm evidence to support this. It is possible that he fled Guernsey with his mother in 1645. In 1656, he was apprenticed to his uncle, Sir Robert Stone, captain of a cavalry company. Andros then served in two winter campaigns in Denmark, including the relief of Copenhagen in 1659. As a result of these experiences he gained fluency in French, Swedish, and Dutch.

He remained a firm supporter of the Stuarts while they were in exile. Charles II, after his restoration to the throne, specifically commended the Andros family for its support.

Andros served as a courtier to Elizabeth of Bohemia from 1660 until her death in 1662. During the 1660s he served in the English army against the Dutch. He was next commissioned a major in the regiment of Sir Tobias Bridge, which was sent to Barbados in 1666. He returned to England two years later, carrying despatches and letters.

In 1671, he married Mary Craven, the daughter of Thomas Craven of Burnsall in the West Riding of Yorkshire (now North Yorkshire), the son of a cousin to the Earl of Craven, one of the queen's closest advisors, and a friend who served as his patron for many years. In 1672 he was commissioned major.

Governor of New York

After his father died in 1674, Andros acquired Sausmarez Manor and was named to succeed him as Bailiff of Guernsey. He was also appointed by the Duke of York to be the first proprietary governor of the Province of New York. The province's territory included the former territories of New Netherland, ceded to England by the Treaty of Westminster, including all of present-day New Jersey, the Dutch holdings on the Hudson River from New Amsterdam (renamed New York City) to Albany, as well as Long Island, Martha's Vineyard, and Nantucket.

In 1664 Charles II had granted James all of this territory, as well as all of the land in present-day Maine between the Kennebec and St. Croix Rivers, but with the intervening Dutch retaking of the territory, Charles issued a new patent to James.

Andros arrived in New York harbor in late October, and negotiated the handover of the Dutch territories with local representatives and Dutch Governor Anthony Colve, which took place on 10 November 1674. Andros agreed to confirm the existing property holdings and to allow the Dutch inhabitants of the territory to maintain their Protestant religion.

Connecticut boundary dispute

Andros was also involved in boundary disputes with the neighboring Connecticut Colony. Dutch claims had originally extended as far east as the Connecticut River, but these claims had been ceded in the 1650 Treaty of Hartford, and reduced to a boundary line 20 miles (32 km) east of the Hudson in 1664. York's territorial claim did not acknowledge these, and Andros announced to Connecticut authorities his intentions to reclaim that territory (which included Connecticut capital, Hartford) in early 1675. Connecticut leaders pointed out the later revisions to Connecticut's boundaries, but Andros pressed his claim, arguing that those revisions had been superseded by York's grant.

Andros used the outbreak of King Philip's War in July 1675 as an excuse to go by ship to Connecticut with a small military force to establish the duke's claim. When he arrived at Saybrook at the mouth of the river on 8 July he found the fort there occupied by Connecticut militia, who were flying the English flag. Andros came ashore, had a brief conversation with the fort commander, read his commission, and returned to New York City. This was the full extent of Andros' attempt to claim the territory, but it would be remembered in Connecticut when later attempts were made to assert New York authority.

King Philip's War

Following his Connecticut expedition, Andros traveled into Iroquois country to establish relations there. He was well received, and agreed to continue the Dutch practice of supplying firearms to the Iroquois. This action successfully

blunted French diplomatic successes with the Iroquois. It also led to charges in New England that Andros provided arms to Indians allied to King Philip (as the Wampanoag leader Metacom was known to the English); in fact, Andros provided gunpowder to Rhode Island that was used in the Great Swamp Fight against the Narragansetts in December 1675, and specifically outlawed the sale of munitions to tribes known to be allied to Philip. The charges poisoned the atmosphere between Andros and Massachusetts leaders, even though Andros' conduct met with approval in London.

In the meeting with the Iroquois Andros was given the name "Corlaer", a name historically used by the Iroquois to refer to the Dutch governor in New Netherland and continued when the English took over the colony and renamed it New York (in the same way the French governor was dubbed "Onontio"). One other consequence was the establishment at Albany of a colonial department for Indian affairs, with Robert Livingston as its first head.

Philip was known to be in the Berkshires in western Massachusetts that winter, and New Englanders accused Andros of sheltering him. Historian John Fiske suggests that Philip's purpose was not to draw the Iroquois into the conflict, but instead to draw the Mahicans into the conflict with a view toward attacking Albany. An offer by Andros to send New York troops into Massachusetts to attack Philip was rebuffed, based on the idea that it was covert ploy to again assert authority to the Connecticut River. Instead, Mohawks from the Albany area did battle with Philip, driving him eastward. When Connecticut authorities later appealed to Andros for assistance, Andros

replied that it was "strange" that they would do so, considering their previous behavior, and refused to help.

In July 1676 Andros established a haven for the Mahicans and other Indian war refugees at Schaghticoke. Although the conflict came to an end in southern New England in 1676, there continued to be friction between the Abenakis of northern New England and New England settlers. These prompted Andros to send a force to the duke's territory in Maine, where they established a fort at Pemaquid (present-day Bristol). Andros annoyed Massachusetts fishermen by restricting their use of the duke's land for drying fish.

In November 1677 Andros departed for England, where he would spend the next year. During this visit he was knighted as a reward for his performance as governor, and he sat in on meetings of the Lords of Trade in which agents for Massachusetts Bay defended its charter, and gave detailed accounts of the state of his colony.

Southern border disputes

The southernmost territories of the duke, roughly encompassing northern Delaware, were desired by Charles Calvert, Baron Baltimore, who sought to extend the reach of his proprietary Province of Maryland into the area. At the same time Calvert was seeking an end to a frontier war with the Iroquois to the north, having persuaded the intervening Susquehannocks to move to the Potomac River, well within Maryland territory. Furthermore, the Lenape, who dominated Delaware Bay, were unhappy with seizures of their lands by

Virginia and Maryland settlers, and war between these groups had been imminent in 1673 when the Dutch retook New York.

When Andros came to New York, he moved to stabilize the situation. He befriended the Lenape sachems (chiefs), convincing them to act as mediators between the English and other tribes. Peace appeared to be imminent when Bacon's Rebellion broke out in Virginia, resulting in an attack on the Susquehannock fort on the Potomac. The surviving Susquehannocks sneaked out of the fort one night, some of them making their way east toward Delaware Bay. In June 1676 Andros offered, in exchange for their moving into his jurisdiction, to protect them from their enemies among the Virginian and Maryland settlers. He also extended an offer given by the Mohawk for the Susquehannocks to settle among them. These offers were well received, but Maryland authorities were unable to convince their Indian allies to make the peace offered by Andros, and organized them to march toward the Delaware, which would also fulfil the goal of strengthening the Maryland claim to the area.

Andros responded by urging the Susquehannocks to retreat into New York, where they would be beyond Maryland's reach, and delivering a strongly worded threat to Maryland, that it would either have to acknowledge his sovereignty over the Susquehannocks, or they would have to peaceably take them back. He also offered his services as a mediator, pointing out that the absence of the Susquehannocks now left Maryland settlements open to direct attack by the Iroquois.

In a council held at the Lenape village of Shackamaxon (site of present-day Philadelphia) in February and March 1677, all of

the major parties met, but no final agreements were reached, and Andros ordered the Susquehannocks remaining with the Lenape to disperse to other parts of New York in April. Maryland sent Henry Coursey to New York to engage Andros and eventually the Iroquois in peace talks, while at the same time they sent surveyors to lay out plots on land also claimed by New York on Delaware Bay. Coursey was instructed to offer Andros what was in essence a £100 bribe that an Indian peace might be reached in exchange for that land. Andros refused the bribe, and Coursey ended up being compelled to negotiate further through Andros and the Mohawk in Albany. The peace agreed in negotiations that followed in Albany in the summer of 1677 is considered one of the foundations of the set of alliances and treaties called the Covenant Chain.

Although Andros was unable to prevent Baltimore from granting some land on the Delaware, he did successfully blunt the Maryland leader's attempt to control an even greater portion of land. The duke eventually deeded those lands to William Penn, and they became part of the state of Delaware.

Control of the Jerseys

Governance of the Jerseys also created problems for Andros. James had awarded the territory west of the Hudson River to proprietors John Berkeley and George Carteret, and Berkeley had then deeded the western portion (which became known as West Jersey) to a partnership of Quakers. Berkeley had not transferred his proprietary rights to this group, and the exact nature of the rights James had given both Berkeley and Carteret was disputed, in part because James believed that the

second patent granted to him in 1674 overrode the earlier grants he had made to Berkeley and Carteret.

This resulted in conflict when Andros attempted to extend his government over East Jersey, the territory governed on behalf of Carteret by the latter's cousin Philip. Possibly based on orders given to him during his visit to England, Andros began to assert New York authority over East Jersey after George Carteret's death in 1680.

Despite a friendly personal relationship between Andros and Governor Carteret, the issue of governance eventually prompted Andros to have Carteret arrested. In a dispute centering on the collection of customs duties in ports on the Jersey side of the Hudson, Andros in 1680 sent a company of soldiers to Philip Carteret's home in Elizabethtown. According to Carteret's account of the incident, he was beaten by the troops, who jailed him in New York.

In a trial over which Andros presided, Carteret was acquitted by a jury on all charges. Carteret returned to New Jersey, but injuries he sustained in the arrest affected his health, and he died in 1682. In the aftermath of the incident the Duke of York surrendered his claims to East Jersey to the Carterets. Andros acquired in 1683, from the widow of Carteret, for £200, the Patent to the Lordship of Alderney.

A less contentious standoff also occurred when settlers sent by William Penn sought to establish what is now Burlington, New Jersey. Andros insisted they had no right to settle there without the duke's permission, but agreed to allow their settlement after they agreed to receive commissions falling under the authority of the New York gubernatorial

administration. This situation was permanently resolved in 1680 when York renounced in favor of Penn his remaining claims to West Jersey.

Recall and analysis

The political opponents of Andros in the colony brought a number of charges against him to the Duke of York. Among them were accusations of favoritism toward Dutch businessmen, and engaging in business for private gain rather than that of the duke. Statements were also made to the duke that claimed that his revenues were lower than they should have been; this, in addition to the other complaints, led the duke to order Andros back to England to explain the situation. Andros left the province in January 1681, charging Anthony Brockholls with the administration of the New York government. Expecting a short visit to England, his wife remained in New York.

During his time in New York he was thought to have demonstrated good administrative abilities, but his manner was considered imperious by his opponents among the colonists, and he made numerous enemies during his tenure as governor.

Dominion of New England

In 1686 he was appointed governor of the Dominion of New England. He arrived in Boston on 20 December 1686, and immediately assumed the reins of power. His commission called for governance by himself, with a council. The initial composition of the council included representatives from each

of the colonies the dominion absorbed, but because of the inconvenience of travel and the fact that travel costs were not reimbursed, the council's quorums were dominated by representatives from Massachusetts and Plymouth. The Lords of Trade had insisted that he govern without an assembly, something he expressed concern over while his commission was being drafted.

In a brief work, *Sir Edmund Andros*, historian Henry Ferguson attested to the fact that the deliberation of certain policies by an assembly of legislators may have proven inefficient.

The Dominion initially consisted of the territories of the Massachusetts Bay Colony (including present-day Maine), Plymouth Colony, Rhode Island, Connecticut and New Hampshire, and was extended to include New York, and East and West Jersey in 1688. Andros' wife, who had joined him in Boston, died there in 1688 not long after her arrival.

Church of England

Shortly after his arrival, Andros asked each of the Puritan churches in Boston if its meetinghouse could be used for services of the Church of England. When he was rebuffed, he demanded and was given keys to Samuel Willard's Third Church in 1687. Services were held there under the auspices of Rev. Robert Ratcliff until 1688, when King's Chapel was built.

These actions highlighted him as pro-Anglican in the eyes of local Puritans, who would later accuse him of involvement in a "horrid Popish plot."

Revenue laws

His council engaged in a lengthy process to harmonize dominion and English laws. This work consumed such a great amount of time that Andros in March 1687 issued a proclamation stating that pre-existing laws would remain in effect until they were revised. Since Massachusetts had no pre-existing tax laws, a scheme of taxation was created that would apply to the entire dominion. Developed by a committee of landowners, the first proposal derived its revenues from import duties, principally alcohol. After much debate, a different proposal was abruptly proposed and adopted, essentially reviving previous Massachusetts tax laws. These laws had been unpopular with farmers who felt the taxes on livestock were too high. To bring in immediate revenue, Andros also received approval to increase the import duties on alcohol.

The first attempts to enforce the revenue laws were met with stiff resistance from a number of Massachusetts communities. Several towns refused to choose commissioners to assess the town population and estates, and officials from a number of them were consequently arrested and brought to Boston. Some were fined and released, while others were imprisoned until they promised to perform their duties. The leaders of Ipswich, who had been most vocal in their opposition to the law, were tried and convicted of misdemeanor offenses.

The other provinces did not resist the imposition of the new law, even though, at least in Rhode Island, the rates were higher than they had been under the previous colonial administration. Plymouth's relatively poor landowners were hard hit because of the high rates on livestock, and funds

derived from whaling, once sources of profit for the individual towns, were now directed to the dominion government.

Town meeting laws

One consequence of the tax protest was that Andros sought to restrict town meetings, since these were where that protest had begun. He therefore introduced a law that limited meetings to a single annual meeting, solely for the purpose of electing officials, and explicitly banning meetings at other times for any reason.

This loss of local power was widely hated. Many protests were made that the town meeting and tax laws were violations of the Magna Carta, which guaranteed taxation by representatives of the people. It was noted that those who made these complaints had, during the colonial charter, excluded large numbers of voters through the requirement of church membership, and then taxed them.

Land title reform

Andros had been instructed to bring colonial land title practices more in line with those in England, and introduce quit-rents as a means of raising colonial revenues. Titles previously issued in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine under the colonial administration often suffered from defects of form (for example, lacking an imprint of the colonial seal), and most of them did not include a quit-rent payment. Land grants in colonial Connecticut and Rhode Island had been made before either colony had a charter, and there were conflicting claims in a number of areas.

The manner in which Andros approached the issue was necessarily divisive, since it threatened any landowner whose title was in any way dubious. Some landowners went through the confirmation process, but many refused, since they did not want to face the possibility of losing their land, and they viewed the process as a thinly veiled land grab. The Puritans of Plymouth and Massachusetts, some of whom had extensive landholdings, were among the latter. Since all of the existing land titles in Massachusetts had been granted under the now-vacated colonial charter, Andros essentially declared them to be void, and required landowners to recertify their ownership, paying fees to the dominion and becoming subject to the charging of a quit-rent.

Andros attempted to compel the certification of ownership by issuing writs of intrusion, but large landowners who owned many parcels contested these individually, rather than recertifying all of their lands.

Connecticut charter

Since Andros' commission included Connecticut, he asked Connecticut Governor Robert Treat to surrender the colonial charter not long after his arrival in Boston. Unlike Rhode Island, whose officials readily acceded to the dominion, Connecticut officials formally acknowledged Andros' authority, but did little to assist him.

They continued to run their government according to the charter, holding quarterly meetings of the legislature and electing colony-wide officials, while Treat and Andros negotiated over the surrender of the charter.

In October 1687 Andros finally decided to travel to Connecticut to personally see to the matter. Accompanied by an honour guard, he arrived in Hartford on 31 October, and met that evening with the colonial leadership. According to legend, during this meeting the charter was laid out on the table for all to see. The lights in the room unexpectedly went out, and when relit, the charter had disappeared. The charter was said to have been hidden in a nearby oak tree (referred to afterward as the Charter Oak) so that a search of nearby buildings would not locate the document.

Whatever the truth of the account, Connecticut records show that its government formally surrendered its seals and ceased operation that day. Andros then traveled throughout the colony, making judicial and other appointments, before returning to Boston. On 29 December 1687, the dominion council formally extended its laws over Connecticut, completing the assimilation of the New England colonies.

Inclusion of New York and the Jerseys

On 7 May 1688, the provinces of New York, East Jersey, and West Jersey were added to the Dominion. Because they were remote from Boston, where Andros had his seat, New York and the Jerseys were run by Lieutenant Governor Francis Nicholson from New York City. Nicholson, an army captain and protégé of colonial secretary William Blathwayt, came to Boston in early 1687 as part of Andros' honor guard, and had been promoted to his council.

During the summer of 1688, Andros traveled first to New York, and then to the Jerseys, to establish his commission.

Dominion governance of the Jerseys was complicated by the fact that the proprietors, whose charters had been revoked, had retained their property, and petitioned Andros for what were traditional manorial rights. The dominion period in the Jerseys was relatively uneventful, due to their distance from the power centers, and the unexpected end of the dominion in 1689.

Indian diplomacy

In 1687 the governor of New France, the Marquis de Denonville, launched an attack against Seneca villages in what is now western New York. His objective was to disrupt trade between the English at Albany and the Iroquois confederation, to which the Seneca belonged, and to break the Covenant Chain, a peace Andros had negotiated in 1677 while he was governor of New York. New York Governor Thomas Dongan appealed for help, and King James ordered Andros to render assistance. James also entered into negotiations with Louis XIV of France, which resulted in an easing of tensions on the northwestern frontier. On New England's northeastern frontier, however, the Abenaki harbored grievances against New England settlers, and began an offensive in early 1688. Andros made an expedition into Maine early in the year, in which he raided a number of Indian settlements. He also raided the trading outpost and home of Jean-Vincent d'Abbadie de Saint-Castin on Penobscot Bay. His careful preservation of the Catholic Castin's chapel would be a source of later accusations of "popery" against Andros.

When Andros took over the administration of New York in August 1688, he met with the Iroquois at Albany to renew to

covenant. In this meeting he annoyed the Iroquois by referring to them as "children" (implying subservience to the English), rather than "brethren" (implying equality). He returned to Boston amid further attacks on the New England frontier by Abenaki parties, who admitted that they were doing so in part because of French encouragement.

During Andros's presence in New York, the situation in Maine had deteriorated again, as well, with groups of colonists raiding Indian villages and taking prisoners. These actions were taken in accordance with a directive issued by dominion councillors remaining in Boston, who ordered that frontier militia commanders were to take into custody any Abenaki suspected of participating in the raids.

This directive sparked a problem in Maine, when twenty Abenaki, including women and children, were taken into custody by colonial militia. The local authorities were faced with the dilemma of housing the captives, shipping them first to Falmouth and then to Boston, angering other natives in the area, who seized English hostages to ensure the safe return of the captives.

Andros castigated the Mainers for their unwarranted acts and ordered the Indians released and returned to Maine. A brief skirmish during the process of exchanging captives resulted in the deaths of four English hostages, and sparked discontent in Maine. Faced with this discord, Andros returned to Maine with a significant force, and began the construction of additional fortifications to protect the settlers. Andros spent the winter in Maine, and returned to Boston in March upon hearing rumors of revolution in England and discontent in Boston.

Revolt

- On 18 April 1689, soon after news reached Boston of the overthrow of James II of England, the colonists of Boston rose up against his rule. A well-organized "mob" descended on the city, arresting dominion officials and Anglicans. Andros had his quarters in Fort Mary, a garrison house on the south side of the city, where a number of officials took refuge. The old Massachusetts colonial leadership, restored due to the rebellion and headed by ex-governor Simon Bradstreet, then summoned Governor Andros to surrender, for his own safety because of the mob which they claimed "whereof we were wholly ignorant". He refused, and instead tried to escape to the *Rose*, the sole element of the Royal Navy present near Boston at the time of the revolt. However, the boat sent from the *Rose* was intercepted by militia, and Andros was forced back into Fort Mary. Negotiations ensued, and Andros agreed to leave the fort to meet with the rebel council. Promised safe conduct, he was marched under guard to the townhouse where the council had assembled. There he was told that "they must & would have the Government in their own hands", and that he was under arrest. Daniel Fisher grabbed him by the collar and took him to the home of dominion official John Usher and held under close watch.

After Fort Mary fell into rebel hands on the 19th, Andros was moved there from Usher's house. He was confined there with Joseph Dudley and other dominion officials until 7 June, when

he was transferred to Castle Island. It is during this period of captivity that he is said to have attempted an escape dressed in women's clothing. The story, although it circulated widely, was disputed by the Anglican minister Robert Ratcliff, who claimed that story and others had "not the least foundation of Truth", and that they were "falsehoods, and lies" propagated to "render the Governour odious to his people." He did make a successful escape from Castle Island on 2 August, after his servant plied the sentries with drink. He managed to flee to Rhode Island, but was quickly recaptured and thereafter kept in virtual solitary confinement. He and others were held for 10 months before being sent to England for trial.

The Massachusetts agents in London refused to sign the charges made against him, so the court summarily dismissed them, and freed him. When Andros was questioned about the various accusations that had been levelled against him, he pointed out that all of his actions had been taken to bring colonial laws into conformance with English law, or they were specifically taken in pursuit of his commission and instructions.

While Andros was in captivity, the New York government of Lieutenant Governor Francis Nicholson was simultaneously deposed by a military faction led by Jacob Leisler, in an event that came to be known as Leisler's Rebellion. Leisler would govern New York until 1691, when he was captured and executed by a force led by newly appointed provincial governor Henry Sloughter. Andros was eventually allowed to depart for England; by that point, the Dominion of New England had effectively ceased to exist, with the colonies in the dominion having reverted to their previous forms of governance.

Massachusetts and its surrounding territories were reorganized into the Province of Massachusetts Bay in 1691.

Governor of Virginia

Andros was well received at court upon his return to England. The king in particular recalled that Andros had visited his court in the Netherlands, and expressed approval of Andros' service. In search of employment, Andros offered his services as a spy, offering the idea of going to Paris, ostensibly to meet with the exiled James, but to actually attempt to acquire French military plans. This plan was rejected. While in England he married for the second time, to Elizabeth Crisp Clapham, in July 1691. She was the widow of Christopher Clapham, who was connected by that marriage to his first wife's family.

Andros' next opportunity for employment came with the resignation in February 1692 of Lord Effingham as governor of the Province of Virginia. Although Francis Nicholson, formerly dominion lieutenant governor, was then serving as lieutenant governor or Virginia and sought the superior position, William awarded the governorship to Andros, and awarded Nicholson yet another lieutenant governorship, this time that of Maryland. This was destined to make Andros' tenure more difficult, because his relationship with Nicholson had deteriorated for other reasons. The exact reasons for this enmity are unclear: one contemporary wrote that Nicholson "especially [resented] Sir Edmund Andros, against whom he has a particular pique on account of some earlier dealings".

Andros arrived in Virginia on 13 September 1692, and began his duties a week later. Nicholson graciously received him, and not long after sailed for England. Andros settled at Middle Plantation (the future site of Williamsburg), where he would live until 1695. He worked to organize the provincial records, the maintenance of which had suffered since Bacon's Rebellion, and promoted the enforcement of laws designed to prevent slave rebellions.

He encouraged the diversification of Virginia's economy, which was then almost entirely dependent on tobacco. The export-oriented economy was also being badly hurt by the ongoing Nine Years' War, because of which merchant ships were required to travel in convoys. For several years Virginia did not receive any military escorts, so their products were not going to market in Europe. Andros encouraged the introduction of new crops like cotton and flax, and the manufacture of fabric.

Virginia was the first colonial posting in which Andros had to work with a local assembly. His relationship with the House of Burgesses was generally cordial, but he encountered some resistance, especially to measures related to the war and colonial defenses. He hired armed vessels to patrol the colony's waters and contributed financially to New York's colonial defenses, which formed a bulwark against the possibility of French and Indian incursions into Virginia. In 1696 Andros was ordered by the king to send troops to New York, for which the burgesses reluctantly appropriated £1,000. Andros' management of colonial defense and Indian relations were successful: Virginia, unlike New York and New England, was not attacked during the war.

During his tenure, Andros made an enemy of James Blair, a prominent Anglican minister. Blair was working to establish a new college for educating Anglican ministers, and he believed that Andros was not supportive of the idea. However, Blair and Nicholson worked closely together on this idea, with Nicholson often coming from Maryland for meetings on the subject. The two men were united in their dislike of Andros, and their activities helped to cause Andros' resignation. The College of William and Mary was founded in 1693. Despite Blair's claims that Andros was unsupportive, Andros donated the cost of the bricks to construct the college's chapel from his own funds, and convinced the House of Burgesses to approve funding of £100 per year for the college.

Blair's complaints, many of them vague and inaccurate, made their way to London, where proceedings into Andros' conduct began at the Board of Trade and the ecclesiastical courts of the Church of England in 1697. Andros had lost most of his support on the Board of Trade when a Whig faction came to power, and his advocates were unable to sway the board in favor of him. Anglican bishops staunchly supported Blair and Nicholson. In March 1698 Andros, complaining of fatigue and illness, asked to be recalled.

Later years

Andros' recall was announced in London in May 1698; he was replaced by Nicholson. He returned to England, and resumed his post as bailiff of Guernsey. He divided his time between Guernsey and London, where he had a house in Denmark Hill. His second wife died in 1703, and he married for the third time in 1707, to Elizabeth Fitzherbert. In 1704 Queen Anne named

him Lieutenant Governor of Guernsey, a post he held until 1708. He died in London on 24 February 1714 and was buried at St Anne's Church, Soho. His wife died in 1717 and was buried nearby. The church was destroyed during the Second World War, and there is no longer any trace of their graves. He had no issue by any of his wives.

Legacy

The historian Michael Kammen states that Andros failed in all of his roles in the colonies

> - in part because he was neither ruthless enough to cow his provincial subjects into submission nor ingratiating enough to win himself a broad base of local support. In part because he came to New England at a critical moment without prior experience in the peculiar religious and political development of that area. And in part, finally, because he was continually caught in a cross fire between imperious assumptions of the Crown and unfamiliar imperatives of colonial life.

Andros remains a notorious figure in New England, especially in Connecticut, which officially excludes him from its list of colonial governors, but his portrait hangs in the Hall of Governors in the State Museum across from the State Capitol in Hartford. Although he was disliked in the colonies, he was recognized in England as an effective administrator by implementing the policies that he had been ordered to carry out and advancing the crown's agenda. The biographer Mary Lou Lustig notes that he was "an accomplished statesman, a

brave soldier, a polished courtier, and a devoted servant," but his style was often "autocratic, arbitrary, and dictatorial", he lacked tact, and he had difficulty reaching compromises.

Similarly, Andros was featured as an antagonist in the 1879 novel *Captain Nelson*, described as a "romance of colonial days."

Andros appears in several episodes of *The Witch of Blackbird Pond* in which his conflict with the Connecticut colonists forms the background to the protagonist's more personal problems. It is believed that Andros Island in the Bahamas was named for him. Early proprietors of the Bahamas included members of his first wife's family, the Cravens.

Chapter 38

Westo

The **Westo** were a Native American tribe encountered in the Southeastern U.S. by Europeans in the 17th century. They probably spoke an Iroquoian language. The Spanish called these people **Chichimeco** (not to be confused with Chichimeca in Mexico), and Virginia colonists may have called the same people **Richahecrian**. Their first appearance in the historical record is as a powerful tribe in colonial Virginia who had migrated from the mountains into the region around present-day Richmond. Their population provided a force of 700–900 warriors.

Early academic analysis of the origin of the Westo posited that the so-called *Rechahecrian/Rickohakan* of Virginia were perhaps Cherokee or Yuchi, and that the Westo were a band of Yuchi.

Anthropologist Marvin T. Smith (1987:131–32) was the first to suggest that the Westo were a group of Erie, who had lived south of Lake Erie until forced to migrate further south to Virginia during the 17th-century Beaver Wars. The powerful nations of the Iroquois League extended their control into a wider area to gain hunting grounds. Smith theorizes that as the colonial settlements expanded in Virginia, the Westo migrated south to the Savannah River, shortly before the founding of South Carolina in 1670. Subsequent work by John Worth (1995:17) and Eric Bowne (2006) strongly supports Smith's hypothesis.

History

Virginia established a trading relationship with the Westo, exchanging firearms for Indian slaves. When the Westo migrated to the Savannah River, they quickly became known for their military power and their slave raids on other tribes. Before their destruction, the Westo wreaked havoc on the Spanish missionary provinces of Guale and Mocama. On July 20, 1661, a Westo war party canoed down the Altamaha River and destroyed the Spanish mission of Santo Domingo de Talaje near present-day Darien, Georgia. Florida governor Alonso de Aránguiz y Cortés sent troops to what is now St. Simons, Georgia to guard against further raids.

That the Westo had ties with Virginia colonists did not mean they would be friendly toward the South Carolinians. In 1673 the Westo attacked both coastal Indians, such as the Cusabo, and settlements of the Carolina colony. The colony depended on the Esaw (Catawba) tribe for defense until December 1674. Some Westo visited Dr. Henry Woodward and made peace. The peace became an alliance after the Westo escorted Woodward to their towns on the Savannah River, where they gave him many presents and encouraged friendship.

From 1675 to 1680, trade between the Westo and South Carolina thrived. The Westo provided Carolina with slaves, captured from various Native American groups, including the Spanish-allied tribes in Guale and Mocama. The captives were "Settlement Indians", bands supposedly under the protection of Carolina. The Westo likely captured slaves from the upcountry Cherokee, Chickasaw to the south, and the various smaller tribes who would later align as the Creek Confederacy.

Since the Westo were traditionally enemies with nearly every other tribe in the region, their alliance with Carolina effectively blocked the colony from establishing other tribal relationships. A group of Shawnee Indians migrated to the Savannah River region and met with the Westo while Henry Woodward was among them. These Shawnee became known as the "Savannah Indians". Woodward apparently witnessed the first meeting of the Shawnee and Westo. Using sign language, the Shawnee (Savannah) warned the Westo of an impending attack from other tribes. They earned the goodwill of the Westo, who began to prepare for the attack.

The Savannah later approached Woodward and established an independent relationship with the colonists, which would doom the Westo. The Carolinians realized the value of trading beyond the Westo. When war broke out between Carolina and the Westo in 1679, the Savannah/Shawnee assisted the Carolinians. After they destroyed the Westo in 1680, the Savannah moved into their lands and took over their role as the chief Indian trading partner with the Carolina colony. The fate of most of the surviving Westo was probably enslavement after being shipped to work on sugarcane plantations in the West Indies.

Some surviving Westo may have continued to live near the colony of South Carolina. A map published anonymously in 1715 shows Indian villages during the period from about 1691 to 1715, when the early Muscogee/Creek towns had relocated from the Chattahoochee River to the Ocmulgee River and Oconee River. The map shows a town labeled "Westas" (all the towns' labels are pluralized) on the Ocmulgee River above the confluence of the Towaliga River. It is one of a cluster of towns

near the important "Lower Creek" town of Coweta. The 1715 map reflects town locations in the period when the Lower Creek moved their towns back to the Chattahoochee River. The town appears on the Mitchell map of 1755 just below the town of Euchees. As with several other groups of Indian refugees who found haven with the Lower Creek, the surviving Westo appeared to have been absorbed into the emerging Creek confederacy.

Chapter 39

William Penn

William Penn (14 October 1644 – 30 July 1718) was an English writer and religious thinker belonging to the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), and founder of the Province of Pennsylvania, a North American colony of England. He was an early advocate of democracy and religious freedom, notable for his good relations and successful treaties with the Lenape Native Americans. Under his direction, the city of Philadelphia was planned and developed. Philadelphia was planned out to be grid-like with its streets and be very easy to navigate, unlike London where Penn was from. The streets are named with numbers and tree names. He chose to use the names of trees for the cross streets because Pennsylvania means "Penn's Woods".

In 1681, King Charles II handed over a large piece of his North American land holdings along the North Atlantic Ocean coast to Penn to pay the debts the king had owed to Penn's father, the admiral and politician Sir William Penn. This land included the present-day states of Pennsylvania and Delaware. Penn immediately set sail and took his first step on American soil, sailing up the Delaware Bay and Delaware River, (past earlier Swedish and Dutch riverfront colonies) in New Castle (now in Delaware) in 1682. On this occasion, the colonists pledged allegiance to Penn as their new proprietor, and the first Pennsylvania General Assembly was held. Afterward, Penn journeyed further north up the Delaware River and founded Philadelphia, on the west bank. However, Penn's Quaker

government was not viewed favorably by the previous Dutch, Swedish colonists, and also earlier English settlers in what is now Delaware, but claimed for half a century by the neighboring Province of Maryland's proprietor family, the Calverts and Lord Baltimore.

These earlier colonists had no historical allegiance to a "Pennsylvania", so they almost immediately began petitioning for their own representative assembly. Twenty-three years later in 1704, they achieved their goal when the three southernmost counties of provincial Pennsylvania along the western coast of the Delaware, were permitted to split off and become the new semi-autonomous colony of Lower Delaware. As the most prominent, prosperous and influential settlement in the new colony, New Castle, the original Swedish colony town became the capital.

As one of the earlier supporters of colonial unification, Penn wrote and urged for a union of all the English colonies in what was to become the United States of America. The democratic principles that he set forth in the Pennsylvania Frame of Government served as an inspiration for the members of the convention framing the new Constitution of the United States in Philadelphia in 1787.

As a pacifist Quaker, Penn considered the problems of war and peace deeply. He developed a forward-looking project and thoughts for a "United States of Europe" through the creation of a European Assembly made of deputies who could discuss and adjudicate controversies peacefully. He is therefore considered the first thinker to suggest the creation of a European Parliament and what would become the modern

European Union in the late 20th century. A man of deep religious convictions, Penn wrote numerous works in which he exhorted believers to adhere to the spirit of Primitive Christianity. He was imprisoned several times in the Tower of London due to his faith, and his book *No Cross, No Crown* (1669), which he wrote while in prison, has become a Christian classic of theological literature.

Biography

Early years

William Penn was born in 1644 at Tower Hill, London, the son of English Admiral Sir William Penn, and Margaret Jasper, from the Netherlands and the widow of a Dutch captain and the daughter of a rich merchant from Rotterdam. Admiral Penn served in the Commonwealth Navy during the English Civil War and was rewarded by Oliver Cromwell with estates in Ireland. The lands were seized from Irish Catholics in retaliation for the failed Irish Rebellion of 1641. Admiral Penn took part in the restoration of Charles II and was eventually knighted and served in the Royal Navy. At the time of his son's birth, then-Captain Penn was twenty-three and an ambitious naval officer in charge of quelling Irish Catholic unrest and blockading Irish ports.

Penn grew up during the rule of Oliver Cromwell, who succeeded in leading a Puritan rebellion against King Charles I; the king was beheaded when Penn was three years old. Penn's father was often at sea. Little William caught smallpox at a young age, losing all his hair (he wore a wig until he left college), prompting his parents to move from the suburbs to an

estate in Essex. The country life made a lasting impression on young Penn, and kindled in him a love of horticulture. Their neighbor was famed diarist Samuel Pepys, who was friendly at first but later secretly hostile to the Admiral, perhaps embittered in part by his failed seductions of both Penn's mother and his sister Peggy.

Penn was educated first at Chigwell School, by private tutors whilst in Ireland, and later at Christ Church, Oxford. At that time, there were no state schools and nearly all educational institutions were affiliated with the Anglican Church. Children from poor families had to have a wealthy sponsor to get an education. Penn's education heavily leaned on the classical authors and "no novelties or conceited modern writers" were allowed including William Shakespeare. Foot racing was Penn's favorite sport, and he would often run the more than three-mile (5 km) distance from his home to the school. The school itself was cast in an Anglican mode – strict, humorless, and somber – and teachers had to be pillars of virtue and provide sterling examples to their charges. Though later opposing Anglicanism on religious grounds, Penn absorbed many Puritan behaviors, and was known later for his serious demeanor, strict behavior and lack of humor.

After a failed mission to the Caribbean, Admiral Penn and his family were exiled to his lands in Ireland. It was during this period, when Penn was about fifteen, that he met Thomas Loe, a Quaker missionary, who was maligned by both Catholics and Protestants. Loe was admitted to the Penn household and during his discourses on the "Inner Light", young Penn recalled later that "the Lord visited me and gave me divine Impressions of Himself."

A year later, Cromwell was dead, the royalists resurging, and the Penn family returned to England. The middle class aligned itself with the royalists and Admiral Penn was sent on a secret mission to bring back exiled Prince Charles. For his role in restoring the monarchy, Admiral Penn was knighted and gained a powerful position as Lord Commissioner of the Admiralty.

In 1660, Penn arrived at Oxford and enrolled as a gentleman scholar with an assigned servant. The student body was a volatile mix of swashbuckling Cavaliers (aristocratic Anglicans), sober Puritans, and nonconforming Quakers. The new government's discouragement of religious dissent gave the Cavaliers the license to harass the minority groups. Because of his father's high position and social status, young Penn was firmly a Cavalier but his sympathies lay with the persecuted Quakers. To avoid conflict, he withdrew from the fray and became a reclusive scholar. Also at this time, Penn was developing his individuality and philosophy of life. He found that he was not in sympathy with either his father's martial view of the world or his mother's society-oriented sensibilities, "I had no relations that inclined to so solitary and spiritual way; I was a child alone. A child was given to musing, occasionally feeling the divine presence."

Penn returned home for the extraordinary splendor of the King's restoration ceremony and was a guest of honor alongside his father, who received a highly unusual royal salute for his services to the Crown. Though undetermined at the time, the Admiral had great hopes for his son's career under the favor of the King. Back at Oxford, Penn considered a medical career and took some dissecting classes. Rational thought began to spread into science, politics, and economics,

which he took a liking to. When theologian John Owen was fired from his deanery, Penn and other open-minded students rallied to his side and attended seminars at the dean's house, where intellectual discussions covered the gamut of new thought. Penn learned the valuable skills of forming ideas into theory, discussing theory through reasoned debate, and testing the theories in the real world.

At this time he also faced his first moral dilemma. After Owen was censured again after being fired, students were threatened with punishment for associating with him. However, Penn stood by the dean, thereby gaining a fine and reprimand from the university. The Admiral, despairing of the charges, pulled young Penn away from Oxford, hoping to distract him from the heretical influences of the university. The attempt had no effect and father and son struggled to understand each other. Back at school, the administration imposed stricter religious requirements including daily chapel attendance and required a dress. Penn rebelled against enforced worship and was expelled. His father, in a rage, attacked young Penn with a cane and forced him from their home. Penn's mother made peace in the family, which allowed her son to return home but she quickly concluded that both her social standing and her husband's career were being threatened by their son's behavior. So at age 18, young Penn was sent to Paris to get him out of view, improve his manners, and expose him to another culture.

In Paris, at the court of young Louis XIV, Penn found French manners far more refined than the coarse manners of his countrymen – but the extravagant display of wealth and privilege did not sit well with him. Though impressed by Notre

Dame and the Catholic ritual, he felt uncomfortable with it. Instead, he sought out spiritual direction from French Protestant theologian MoiseAmyraut, who invited Penn to stay with him in Saumur for a year. The undogmatic Christian humanist talked of a tolerant, adapting view of religion which appealed to Penn, who later stated, "I never had any other religion in my life than what I felt." By adapting his mentor's belief in free will, Penn felt unburdened of Puritanical guilt and rigid beliefs and was inspired to search out his own religious path.

Upon returning to England after two years abroad, he presented to his parents a mature, sophisticated, well-mannered, "modish" gentleman, though Samuel Pepys noted young Penn's "vanity of the French". Penn had developed a taste for fine clothes, and for the rest of his life would pay somewhat more attention to his dress than most Quakers. The Admiral had great hopes that his son then had the practical sense and the ambition necessary to succeed as an aristocrat. He had young Penn enroll in law school but soon his studies were interrupted. With warfare with the Dutch imminent, young Penn decided to shadow his father at work and join him at sea. Penn functioned as an emissary between his father and the King, then returned to his law studies. Worrying about his father in battle he wrote,

"I never knew what a father was till I had wisdom enough to prize him... I pray God... that you come home secure." The Admiral returned triumphantly but London was in the grip of the plague of 1665. Young Penn reflected on the suffering and the deaths, and the way humans reacted to the epidemic. He wrote that the scourge "gave me a deep sense of the vanity of

this World, of the Irreligiousness of the Religions in it." Further he observed how Quakers on errands of mercy were arrested by the police and demonized by other religions, even accused of causing the plague.

With his father laid low by gout, young Penn was sent to Ireland in 1666 to manage the family landholdings. While there he became a soldier and took part in suppressing a local Irish rebellion. Swelling with pride, he had his portrait painted wearing a suit of armor, his most authentic likeness. His first experience of warfare gave him the sudden idea of pursuing a military career, but the fever of battle soon wore off after his father discouraged him, "I can say nothing but advise to sobriety...I wish your youthful desires mayn't outrun your discretion." While Penn was abroad, the Great Fire of 1666 consumed central London. As with the plague, the Penn family was spared. But after returning to the city, Penn was depressed by the mood of the city and his ailing father, so he went back to the family estate in Ireland to contemplate his future. The reign of King Charles had further tightened restrictions against all religious sects other than the Anglican Church, making the penalty for unauthorized worship imprisonment or deportation. The "Five Mile Act" prohibited dissenting teachers and preachers to come within that distance of any borough. The Quakers were especially targeted and their meetings were deemed undesirable.

Religious conversion

Despite the dangers, Penn began to attend Quaker meetings near Cork. A chance re-meeting with Thomas Loe confirmed Penn's rising attraction to Quakerism. Soon Penn was arrested

for attending Quaker meetings. Rather than state that he was not a Quaker and thereby dodge any charges, he publicly declared himself a member and finally joined the Quakers at the age of 22. In pleading his case, Penn stated that since the Quakers had no political agenda (unlike the Puritans) they should not be subject to laws that restricted political action by minority religions and other groups. Sprung from jail because of his family's rank rather than his argument, Penn was immediately recalled to London by his father.

The Admiral was severely distressed by his son's actions and took the conversion as a personal affront. His father's hopes that Penn's charisma and intelligence would win him favor at the court were crushed. Though enraged, the Admiral tried his best to reason with his son but to no avail. His father not only feared for his own position but that his son seemed bent on a dangerous confrontation with the Crown. In the end, young Penn was more determined than ever, and the Admiral felt he had no option but to order his son out of the house and to withhold his inheritance.

As Penn became homeless, he began to live with Quaker families. Quakers were relatively strict Christians in the 17th century. They refused to bow or take off their hats to social superiors, believing all men equal under God, a belief antithetical to an absolute monarchy that believed the monarch divinely appointed by God. Therefore, Quakers were treated as heretics because of their principles and their failure to pay tithes. They also refused to swear oaths of loyalty to the King believing that this was following the command of Jesus not to swear. The basic ceremony of Quakerism was silent worship in a meeting house, conducted in a group. There was

no ritual and no professional clergy, and many Quakers disavowed the concept of original sin. God's communication came to each individual directly, and if so moved, the individual shared his revelations, thoughts, or opinions with the group. Penn found all these tenets to sit well with his conscience and his heart.

Penn became a close friend of George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, whose movement started in the 1650s during the tumult of the Cromwellian revolution. The times sprouted many new sects besides Quakers, including Seekers, Ranters, Antinomians, Seventh Day Baptists, Soul sleepers, Adamites, Diggers, Levellers, Behmenists, Muggletonians, and many others, as the Puritans were more tolerant than the monarchy had been. Following Oliver Cromwell's death, however, the Crown was re-established and the King responded with harassment and persecution of all religions and sects other than Anglicanism.

Fox risked his life, wandering from town to town, and he attracted followers who likewise believed that the "God who made the world did not dwell in temples made with hands." By abolishing the church's authority over the congregation, Fox not only extended the Protestant Reformation more radically, but he helped extend the most important principle of modern political history – the rights of the individual – upon which modern democracies were later founded. Penn traveled frequently with Fox, through Europe and England. He also wrote a comprehensive, detailed explanation of Quakerism along with a testimony to the character of George Fox, in his introduction to the autobiographical *Journal of George Fox*. In effect, Penn became the first theologian, theorist, and legal

defender of Quakerism, providing its written doctrine and helping to establish its public standing.

Penn in Ireland (1669–1670)

In 1669, Penn traveled to Ireland to deal with many of his father's estates. While there, he attended many meetings and stayed with leading Quaker families. He became a great friend of William Morris, a leading Quaker figure in Cork, and often stayed with Morris at Castle Salem near Rosscarbery.

Penn in Germany (1671–1677)

Between 1671 and 1677 William Penn made trips to Germany on behalf of the Quaker faith, resulting in a German Settlement in Pennsylvania that was symbolic in two ways: it was a specifically German-speaking congregation, and it comprised religious dissenters. Pennsylvania has remained the heartland for various branches of Anabaptists: Old Order Mennonites, Ephrata Cloister, Brethren, and Amish. Pennsylvania also became home for many Lutheran refugees from Catholic provinces (e.g., Salzburg), as well as for German Catholics who had also been discriminated against in their home country.

In Philadelphia, Francis Daniel Pastorius negotiated the purchase of 15,000 acres (61 km) from his friend William Penn, the proprietor of the colony, and laid out the settlement of Germantown. The German Society of Pennsylvania was established in 1764 and is still functioning today from its headquarters in Philadelphia.

Persecutions and imprisonments

Penn's first of many pamphlets, *Truth Exalted: To Princes, Priests, and People* (1668), was a criticism of all religious groups, except Quakers, which he perceived as the only true Christian group living at that time in England. He branded the Catholic Church as "the Whore of Babylon", defied the Church of England, and called the Puritans "hypocrites and revelers in God". He also lambasted all "false prophets, tithemongers, and opposers of perfection". Pepys thought it a "ridiculous nonsensical book" that he was "ashamed to read".

In 1668 Penn was imprisoned in the Tower of London after writing a follow-up tract entitled *The Sandy Foundation Shaken*. The Bishop of London ordered that Penn be held indefinitely until he publicly recanted his written statements. The official charge was publication without a licence but the real crime was blasphemy, as signed in a warrant by King Charles II.

Placed in solitary confinement in an unheated cell and threatened with a life sentence, Penn was being accused of denying the Trinity, though this was a misinterpretation Penn himself refuted in the essay *Innocency with her open face, presented by way of Apology for the book entitled The Sandy Foundation Shaken*, where he himself proceeded to prove the Godhead of Christ. Penn said the rumor had been "maliciously insinuated" by detractors who wanted to create a bad reputation to Quakers. Later, he stated that what he really denied were the Catholic interpretations of this theological topic, and the use of unbiblical concepts to explain it. Penn expressly confessed he believed in the Holy Three as well as in

the divinity of Christ. In 1668 in a letter to the anti-Quaker minister Jonathan Clapham, Penn wrote: "Thou must not, reader, from my querying thus, conclude we do deny (as he hath falsely charged us) those glorious Three, which bear record in heaven, the Father, Word, and Spirit; neither the infinity, eternity and divinity of Jesus Christ; for that we know he is the mighty God."

Given writing materials in the hope that he would put on paper his retraction, Penn wrote another inflammatory treatise, *No Cross, No Crown: A Discourse Shewing The Nature and Discipline of the Holy Cross of Christ and that the Denial of Self, and Daily Hearing of Christ's Cross, is the Alone Way to Rest and Kingdom of God.* In it, Penn exhorted believers to adhere to the spirit of Primitive Christianity. This work was remarkable for its historical analysis and citation of 68 authors whose quotations and commentary he had committed to memory and was able to summon without any reference material at hand. Penn petitioned for an audience with the King, which was denied but which led to negotiations on his behalf by one of the royal chaplains. Penn bravely declared, "My prison shall be my grave before I will budge a jot: for I owe my conscience to no mortal man." He was released after eight months of imprisonment.

Penn demonstrated no remorse for his aggressive stance and vowed to keep fighting against the wrongs of the Church and the King. For its part, the Crown continued to confiscate Quaker property and jailed thousands of Quakers. From then on, Penn's religious views effectively exiled him from English society; he was sent down (expelled) from Christ Church, a college at Oxford University, for being a Quaker, and was

arrested several times. Among the most famous of these events was the trial following his 1670 arrest with William Mead. Penn was accused of preaching before a gathering in the street, which Penn had deliberately provoked to test the validity of the 1664 Conventicle Act, just renewed in 1670, which denied the right of assembly to "more than five persons in addition to members of the family, for any religious purpose not according to the rules of the Church of England". Penn pleaded for his right to see a copy of the charges laid against him and the laws he had supposedly broken, but the Recorder of London, Sir John Howel, on the bench as chief judge, refused, although this was a right guaranteed by law. Furthermore, the Recorder directed the jury to come to a verdict without hearing the defense.

Despite heavy pressure from Howel to convict Penn, the jury returned a verdict of "not guilty". When invited by the Recorder to reconsider their verdict and to select a new foreman, they refused and were sent to a cell over several nights to mull over their decision.

The Lord Mayor of London, Sir Samuel Starling, also on the bench, then told the jury, "You shall go together and bring in another verdict, or you shall starve", and not only had Penn sent to jail in Newgate Prison (on a charge of contempt of court for refusing to remove his hat), but the full jury followed him, and they were additionally fined the equivalent of a year's wages each.

The members of the jury, fighting their case from prison in what became known as Bushel's Case, managed to win the right for all English juries to be free from the control of judges.

This case was one of the more important trials that shaped the concept of jury nullification and was a victory for the use of the writ of habeas corpus as a means of freeing those unlawfully detained.

With his father dying, Penn wanted to see him one more time and patch up their differences. But he urged his father not to pay his fine and free him, "I entreat thee not to purchase my liberty." But the Admiral refused to let the opportunity pass and he paid the fine, releasing his son.

The old man had gained respect for his son's integrity and courage and told him, "Let nothing in this world tempt you to wrong your conscience." The Admiral also knew that after his death young Penn would become more vulnerable in his pursuit of justice. In an act which not only secured his son's protection but also set the conditions for the founding of Pennsylvania, the Admiral wrote to the Duke of York, the heir to the throne.

The Duke and the King, in return for the Admiral's lifetime of service to the Crown, promised to protect young Penn and make him a royal counselor.

Penn was not disinherited and he came into a large fortune but found himself in jail again for six months as he continued to agitate. After gaining his freedom, he finally married GulielmaSpringett in April 1672, after a four-year engagement filled with frequent separations. Penn stayed close to home but continued writing his tracts, espousing religious tolerance and railing against discriminatory laws. A minor split developed in the Quaker community between those who favored Penn's analytical formulations and those who preferred Fox's simple

precepts. But the persecution of Quakers had accelerated and the differences were overridden; Penn again resumed missionary work in Holland and Germany.

Founding of Pennsylvania

Seeing conditions deteriorating, Penn decided to appeal directly to the King and the Duke. Penn proposed a solution which would solve the dilemma—a mass emigration of English Quakers. Some Quakers had already moved to North America, but the New England Puritans, especially, were as hostile towards Quakers as Anglicans in England were, and some of the Quakers had been banished to the Caribbean. In 1677 a group of prominent Quakers that included Penn purchased the colonial province of West Jersey (half of the current state of New Jersey). That same year, two hundred settlers from the towns of Chorleywood and Rickmansworth in Hertfordshire and other towns in nearby Buckinghamshire arrived, and founded the town of Burlington. George Fox himself had made a journey to America to verify the potential of further expansion of the early Quaker settlements. In 1682 East Jersey was also purchased by Quakers.

With the New Jersey foothold in place, Penn pressed his case to extend the Quaker region. Whether from personal sympathy or political expediency, to Penn's surprise, the King granted an extraordinarily generous charter which made Penn the world's largest private (non-royal) landowner, with over 45,000 square miles (120,000 km). Penn became the sole proprietor of a huge tract of land west of New Jersey and north of Maryland (which belonged to Lord Baltimore), and gained sovereign rule of the territory with all rights and privileges (except the power to

declare war). The land of Pennsylvania had belonged to the Duke of York, who acquiesced, but he retained New York and the area around New Castle and the Eastern portion of the Delmarva Peninsula. In return, one-fifth of all gold and silver mined in the province (which had virtually none) was to be remitted to the King, and the Crown was freed of a debt to the Admiral of £16,000, equal to roughly £2,526,337 in 2008.

- Penn first called the area "New Wales", then "Sylvania" (Latin for "forests" or "woods"), which King Charles II changed to "Pennsylvania" in honor of the elder Penn. On 4 March 1681, the King signed the charter and the following day Penn jubilantly wrote, "It is a clear and just thing, and my God who has given it to me through many difficulties, will, I believe, bless and make it the seed of a nation." Penn then traveled to America and while there, he negotiated Pennsylvania's first land-purchase survey with the Lenape Indian tribe. Penn purchased the first tract of land under a white oak tree at Graystones on 15 July 1682. Penn drafted a charter of liberties for the settlement creating a political utopia guaranteeing free and fair trial by jury, freedom of religion, freedom from unjust imprisonment and free elections.

Having proved himself an influential scholar and theoretician, Penn now had to demonstrate the practical skills of a real estate promoter, city planner, and governor for his "Holy Experiment", the province of Pennsylvania.

Besides achieving his religious goals, Penn had hoped that Pennsylvania would be a profitable venture for himself and his family. But he proclaimed that he would not exploit either the natives or the immigrants, "I would not abuse His love, nor act unworthy of His providence, and so defile what came to me clean."

To that end, Penn's land purchase from the Lenape included the latter party's retained right to traverse the sold lands for purposes of hunting, fishing, and gathering. Though thoroughly oppressed, getting Quakers to leave England and make the dangerous journey to the New World was his first commercial challenge. Some Quaker families had already arrived in Maryland and New Jersey but the numbers were small. To attract settlers in large numbers, he wrote a glowing prospectus, considered honest and well-researched for the time, promising religious freedom as well as material advantage, which he marketed throughout Europe in various languages. Within six months he had parcelled out 300,000 acres (1,200 km) to over 250 prospective settlers, mostly rich London Quakers. Eventually he attracted other persecuted minorities including Huguenots, Mennonites, Amish, Catholics, Lutherans, and Jews from England, France, Holland, Germany, Sweden, Finland, Ireland, and Wales.

Next, he set out to lay the legal framework for an ethical society where power was derived from the people, from "open discourse", in much the same way as a Quaker Meeting was run. Notably, as the sovereign, Penn thought it important to limit his own power as well. The new government would have two houses, safeguard the rights of private property and free enterprise, and impose taxes fairly. It would call for death for

only two crimes, treason and murder, rather than the two hundred crimes under English law, and all cases were to be tried before a jury. Prisons would be progressive, attempting to correct through "workshops" rather than through hellish confinement. The laws of behaviour he laid out were rather Puritanical: swearing, lying, and drunkenness were forbidden as well as "idle amusements" such as stage plays, gambling, revels, masques, cock-fighting, and bear-baiting.

All this was a radical departure from the laws and the lawmaking of European monarchs and elites. Over twenty drafts, Penn laboured to create his "Framework of Government". He borrowed liberally from John Locke who later had a similar influence on Thomas Jefferson, but added his own revolutionary idea—the use of amendments—to enable a written framework that could evolve with the changing times. He stated, "Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them."

Penn hoped that an amendable constitution would accommodate dissent and new ideas and also allow meaningful societal change without resorting to violent uprisings or revolution. Remarkably, though the Crown reserved the right to override any law it wished, Penn's skillful stewardship did not provoke any government reaction while Penn remained in his province. Despite criticism by some Quaker friends that Penn was setting himself above them by taking on this powerful position, and by his enemies who thought he was a fraud and "falsest villain upon earth", Penn was ready to begin the "Holy Experiment". Bidding goodbye to his wife and children, he reminded them to "avoid pride, avarice, and luxury".

Back to England

In 1684 Penn returned to England to see his family and to try to resolve a territorial dispute with Lord Baltimore. Penn did not always pay attention to details and had not taken the fairly simple step of determining where the 40th degree of latitude (the southern boundary of his land under the charter) actually was. After he sent letters to several landowners in Maryland advising the recipients that they were probably in Pennsylvania and not to pay any more taxes to Lord Baltimore, trouble arose between the two proprietors. This led to an eighty-year legal dispute between the two families.

Political conditions at home had stiffened since Penn left. To his dismay, he found Bridewell and Newgate prisons filled with Quakers. Internal political conflicts even threatened to undo the Pennsylvania charter. Penn withheld his political writings from publication as "The times are too rough for print."

In 1685 King Charles died, and the Duke of York was crowned James II. The new king resolved the border dispute in Penn's favor. But King James, a Catholic with a largely Protestant parliament, proved a poor ruler, stubborn and inflexible. Penn supported James' Declaration of Indulgence, which granted toleration to Quakers, and went on a "preaching tour through England to promote the King's Indulgence". His proposal at the London Yearly Meeting of the Society of Friends in June 1688 to establish an "advisory committee that might offer counsel to individual Quakers deciding whether to take up public office" under James II was rebuffed by George Fox, who argued that it was "not safe to conclude such things in a Yearly Meeting". Penn offered some assistance to James II's campaign to

regulate the parliamentary constituencies by sending a letter to a friend in Huntingdon asking him to identify men who could be trusted to support the king's campaign for liberty of conscience.

Penn faced serious problems in the colonies due to his sloppy business practices. Apparently, he could not be bothered with administrative details, and his business manager, fellow Quaker Philip Ford, embezzled substantial sums from Penn's estates. Ford capitalized on Penn's habit of signing papers without reading them. One such paper turned out to be a deed transferring ownership of Pennsylvania to Ford who then demanded a rent beyond Penn's ability to pay.

Return to America

After agreeing to let Ford keep all his Irish rents in exchange for keeping quiet about Ford's legal title to Pennsylvania, Penn felt his situation sufficiently improved to return to Pennsylvania with the intention of staying. Accompanied by his wife Hannah, daughter Letitia and secretary James Logan, Penn sailed from the Isle of Wight on the *Canterbury*, reaching Philadelphia in December 1699.

Penn received a hearty welcome upon his arrival and found his province much changed in the intervening 18 years. Pennsylvania was growing rapidly and now had nearly 18,100 inhabitants and Philadelphia over 3,000. His tree plantings were providing the green urban spaces he had envisioned. Shops were full of imported merchandise, satisfying the wealthier citizens and proving America to be a viable market for English goods. Most importantly, religious diversity was

succeeding. Despite the protests of fundamentalists and farmers, Penn's insistence that Quaker grammar schools be open to all citizens was producing a relatively educated workforce. High literacy and open intellectual discourse led to Philadelphia becoming a leader in science and medicine. Quakers were especially modern in their treatment of mental illness, decriminalizing insanity and turning away from punishment and confinement.

Ironically, the tolerant Penn transformed himself almost into a Puritan, in an attempt to control the fractiousness that had developed in his absence, tightening up some laws. Another change was found in Penn's writings, which had mostly lost their boldness and vision. In those years, he did put forward a plan to make a federation of all English colonies in America. There have been claims that he also fought slavery, but that seems unlikely, as he owned and even traded slaves himself and his writings do not support that idea. However, he did promote good treatment for slaves, including marriage among slaves (though rejected by the council). Other Pennsylvania Quakers were more outspoken and proactive, being among the earliest fighters against slavery in America, led by Daniel Pastorius, founder of Germantown, Pennsylvania. Many Quakers pledged to release their slaves upon their death, including Penn, and some sold their slaves to non-Quakers.

The Penns lived comfortably at Pennsbury Manor and had all intentions of living out their lives there. They also had a residence in Philadelphia. Their only American child, John, had been born and was thriving. Penn was commuting to Philadelphia on a six-man barge, which he admitted he prized above "all dead things".

James Logan, his secretary, kept him acquainted with all the news. Penn had plenty of time to spend with his family and still attend to affairs of state, though delegations and official visitors were frequent. His wife, however, did not enjoy life as a governor's wife and hostess and preferred the simple life she led in England. When new threats by France again put Penn's charter in jeopardy, Penn decided to return to England with his family, in 1701.

Later years

Penn returned to England and immediately became embroiled in financial and family troubles. His eldest son William, Jr. was leading a dissolute life, neglecting his wife and two children, and running up gambling debts. Penn had hoped to have William succeed him in America. Now he could not even pay his son's debts. His own finances were in turmoil. He had sunk over £30,000 in America and received little back except for some bartered goods. He had made many generous loans which he failed to press.

Making matters worse from Penn's perspective, Philip Ford, his financial advisor, had cheated Penn out of thousands of pounds by concealing and diverting rents from Penn's Irish lands, claiming losses, then extracting loans from Penn to cover the shortfall. When Ford died in 1702, his widow Bridget threatened to sell Pennsylvania, to which she claimed title. Penn sent William to America to manage affairs, but he proved just as unreliable as he had been in England. There were considerable discussions about scrapping his constitution. In desperation, Penn tried to sell Pennsylvania to the Crown before Bridget Ford got wind of his plan, but by insisting that

the Crown uphold the civil liberties that had been achieved, he could not strike a deal. Mrs. Ford took her case to court. At age 62, Penn landed in debtors' prison; however, a rush of sympathy reduced Penn's punishment to house arrest, and Bridget Ford was finally denied her claim to Pennsylvania. A group of Quakers arranged for Ford to receive payment for back rents and Penn was released.

In 1712 Berkeley Codd, Esq. of Sussex County, Delaware disputed some of the rights of Penn's grant from the Duke of York.

Some of William Penn's agents hired lawyer Andrew Hamilton to represent the Penn family in this replevin case. Hamilton's success led to an established relationship of goodwill between the Penn family and Andrew Hamilton. Penn had grown weary of the politicking back in Pennsylvania and the restlessness with his governance, but Logan implored him not to forsake his colony, for fear that Pennsylvania might fall into the hands of an opportunist who would undo all the good that had been accomplished. During his second attempt to sell Pennsylvania back to the Crown in 1712, Penn suffered a stroke. A second stroke several months later left him unable to speak or take care of himself. He slowly lost his memory.

William Penn died penniless in 1718, at his home in Ruscombe, near Twyford in Berkshire, and is buried in a grave next to his first wife in the cemetery of the Jordans Quaker meeting house near Chalfont St Giles in Buckinghamshire. His wife, as sole executor, became the de facto proprietor until she died in 1726.

Family

Penn first married Gulielma Maria PosthumaSpringett (1644–1694), daughter of William S. Springett (the *Posthuma* in her name indicates that her father had died prior to her birth) and Lady Mary ProudePenington. They had three sons and five daughters:

- Gulielma Maria (1671/72-before 1685)
- Maria Margaret (born and died 1673/74)
- Springett (1674/75-1696)
- Letitia (1678–1746), who married William Awbrey (Aubrey)
- William, Jr. (1679/80-1720)
- Unnamed child (born and died 1682)
- Gulielma Maria (1685–1689)

Two years after Gulielma's death he married Hannah Margaret Callowhill (1671–1726), daughter of Thomas Callowhill and Anna (Hannah) Hollister. William Penn married Hannah when she was 25 and he was 52. They had eight children in twelve years.

The first two children died in infancy. The other children were:

- Unnamed daughter (born and died 1697)
- John Penn (1699/00–1746), never married.
- Thomas Penn (1700/01–1775), married Lady Juliana Fermor, fourth daughter of Thomas, first Earl of Pomfret.
- Hannah Penn (1703–1706)

- Margaret Penn (1704/05–1750), married Thomas Freame (1701/02-1746) nephew of John Freame, founder of Barclays Bank
- Richard Penn Sr. (1705–1771)
- Dennis Penn (1705/06–1721/22)
- Hannah Penn (1708–1709)
- Louis Penn (1707–1724)

Legacy

According to Mary Maples Dunn:

> - Penn liked money and although he was certainly sincere about his ambitions for a "holy experiment" in Pennsylvania, he also expected to get rich. He was, however, extravagant, a bad manager and businessman, and not very astute in judging people and making appointments... Penn was gregarious, had many friends, and was good at developing the useful connections which protected him through many crises. both his marriages were happy, and he would describe himself as a family man, all the public affairs took him away from home a great deal and he was disappointed in those children whom he knew as adults.

After Penn's death, Pennsylvania slowly drifted away from a colony founded by religion to a secular state dominated by commerce. Many of Penn's legal and political innovations took root, however, as did the Quaker school in Philadelphia for which Penn issued two charters (1689 and 1701). Sometime later, the institution was renamed the William Penn Charter

School. "Penn Charter", a well-known secondary day school, is now the oldest Quaker school in the world. Voltaire praised Pennsylvania as the only government in the world that responds to the people and is respectful of minority rights. Penn's "Frame of Government" and his other ideas were later studied by Benjamin Franklin as well as the pamphleteer of the American Revolution,

Thomas Paine, whose father was a Quaker. Among Penn's legacies was the unwillingness to force a Quaker majority upon Pennsylvania, allowing his state to develop into a successful "melting pot". In addition, Thomas Jefferson and the founding Fathers adapted Penn's theory of an amendable constitution and his vision that "all Persons are equal under God" informing the federal government following the American Revolution. In addition to Penn's extensive political and religious treatises, he wrote nearly 1,000 maxims, full of wise observations about human nature and morality.

Penn's family retained ownership of the colony of Pennsylvania until the American Revolution. However, William's son and successor, Thomas Penn, and his brother John, renounced their father's faith, and fought to restrict religious freedom (particularly for Catholics and later Quakers as well). Thomas weakened or eliminated the elected assembly's power, and ran the colony instead through his appointed governors. He was a bitter opponent of Benjamin Franklin and Franklin's push for greater democracy in the years leading up to the revolution. Through the infamous Walking Purchase of 1737, the Penns cheated the Lenape out of their lands in the Lehigh Valley.

Posthumous honours

On 28 November 1984 Ronald Reagan, by Presidential Proclamation 5284 (authorized by an Act of Congress), declared William Penn and his second wife, Hannah Callowhill Penn, each to be an Honorary Citizen of the United States.

A bronze statue of William Penn by Alexander Milne Calder stands atop Philadelphia's City Hall. When installed in 1894, the statue represented the highest point in the city, as City Hall was then the tallest building in Philadelphia. Urban designer Edmund Bacon was known to have said that no gentleman would build taller than the "brim of Billy Penn's hat". This agreement existed for almost 100 years until the city decided to allow skyscrapers taller to be built. In March 1987, the completion of One Liberty Place was the first building to do that. This resulted in a "curse" which lasted from that year on until 2008 when a small statue of William Penn was put on top of the newly built Comcast Center. The Philadelphia Phillies went on to win the 2008 World Series that year.

A lesser-known statue of Penn is located at Penn Treaty Park, on the site where Penn entered into his treaty with the Lenape, which is famously commemorated in the painting Penn's Treaty with the Indians. In 1893, Hajoca Corporation, the nation's largest privately held wholesale distributor of plumbing, heating, and industrial supplies, adopted the statue as its trademark symbol.

The Quaker Oats cereal brand standing "Quaker man" logo, dating back to 1877, was identified in their advertising after 1909 as William Penn, and referred to him as "standard bearer

of the Quakers and of Quaker Oats". In 1946 the logo was changed into a head-and-shoulders portrait of the smiling Quaker Man. The Quaker Oats Company's website currently claims their logo is not a depiction of William Penn.

Bil Keane created the comic Silly Philly for the Philadelphia Bulletin, a juvenile version of Penn, that ran from 1947 to 1961.

Penn was depicted in the 1941 film *Penn of Pennsylvania* by Clifford Evans.

The William Penn High School for Girls was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1986.

The William Penn House – a Quaker hostel and seminar center – was named in honor of William Penn when it opened in 1966 to house Quakers visiting Washington, D.C. to partake in the many protests, events and social movements of the era.

Chigwell School, the school he attended, has named one of their four houses after him and now owns several letters and documents which boasts his handwriting.

The former William Penn Primary School, and the successor Penn Wood Primary and Nursery School, in Manor Park, Slough, near to Stoke Park, is named after William Penn.

The Friends' School, Hobart has named one of their seven six-year classes after him.

The William Penn Society of Whittier College has existed since 1934 as a society on the college campus of Whittier College and continues to this day.

William Penn University in Oskaloosa, Iowa, which was founded by Quaker settlers in 1873, was named in his honor. Penn Mutual, a life insurance company established in 1847, also bears his name.

Chapter 40

René-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle

René-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle/ləˈsæl/ (November 22, 1643 – March 19, 1687) was a 17th-century French explorer and fur trader in North America. He explored the Great Lakes region of the United States and Canada, the Mississippi River, and the Gulf of Mexico. He is best known for an early 1682 expedition in which he canoed the lower Mississippi River from the mouth of the Illinois River to the Gulf of Mexico; there, on 9 April 1682, he claimed the Mississippi River basin for France after giving it the name *La Louisiane*. One source states that "he acquired for France the most fertile half of the North American continent".

La Salle is often credited with being the first European to traverse the Ohio River, and sometimes the Mississippi as well. It has now been established that Joliet and Marquette preceded him on the Mississippi in their journey of 1673–74, and the existing historical evidence does not indicate that La Salle ever reached the Ohio/Allegheny Valley.

Early life

Robert Cavelier was born on November 22, 1643, into a comfortably well-off family in Rouen, France, in the parish Saint-Herbland. His parents were Jean Cavelier and Catherine Geest. His older brother, Jean Cavelier, became a Sulpician

priest. When he was young, he enjoyed science and nature. In his teens, he studied with the Jesuit religious order and became a member after taking initial vows in 1660.

Required to reject his father's legacy when he joined the Jesuits, La Salle was nearly destitute when he traveled as a prospective colonist to North America. He sailed for New France in the spring of 1666. His brother Jean, had moved there the year before. At La Salle's request on March 27, 1667, after he was in Canada, he was released from the Society of Jesus after citing "moral weaknesses". Although he left the order, never took final vows in it, and later became hostile to it, historians sometimes described him incorrectly as a priest or a leader.

La Salle was granted a *seigneurie* on land at the western end of the Island of Montreal, which became known as *Lachine*. La Salle immediately began to issue land grants, set up a village and learn the languages of the Native people, several tribes of Iroquois in this area.

Sieur de La Salle

Sieur de La Salle is a French title roughly translating to "Lord of the manor", from the old French *sal(e)* (modern *salle*), "hall", a manor house. *Sieur* is a French title of nobility, similar to the English "Sir," but under the French signeurial system, the title is purchased rather than earned, and does not imply military duty. Robert Cavelier received the title with his signeurial purchase of Lachine from the Sulpician order at Ville Marie around 1667. However, the phrase *La Salle* has become iconic,

and associated with the person as if it were his name; he is therefore often called Robert La Salle, or simply "La Salle".

Expeditions

"Ohio" expedition

The Seneca told La Salle of a great river, called the Ohio, which flowed into the sea, the "Vermilion Sea". He began to plan for expeditions to find a western passage to China. He sought and received permission from Governor Daniel Courcelle and IntendantJean Talon to embark on the enterprise. He sold his interests in Lachine to finance the venture.

La Salle left Lachine by the St. Lawrence on July 6, 1669, with a flotilla of nine canoes and 24 men, an unknown number of Seneca guides: himself and 14 hired men in four canoes, the two SulpiciansDollier de Casson and Abbé René de Bréhan de Galinée with seven new recruits in three canoes, and two canoes of Natives. There they went up the St. Lawrence and across Lake Ontario. After 35 days, they arrived at what is called today Irondequoit Bay on the southern shore of Lake Ontario at the mouth of Irondequoit Creek, a place now commemorated as La Salle's Landing.

There they were greeted by a party of Natives, who escorted them starting the next day to a village some leagues distant, a journey of a few days. At the village, the Seneca vehemently attempted to dissuade the party from proceeding into the lands of their enemies, the Algonquins, telling of the dire fate awaiting them. The necessity of securing guides for the further

part of the journey, and the refusal of the Seneca to provide them, delayed the expedition a month. A fortuitous capture by the Natives in the lands to the south of a Dutchman who spoke Iroquois well but French ill, and was to be burned at the stake for transgressions unknown, provided an opportunity to obtain a guide. The Dutchman's freedom was purchased by the party in exchange for wampum.

While at the Native village in Sept. 1669, La Salle was seized with a violent fever and expressed the intention of returning to Ville Marie.

At this juncture, he parted from his company and the narrative of the Jesuits, who continued on to upper Lake Erie. The missionaries continued on to the upper lakes, to the land of the Potawatomies. Other accounts have it that some of La Salle's men soon returned to New Holland or Ville Marie.

Further evidence

Beyond that, the factual record of La Salle's first expedition ends, and what prevails is obscurity and fabrication. It is likely that he spent the winter in Ville Marie. The next confirmed sighting of La Salle was by Nicolas Perrot on the Ottawa River near the Rapide des Chats in early summer, 1670, hunting with a party of Iroquois. That would be 700 miles as the crow flies from the Falls of the Ohio, the point supposed by some that he reached on the Ohio River.

La Salle's own journal of the expedition was lost in 1756. Two indirect historical accounts exist. The one, *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galliné*, purported to be a recitation by La Salle

himself to an unknown writer during his visit to Paris in 1678, and the other *Mémoire sur le projet du sieur de la Salle pour la descouverte de la partieoccidentale de l'Amériqueseptentrionale entre la Nouvelle-France, la Floride et le Mexique*. A letter from Madeleine Cavelier, his now elderly niece, written in 1746, commenting on the journal of La Salle in her possession may also shed some light on the issue.

La Salle himself never claimed to have discovered the Ohio River. In a letter to the intendent Talon in 1677, he claimed "discovery" of a river, the Baudrane, flowing southwesterly with its mouth on Lake Erie and emptying into the Saint Louis (i.e. the Mississippi), a hydrography which was non-existent. In those days, maps as well as descriptions were based part on observation and part on hearsay, of necessity. This confounded courses, mouths and confluences among the rivers. At various times, La Salle invented such rivers as the Chucagoa, Baudrane, Louisiane (Anglicized "Saint Louis"), and Ouabanchi-Aramoni. These included segments of those he'd actually traversed, which were earlier the Illinois and Kankakee, St. Joseph's of Lake Michigan, probably the *Ouabache* (Wabash) and possibly the upper Allegheny and later, the Chicago and lower Mississippi. He also correctly described the Missouri, though it was hearsay - he'd never been on it.

Confounding fact with fiction started with publication in 1876 of Margry's*DécouvertesetÉtablissements des Français*. Margry was a French archivist and partisan who had private access to the French archives. He came to be the agent of the American historian Francis Parkman. Margry's work, a massive nine volumes, encompassed an assemblage of documents some

previously published, but many not. In it, he sometimes published a reproduction of the whole document, and sometimes only an extract, or summary, not distinguishing the one from the other. He also used in some cases one or another copies of original documents previously edited, extracted or altered by others, without specifying which transcriptions were original, and which were copies, or whether the copy was dated earlier or later.

Reproductions were scattered in fragments across chapters, so that it was impossible to ascertain the integrity of the document from its fragments. Chapter headings were oblique and sensational, so as to obfuscate the content therein. English and American scholars were immediately skeptical of the work, since full and faithful publication of some of the original documents had previously existed. The situation was so fraught with doubt, that the United States Congress appropriated $10,000 in 1873, which Margry wanted as an advance, to have the original documents photostated, witnessed by uninvolved parties as to veracity.

Discovery of the Ohio and Mississippi

If La Salle is excused from discovering the two great rivers of the midwest, history does not leave a void. On May 8, 1541, south of present-day Memphis, Tennessee, Spanish conquistador Hernando de Soto reached the Mississippi River, which the Spanish called the *Rio Grande* for its immense size. He was the first European to document and cross the river, though not traverse it. It is uncontested that Louis Joliet and Jacques Marquette were the first Europeans to traverse the upper Mississippi in 1673, and that Father Louis Hennepin

and AntonineAugalle visited the Falls of St. Anthony on the upper Mississippi in spring, 1680, in advance of La Salle's own excursion in early 1682.

Credit for "discovery" of the Ohio River is provisionally given to two obscure early English explorers, Thomas Batts and Robert Fallam from Virginia who visited Wood's River (today called the New River), a tributary of the Ohio via the Kanawha, in what is today West Virginia in Sept. 1671. Other scholars declaim that this short (one month) expedition did not penetrate to the Ohio to the west, but elect instead Virginia Englishmen James Needham and Gabriel Arthur who in 1673–74 circumnavigated the southeast finally traversing Shawnee villages along the Ohio. The lower Ohio River first began appearing on French maps about 1674 in approximately its correct hydrography, and in its relation to the Mississippi, though diagrammed more northerly, approaching Lake Erie from the west and may have been confounded with the Maumee portage route. A memoir by M. de Denonville in 1688, recites that the lower Ohio, at least from its confluence with the Wabash to the Mississippi, was a familiar trade route. In 1692, ArnoutViele, a Dutchman from New York, traversed the length of the Ohio from the headwaters of the Allegheny in Pennsylvania to its mouth on the Mississippi, though the hydrography of the Allegheny remained opaque for at least several decades thereafter.

Great Lakes forts

On July 12, 1673, the Governor of New France, Louis de Buade de Frontenac, arrived at the mouth of the Cataraqui River to meet with leaders of the Five Nations of the Iroquois to encourage them to trade with the French. While the groups met

and exchanged gifts, Frontenac's men, led by La Salle, hastily constructed a rough wooden palisade on a point of land by a shallow, sheltered bay. Originally the fort was named Fort Cataraqui but was later renamed Fort Frontenac by La Salle in honor of his patron. The purpose of Fort Frontenac was to control the lucrative fur trade in the Great Lakes Basin to the west.

The fort was also meant to be a bulwark against the English and Dutch, who were competing with the French for control of the fur trade. La Salle was left in command of the fort in 1673.

Thanks to his powerful protector, the discoverer managed, during a voyage to France in 1674–75, to secure for himself the grant of Fort Cataraqui and acquired letters of nobility for himself and his descendants. With Frontenac's support, he received not only a fur trade concession, with permission to establish frontier forts, but also a title of nobility. He returned and rebuilt Frontenac in stone.

An Ontario Heritage Trust plaque describes La Salle at Cataraqui as "[a] major figure in the expansion of the French fur trade into the Lake Ontario region, Using the fort as a base, he undertook expeditions to the west and southwest in the interest of developing a vast fur-trading empire." Henri de Tonti joined his explorations as his lieutenant.

After leaving Lower Canada in 1678, de La Salle and Henri de Tonti travelled to Fort Frontenac (now in Kingston, Ontario) and then to Niagara where, in December 1678, they were the first Europeans to view Niagara Falls; they built Fort Conti at the mouth of the Niagara River.

There they loaded supplies into smaller boats (canoes or bateaux), so they could continue up the shallow and swiftly flowing lower Niagara River to what is now the location of Lewiston, New York.

There the Iroquois had a well-established portage route which bypassed the rapids and the cataract later known as Niagara Falls.

The first ship built by La Salle, called the *Frontenac*, a 10-ton single-decked brigantine or barque was lost in Lake Ontario, on January 8, 1679. Afterward, La Salle built *Le Griffon*, a seven-cannon, 45-ton barque, on the upper Niagara River at or near Cayuga Creek. She was launched on August 7, 1679.

La Salle sailed in *Le Griffon* up Lake Erie to Lake Huron, then up Huron to Michilimackinac and on to present-day Green Bay, Wisconsin. *Le Griffon* left for Niagara with a load of furs, but was never seen again. He continued with his men in canoes down the western shore of Lake Michigan, rounding the southern end to the mouth of the Miami River (now St. Joseph River), where they built a stockade in January 1680. They called it Fort Miami (now known as St. Joseph, Michigan). There they waited for Tonti and his party, who had crossed the Lower Michigan peninsula on foot.

Mississippi expedition

On 3 December 1679, with a group of 40, La Salle and Henri de Tonti headed south from Fort Conti in Niagara. They canoed up the St. Joseph and followed it to a portage at present-day South Bend, Indiana. They crossed to the Kankakee River and followed it to the Illinois River. Im January 1680, reached an

area that is near the current city of Peoria, Illinois. In order to help the local Peoria tribe defend themselves against the Iroquois, La Salle and his group built a stockade and named it Fort Crèvecoeur.

La Salle set off on foot for Fort Frontenac for supplies. While he was gone, the soldiers at Ft. Crevecoeur, led by Martin Chartier, mutinied, destroyed the fort, and exiled Tonti, whom he had left in charge.

The group later travelled along the Illinois River and arrived at the Mississippi River in February 1682; they built canoes here. The exploration reached an area that is now Memphis, Tennessee, where La Salle built a small fort, named Fort Prudhomme. Fort Prudhomme was the first structure built by the French in Tennessee.

In April 1682, the expedition reached the Gulf of Mexico. There, La Salle named the Mississippi basin *La Louisiane* in honor of Louis XIV and claimed it for France.

During 1682-83, La Salle, with Henry de Tonti, established Fort Saint-Louis of Illinois at Starved Rock on the Illinois River to protect and hold the region for France. La Salle then returned to Montreal and later, to France.

Texas expedition and death

On July 24, 1684, he departed France and returned to America with a large expedition designed to establish a French colony on the Gulf of Mexico, at the mouth of the Mississippi River. They had four ships and 300 colonists. The expedition was plagued by pirates, Natives defending their land, and poor

navigation. One ship was lost to pirates in the West Indies, a second sank in the inlets of Matagorda Bay. They founded a settlement, near the bay which they called the Bay of Saint Louis, on Garcitas Creek in the vicinity of present-day Victoria, Texas. La Salle led a group eastward on foot on three occasions to try to locate the mouth of the Mississippi.

In the meantime, the flagship *La Belle*, the only remaining ship, ran aground and sank into the mud, stranding the colony on the Texas coast.

During a final search for the Mississippi River in 1687, La Salle got lost and for "two years he wandered, without maps, in the marshes of the Mississippi delta".

Some of his men mutinied, near the site of present Navasota, Texas.

On March 19, 1687, La Salle was slain by Pierre Duhaut during an ambush while talking to Duhaut's decoy, Jean L'Archevêque. They were "six leagues" from the westernmost village of the Hasinai (Tejas) Indians. One source states that Duhaut was a "disenchanted follower". Duhaut was shot and killed by James Hiems to avenge La Salle. Over the following week, others were killed; confusion followed as to who killed whom.

The colony lasted only until 1688, when Karankawa-speaking Natives killed the 20 remaining adults and took five children as captives. Tonti sent out search missions in 1689 when he learned of the colonizers' fate, but failed to find survivors.

Personal life

La Salle never married, but has been linked to Madeleine de Roybond'Allonne, an early colonizer of New France.

Legacy

In addition to the forts, which also served as authorized agencies for the extensive fur trade, La Salle's visits to Illinois and other Natives cemented the French policy of alliance with Natives in the common causes of containing both Iroquois influence and Anglo-American colonization. He also gave the name Louisiana (*La Louisiane*) to the interior North American territory he claimed for France, which lives on in the name of a U.S. state.

The *Encyclopædia Britannica* provides this summary of La Salle's achievements: "His claim of Louisiana for France, though but a vain boast at the time, pointed the way to the French colonial empire that was eventually built by other men".

Archaeology

In 1995, La Salle's primary ship *La Belle* was discovered in the muck of Matagorda Bay. It has been the subject of archeological research. A search of the wreck and surrounding area during 1996 to 1997 yielded numerous artifacts from the 17th century. Through an international treaty, the artifacts excavated from La Belle are owned by France and held in trust by the Texas Historical Commission. The collection is held by

the Corpus Christi Museum of Science and History. Artifacts from *La Belle* are shown at nine museums across Texas.

The wreckage of his ship *L'Aimable* has yet to be located. In 1998, The National Underwater and Marine Agency claimed that it had found the wreck in Matagorda Bay but the Texas Historical Commission stated that the wreck was much more recent.

The possible remains of *Le Griffon* were found in 1898 by lighthouse keeper Albert Cullis, on a beach on the western edge of Manitoulin Island in northern Lake Huron. Results of testing some of the artifacts were disputed. Many of the recovered artifacts were lost and the wreck was washed away in 1942. A possible shipwreck of *Le Griffon* near Poverty Island at the entrance to Green Bay in northern Lake Michigan was located by Steve Libert of the Great Lakes Exploration Group in 2001. The organization prevailed in a lawsuit against the state of Michigan over ownership of artifacts in 2012, and in 2013 was issued a permit to excavate the wreck. Only one artifact, a wood pole, was recovered, and it is indeterminate whether it was from a shipwreck. In 2019, the Discovery Channel featured the story of the ship; divers who were involved in the investigation were convinced that *Le Griffon* sank in the Mississagi Strait.

Historians debated the site of La Salle's "Fort St Louis" colony, which had been said to be near Lavaca Bay at Garcitas Creek, and was a significant part of the history of French colonization of Texas. A June 1996 dig at the site that was believed to be the correct location revealed eight French cannon. This led archeologists to excavate the Keeran Ranch site in the area,

during 1996–2002; they concluded that the Spanish Presidio La Bahía fort "was built on the La Salle settlement". Some 10 percent of the artifacts recovered are believed to have originated in France.

Place names

Many places, streets, parks, buildings and other things were named in La Salle's honor:

Counties and towns

- LaSalle, in Essex County, Ontario, south of Windsor on the Detroit River
- LaSalle, Quebec is a borough of the city of Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- LaSalle County, Illinois, the city of LaSalle and the La Salle Speedway within it.
- LaSalle Parish, Louisiana
- La Salle County, Texas

Parks and streets

- The LaSalle Expressway, a roadway through Niagara Falls, New York and its outer suburbs.
- LaSalle Street, a north-south thoroughfare in Chicago, leads directly to the Board of Trade, and is the center of Chicago's financial district.
- The La Salle Causeway, connecting Kingston, Ontario to neighbouringBarriefield, Ontario.
- *JardinCavelier de La Salle* in the *6ème arrondissement* in Paris

- La Salle Avenue, a downtown street in Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Avenue La Salle, located in Shawinigan, Quebec, Canada.
- La Salle Street in Navasota, Texas. It also contains a statue given by the local Robert Raines Chapter of the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution and the Texas Society Daughters of the American Revolution.
- Lasalle Road, an east-west road to the south of Sarnia, Ontario, Canada.
- LaSalle Avenue, a thoroughfare in South Bend, Indiana, which traverses the downtown area and carries a portion of U.S. Route 20 Business.
- LaSalle Boulevard and Cavelier Road in Marquette Heights, Illinois, near Fort Crèvecoeur
- La Salle Avenue in Waco, Texas.
- La Salles Landing Park on Irondequoit Creek in Penfield, NY
- La Salle Park in Burlington, Ontario
- Robert LaSalle County Park, Door County, Wisconsin.

Buildings and other

- LaSalleautomobile brand
- LaSalle-Peru Township High School in LaSalle, Illinois has the mascot of the Cavaliers (Cavs) and Lady Cavaliers (Lady Cavs).
- La Salle Hotel, Chicago
- LaSalle Hotel in downtown Bryan, Texas

- *Écolesecondairepublique De La Salle* in Ottawa, Ontario
- La Salle Secondary School in Kingston, Ontario

Chapter 41

King William's War

King William's War (1688–1697, also known as the **Second Indian War**, Father Baudoin's War, Castin's War, or the **First Intercolonial War** in French) was the North American theater of the Nine Years' War (1688–1697), also known as the War of the Grand Alliance or the War of the League of Augsburg. It was the first of six colonial wars (see the four French and Indian Wars, Father Rale's War and Father Le Loutre's War) fought between New France and New England along with their respective Native allies before France ceded its remaining mainland territories in North America east of the Mississippi River in 1763.

For King William's War, neither England nor France thought of weakening their position in Europe to support the war effort in North America. New France and the Wabanaki Confederacy were able to thwart New England expansion into Acadia, whose border New France defined as the Kennebec River in southern Maine. According to the terms of the 1697 Treaty of Ryswick that ended the Nine Years' War, the boundaries and outposts of New France, New England, and New York remained substantially unchanged.

The war was largely caused by the fact that the treaties and agreements that were reached at the end of King Philip's War (1675–1678) were not adhered to. In addition, the English were alarmed that the Indians were receiving French or maybe Dutch aid. The Indians preyed on the English and their fears,

by making it look as though they were with the French. The French were played as well, as they thought the Indians were working with the English. These occurrences, in addition to the fact that the English perceived the Indians as their subjects, despite the Indians' unwillingness to submit, eventually led to two conflicts, one of which was King William's War.

North America at the end of the 17th century

The English settlers were more than 154,000 at the beginning of the war, outnumbering the French 12 to 1. However, they were divided in multiple colonies along the Atlantic coast, which were unable to cooperate efficiently, and they were engulfed in the Glorious Revolution, creating tension among the colonists. In addition, the English lacked military leadership and had a difficult relationship with their Iroquois allies.

New France was divided into three entities: Acadia on the Atlantic coast; Canada along the Saint Lawrence River and up to the Great Lakes; and Louisiana from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, along the Mississippi River. The French population amounted to 14,000 in 1689. Although the French were vastly outnumbered, they were more politically unified and contained a disproportionate number of adult males with military backgrounds. Realizing their numerical inferiority, they developed good relationships with the indigenous peoples in order to multiply their forces and made effective use of hit-and-run tactics.

Causes of the war

England's Catholic King James II was deposed at the end of 1688 in the Glorious Revolution, after which Protestants William III and Mary II took the throne. William joined the League of Augsburg in its war against France (begun earlier in 1688), where James had fled.

In North America, there was significant tension between New France and the northern English colonies, which had in 1686 been united in the Dominion of New England. New England and the Iroquois Confederacy fought New France and the Wabanaki Confederacy. The Iroquois dominated the economically important Great Lakes fur trade and had been in conflict with New France since 1680. At the urging of New England, the Iroquois interrupted the trade between New France and the western tribes. In retaliation, New France raided Seneca lands of western New York. In turn, New England supported the Iroquois in attacking New France, which they did by raiding Lachine.

There were similar tensions on the border between New England and Acadia, which New France defined as the Kennebec River in southern Maine. English settlers from Massachusetts (whose charter included the Maine area) had expanded their settlements into Acadia. To secure New France's claim to present-day Maine, New France established Catholic missions among the three largest native villages in the region: one on the Kennebec River (Norridgewock); one further north on the Penobscot River (Penobscot) and one on the Saint John River (Medoctec). For their part, in response to King Philip's War, the five Indian tribes in the region of Acadia

created the Wabanaki Confederacy to form a political and military alliance with New France to stop the New England expansion.

Course of war

New England, Acadia and Newfoundland Theatre

The New England, Acadia and Newfoundland Theatre of the war is also known as Castin's War and Father Jean Baudoin's War.

In April 1688, Governor Andros plundered Castine's home and village on Penobscot Bay (Castine, Maine). Later in August, the English raided the French village of Chedabouctou. In response, Castin and the Wabanaki Confederacy engaged in the Northeast Coast Campaign of 1688 along the New England/Acadia border. They began August 13, 1688, at New Dartmouth (Newcastle), killing a few settlers. A few days later they killed two people at Yarmouth in the first battle. At Kennebunk, in the fall of 1688, members of the Confederacy killed two families.

The following spring, in June 1689, several hundred Abenaki and Pennacook Indians under the command of Kancamagus and Mesandowit raided Dover, New Hampshire, killing more than 20 and taking 29 captives, who were sold into captivity in New France. In June, they killed four men at Saco. In response to these raids, a company of 24 men was raised to search for the bodies and pursue the natives. They were forced to return after they lost a quarter of their men in conflicts with the natives.

In August 1689, Jean-Vincent d'Abbadie de Saint-Castin and Father Louis-Pierre Thury led an Abenaki war party that captured and destroyed the fort at Pemaquid (in present-day Bristol, Maine).

The fall of Pemaquid was a significant setback to the English. It pushed the frontier back to Casco (Falmouth), Maine.

New England retaliated for these raids by sending Major Benjamin Church to raid Acadia. During King William's War, Church led four New England raiding parties into Acadia (which included most of Maine) against the Acadians and members of the Wabanaki Confederacy.

On the first expedition into Acadia, on September 21, 1689, Church and 250 troops defended a group of English settlers trying to establish themselves at Falmouth (present-day Portland, Maine).

The tribes of the Wabanaki Confederacy killed 21 of his men, but Church's defense was successful and the natives retreated. Church then returned to Boston, leaving the small group of English settlers unprotected.

The following spring over 400 French and native troops, under the leadership of Castin, destroyed Salmon Falls (present-day Berwick, Maine), then returned to Falmouth and massacred all the English settlers in the Battle of Fort Loyal. When Church returned to the village later that summer he buried the dead. The fall of Fort Loyal (Casco) led to the near depopulation of Maine. Native forces were then able to attack New Hampshire frontier without reprisal.

Battle of Port Royal (1690)

The New Englanders, led by Sir William Phips, retaliated by attacking Port Royal, the capital of Acadia. The Battle of Port Royal began on May 9, 1690. Phips arrived with 736 New England men in seven English ships. Governor de Meneval fought for two days and then capitulated. The garrison was imprisoned in the church, and Governor de Meneval was confined to his house. The New Englanders levelled what was begun of the new fort. The residents of Port Royal were imprisoned in the church and administered an oath of allegiance to the King.

Phips left, but warships from New York City arrived in June, which resulted in more destruction. The seamen burned and looted the settlement, including the parish church. The New Englanders left again, and Villebon, the governor of Acadia, moved the capital to safer territory inland at Fort Nashwaak (present-day Fredericton, New Brunswick). Fort Nashwaak remained the capital until after the war, when Port Royal was restored as the capital in 1699.

In Church's second expedition to Acadia, he arrived with 300 men at Casco Bay on 11 September 1690. His mission was to relieve the English Fort Pejpescot (present-day Brunswick, Maine), which had been taken by the Wabanaki Confederacy. He went up the Androscoggin River to Fort Pejepscot. From there he went 40 miles (64 km) upriver to Livermore Falls and attacked a native village. Church's men shot three or four native men when they were retreating. Church discovered five English captives in the wigwams. Church butchered six or seven natives and took nine prisoners. A few days later, in

retaliation, the members of the Wabanaki Confederacy attacked Church at Cape Elizabeth on Purpooduc Point, killing seven of his men and wounding 24 others. On September 26, Church returned to Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

During King William's War, when the town of Wells contained about 80 houses and log cabins strung along the Post Road, it was attacked on June 9, 1691, by about 200 Native Americans commanded by the sachem Moxus. But Captain James Converse and his militia successfully defended Lieutenant Joseph Storer's garrison, which was surrounded by a gated palisade. Another sachem, Madockawando, threatened to return the next year "and have the dog Converse out of his den".

As the natives withdrew, they went to York off Cape Neddick and boarded a vessel, killing most of the crew. They also burned a hamlet.

In early 1692, an estimated 150 Abenakis commanded by officers of New France returned to York, killing about 100 of the English settlers and burning down buildings in what would become known as the Candlemas Massacre.

Church's third expedition to Acadia during the war was in 1692 when he raided Penobscot (present-day Indian Island, Maine) with 450 men. Church and his men then went on to raid Taconock (Winslow, Maine).

In 1693, New England frigates attacked Port Royal again, burning almost a dozen houses and three barns full of grain.

On July 18, 1694, French soldier Claude-Sébastien de Villieu with about 250 Abenakis from Norridgewock under command of their sagamore (paramount chief) Bomazeen (or Bomoseen) raided the English settlement of Durham, New Hampshire, in the Oyster River Massacre. In all, the French and native force killed 45 inhabitants and took 49 captive, burning half the dwellings, including five garrisons. They also destroyed crops and killed livestock, causing famine and destitution for the survivors.

Siege of Pemaquid (1696)

In 1696, New France and the tribes of the Wabanaki Confederacy, led by St. Castine and Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville, returned and fought a naval battle in the Bay of Fundy before moving on to raid Pemaquid.

After the Siege of Pemaquid, d'Iberville led a force of 124 Canadians, Acadians, Mi'kmaq and Abenakis in the Avalon Peninsula Campaign. They destroyed almost every English settlement in Newfoundland, over 100 English were killed, many times that number captured, and almost 500 deported to England or France.

In retaliation, Church went on his fourth expedition to Acadia and carried out a retaliatory raid against Acadian communities on the Isthmus of Chignecto and Fort Nashwack (present-day Fredericton, New Brunswick), which was then the capital of Acadia. He led his troops personally in killing inhabitants of Chignecto, looting their household goods, burning their houses and slaughtering the livestock.

Quebec and New York Theatre

- Also in August 1689, 1,500 Iroquois, seeking revenge for Governor General Denonville's actions, attacked the French settlement at Lachine. Count Frontenac, who replaced Denonville as governor general, later attacked the Iroquois village of Onondaga. New France and its Indian allies then attacked English frontier settlements in early 1690, most notably at Schenectady in New York.

This was followed by two expeditions. One, on land under Connecticut provincial militia general Fitz-John Winthrop, targeted Montreal; the other, led by Sir William Phips, targeted Quebec.

Winthrop's expedition failed due to disease and supply issues, and Phips was defeated in the Battle of Quebec. The Quebec and Port Royal expeditions were the only major New England offensives of King William's War; for the remainder of the war the English colonists were primarily engaged in defensive operations, skirmishes and retaliatory raids.

The Iroquois Five Nations suffered from the weakness of their English allies. In 1693 and 1696, the French and their Indian allies ravaged Iroquois towns and destroyed crops while New York colonists remained passive. After the English and French made peace in 1697, the Iroquois, now abandoned by the English colonists, remained at war with New France until 1701, when a peace was agreed at Montreal between New France and a large number of Iroquois and other tribes.

Hudson Bay Theatre

The war also served as a backdrop for an ongoing economic war between French and English interests in Arctic North America. The Hudson's Bay Company had established trading outposts on James Bay and the southern reaches of Hudson Bay by the early 1680s. In a series of raids, beginning with the so-called Hudson Bay expedition, organized by Governor Denonville and continuing through the time of the Nine Years' War (1688-1697), most of these outposts, including Moose Factory, York Factory and Fort Albany, were taken by French raiders, primarily led by Pierre Le Moyne d'Iberville.

But the French forces were small, and their hold on the captured posts quite weak — York Factory was recaptured by the English in 1695. In 1697, in the Battle of Hudson's Bay, one of the war's major naval battles, d'Iberville, with a single ship, defeated three English ships and went on to again capture York Factory.

Aftermath

The Treaty of Ryswick signed in September 1697 ended the war between the two colonial powers, reverting the colonial borders to the *status quo ante bellum*. The peace did not last long; and within five years, the colonies were embroiled in the next phase of the colonial wars, Queen Anne's War. After their settlement with France in 1701, the Iroquois remained neutral in that conflict, never taking part in active hostilities against either side. Tensions remained high between the English and the tribes of the Wabanaki Confederacy, who again fought with the

French in Queen Anne's War, with conflict characterized by frequent raids in Massachusetts, including one on Groton in 1694, in which children were kidnapped, and the Deerfield Massacre in 1704, in which more than 100 captives were taken north to Montreal for ransom or adoption by Mohawk and French. By the end of the war, natives were successful in killing more than 700 English and capturing over 250 along the Acadia/ New England border.

The Ryswick treaty was unsatisfactory to representatives of the Hudson's Bay Company. Since most of its trading posts in Hudson Bay had been lost to the French before the war began, the rule of *status quo ante bellum* meant that they remained under French control. The company recovered its territories at the negotiating table when the Treaty of Utrecht ended Queen Anne's War.

Scholars debate whether the war was a contributing factor to the Salem witch trials. King William's War as well as King Philip's War (1675–78) led to the displacement of many refugees in Essex County. The refugees carried with them fears of the Indians, which is debated to have led to fears of witchcraft, especially since the devil was arguably closely associated with Indians and magic. Of course, Cotton Mather also wrote that it was going to lead to an age of sorrow and is arguably a proponent in leading Salem into the witchcraft crisis of 1692. Scholars debate this theory and one scholar, Jenny Hale Pulsipher, maintains that King William's War was more of a cause. Other scholars that have written on the theory of the wars being a leading cause of the Salem Witchcraft Trials include Mary Beth Norton, James Kences, and Emerson Baker.

Chapter 42

Glorious Revolution

The **Glorious Revolution** of November 1688 (Irish: *An Réabhlóid Ghlórmhar*; Scottish Gaelic: *Rèabhlaid Ghlòrmhor*; Welsh: *Chwyldro Gogoneddus*), also known as the *Glorieuze Overtocht* or **Glorious Crossing** by the Dutch, was the deposition of James II and VII, king of England, Scotland and Ireland and replacement by his daughter Mary II and her husband, William III of Orange, stadtholder and de facto ruler of the Dutch Republic. A term first used by John Hampden in late 1689, historian Jeremy Black suggests it can be seen as both the last successful invasion of England and also an internal coup.

Despite his Catholicism, James became king in February 1685 with widespread support as many feared his exclusion would lead to a repetition of the 1638–1651 Wars of the Three Kingdoms. Over the next three years, he alienated his supporters by suspending the Scottish and English Parliaments in 1685 and ruling by personal decree. Despite this, it was considered a short-term issue, as James was 52, and since his second marriage was childless after 11 years, the heir presumptive was his Protestant daughter Mary.

Two events in June 1688 turned dissent into a political crisis. The first was the birth of James Francis Edward on 10 June, displacing Mary as heir which created the prospect of a Catholic dynasty. The second was the prosecution of the Seven Bishops on 15 June; one in a series of perceived assaults on

the Church of England, their acquittal on 30th sparked anti-Catholic riots and destroyed James's political authority. The combination convinced a broad coalition of English politicians to issue an Invitation to William, inviting him to secure the English throne for his wife Mary.

With Louis XIV of France preparing to attack the Dutch, William viewed this as an opportunity to secure English resources for the Nine Years' War, which began in September 1688. On 5 November, he landed in Brixham in Torbay with 14,000 men. As he advanced on London, most of the 30,000-strong Royal Army joined him. James went into exile on 23 December and in April 1689, Parliament made William and Mary joint monarchs of England and Ireland. A separate but similar Scottish settlement was made in June.

While the Revolution itself was quick and relatively bloodless, pro-Stuart revolts in Scotland and Ireland caused significant casualties. Although Jacobitism persisted into the late 18th century, the Revolution ended a century of political dispute by confirming the primacy of Parliament over the Crown, a principle established in the Bill of Rights 1689. Restrictions on Catholics contained in the 1678 and 1681 English and Scottish Test Acts remained in force until 1828; while religious prohibitions on the monarch's choice of spouse were removed in 2015, those applying to the monarch remain.

Background

Despite his Catholicism, James became king in 1685 with widespread support, as demonstrated by the rapid defeat of the Argyll and Monmouth Rebellions; less than four years later, he

was forced into exile. Often seen as an exclusively English event, modern historians argue James failed to appreciate the extent to which Royal power relied on support from the county gentry, the vast majority of whom were members of the Protestant Church of England and Scottish kirk. Although willing to accept his personal Catholicism, his policies of "tolerance" and the methods used to overcome opposition ultimately alienated his supporters in England and Scotland, while destabilising Catholic-majority Ireland.

Stuart political ideology derived from James VI and I, who in 1603 created a vision of a centralised state, run by a monarch whose authority came from God, and where the function of Parliament was simply to obey. Disputes over the relationship between king and Parliament led to the War of the Three Kingdoms and continued after the 1660 Stuart Restoration. Charles II came to rely on the Royal Prerogative since measures passed in this way could be withdrawn when he decided, rather than Parliament. However, it could not be used for major legislation or taxation.

Concern that James intended to create an absolute monarchy led to the 1679 to 1681 Exclusion Crisis, dividing the English political class into those who wanted to 'exclude' him from the throne, mostly Whigs, and their opponents, mostly Tories. However, in 1685 many Whigs feared the consequences of bypassing the 'natural heir', while Tories were often strongly anti-Catholic and their support assumed the continued primacy of the Church of England. Most importantly, it was seen as a short-term issue; James was 52, his marriage to Mary of Modena remained childless after 11 years, and the heirs were his Protestant daughters, Mary and Anne.

There was much greater sympathy in Scotland for a 'Stuart heir', and the 1681 Succession Act confirmed the duty of all to support him, 'regardless of religion.' Unlike England, over 95 percent of Scots belonged to the Church of Scotland, or kirk; even other Protestant sects were banned, and by 1680, Catholics were a tiny minority confined to parts of the aristocracy and the remote Highlands. Episcopalians had regained control of the kirk in 1660, leading to a series of Presbyterian uprisings, but the bitter religious conflicts of the civil war period meant the majority preferred stability.

In England and Scotland, most of those who backed James in 1685 wanted to retain existing political and religious arrangements, but this was not the case in Ireland. While he was guaranteed support from the Catholic majority, James was also popular among Irish Protestants. The Church of Ireland depended on the Crown for its survival, while Ulster was dominated by Presbyterians who supported his tolerance policies. However, religion was only one factor; of equal concern for Catholics were laws barring them from serving in the military or holding public office, and land reform. In 1600, 90% of Irish land was owned by Catholics but following a series of confiscation during the 17th century, this had dropped to 22% in 1685. Catholic and Protestant merchants in Dublin and elsewhere objected to commercial restrictions placing them at a disadvantage to their English competitors.

The political background in England

While James' supporters viewed hereditary succession as more important than his personal Catholicism, they opposed its extension into public life; from the start, opposition to his

religious policies was led by devout Anglicans. In an age when oaths were seen as fundamental to a stable society, he had sworn to uphold the supremacy of the Church of England, a commitment viewed by many as incompatible with 'Tolerance'. In demanding Parliament approve these measures, James was not only breaking his own word but requiring others to do the same; they refused to comply, despite being "the most Loyal Parliament a Stuart ever had".

Although historians generally accept James wished to promote Catholicism, not establish an Absolute monarchy, his stubborn and inflexible reaction to opposition had the same result. When the English and Scottish Parliaments refused to repeal the 1678 and 1681 Test Acts, he suspended them in November 1685 and ruled by decree. Attempts to form a 'King's party' of Catholics, English Dissenters and dissident Scottish Presbyterians was politically short-sighted, since it rewarded those who joined the 1685 rebellions and undermined his supporters.

Demanding tolerance for Catholics was also badly timed. In October 1685 Louis XIV of France issued the Edict of Fontainebleau revoking the Edict of Nantes (1598) which had granted French Protestants the right to practise their religion; over the next four years, an estimated 200,000 to 400,000 went into exile, 40,000 of whom settled in London.

Combined with Louis' expansionist policies and the killing of 2,000 Vaudois Protestants in 1686, it led to fears Protestant Europe was threatened by a Catholic counter-reformation. These concerns were reinforced by events in Ireland; the Lord Deputy, the Earl of Tyrconnell, wanted to create a Catholic

establishment able to survive James' death, which meant replacing Protestant officials at a pace that was inherently destabilising.

Timeline of events: 1686 to 1688

The majority of those who backed James in 1685 did so because they wanted stability and the rule of law, qualities frequently undermined by his actions. After suspending Parliament in November 1685, he sought to rule by decree; although the principle was not disputed, the widening of its scope caused considerable concern, particularly when judges who disagreed with its application were dismissed. He then alienated many by perceived attacks on the established church; Henry Compton, Bishop of London, was suspended for refusing to ban John Sharp from preaching after he gave an anti-Catholic sermon.

He often made things worse by political clumsiness; to general fury, the Ecclesiastical Commission of 1686 established to discipline the Church of England included suspected Catholics like the Earl of Huntingdon. This was combined with an inability to accept opposition; in April 1687, he ordered Magdalen College,

Oxford to elect a Catholic sympathiser named Anthony Farmer as president, but as he was ineligible under the college statutes, the fellows elected John Hough instead. Both Farmer and Hough withdrew in favour of another candidate selected by James, who then demanded the fellows personally apologise on their knees for 'defying' him; when they refused, they were replaced by Catholics.

Attempts to create an alternative 'Kings Party' were never likely to succeed since English Catholics were only 1.1% of the population and Nonconformists 4.4%. Both groups were divided; since private worship was generally tolerated, Catholic moderates feared greater visibility would provoke a backlash. Among Nonconformists, while Quakers and Congregationalists supported repeal of the Test Acts, the majority wanted to amend the 1662 Act of Uniformity and be allowed back into the Church of England. When James ensured the election of the Presbyterian Sir John Shorter as Lord Mayor of London in 1687, he insisted on complying with the Test Act, reportedly due to a 'distrust of the King's favour...thus encouraging that which His Majesties whole Endeavours were intended to disannull.'

To ensure a compliant Parliament, James required potential MPs to be approved by their local Lord Lieutenant; eligibility for both offices required positive answers in writing to the 'Three Questions', one being a commitment to repeal of the Test Act. In addition, local government and town corporations were purged to create an obedient electoral machine, further alienating the county gentry who had formed the majority of those who backed James in 1685. On 24 August 1688, writs were issued for a general election.

The expansion of the military caused great concern, particularly in England and Scotland, where memories of the civil war left huge resistance to standing armies. In Ireland, Talbot replaced Protestant officers with Catholics; James did the same in England, while basing the troops at Hounslow appeared a deliberate attempt to overawe Parliament. In April 1688, he ordered his Declaration of Indulgence read in every

church; when the Archbishop of Canterbury and six other bishops refused, they were charged with seditious libel and confined in the Tower of London. In June, two events turned dissent into a crisis; the birth of James Francis Edward Stuart on June 10th created the prospect of a Catholic dynasty, while the acquittal of the Seven Bishops on June 30th destroyed James' political authority.

Dutch intervention

Prelude: 1685 to June 1688

In 1677, James' elder daughter and heir Mary married her Protestant cousin William of Orange, stadtholder of the main provinces of the Dutch Republic. The two initially shared common objectives in wanting Mary to succeed her father, while French ambitions in the Spanish Netherlands threatened both English and Dutch trade. Although William sent James troops to help suppress the 1685 Monmouth Rebellion, their relationship deteriorated thereafter.

The Franco-Dutch War, continued French expansion and expulsion of the Huguenots meant William assumed another war was inevitable, and although the States General of the Netherlands preferred peace, the majority accepted he was correct. This view was widely shared throughout Protestant Europe; in October 1685, Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg renounced his French alliance for one with the Dutch. In July 1686, other Protestant states formed the anti-French League of Augsburg, with Dutch support; securing or neutralising English resources, especially the Royal Navy, now became key to both sides.

Following a skirmish between French and Dutch naval vessels in July 1686, William concluded English neutrality was not enough and he needed their active support in the event of war. His relationship with James was affected by the fact both men relied on advisors with relatively limited views; in William's case, mainly English and Scots Presbyterian exiles, the latter with close links to the Protestant minority in Ireland, who saw Tyrconnell's policies as a threat to their existence. Having largely alienated his Tory support base, James depended on a small circle of Catholic converts like Sunderland, Melfort and Perth.

Suspicions increased when James sought William's backing for repealing the Test Acts; he predictably refused, further damaging their relationship. Having previously assumed he was guaranteed English support in a war with France, William now worried he might face an Anglo-French alliance, despite assurances by James he had no intention of doing so. Historians argue these were genuine, but James did not appreciate the distrust caused by his domestic policies. In August 1687, William's cousin de Zuylestein travelled to England with condolences on the death of Mary of Modena's mother, allowing him to make contact with the political opposition. Throughout 1688, his English supporters provided William detailed information on public opinion and developments, very little of which was intercepted.

In October 1687, after fourteen years of marriage and multiple miscarriages, it was announced the Queen was pregnant, Melfort immediately declaring it was a boy. When James then wrote to Mary urging her to convert to Catholicism, it convinced many he was seeking a Catholic heir, one way or the

other and may have been a deciding factor in whether to invade. Early in 1688, a pamphlet circulated in England written by Dutch Grand Pensionary Gaspar Fagel; this guaranteed William's support for freedom of worship for Dissenters *and* retaining the Test Acts, unlike James who offered tolerance in return for repeal.

In April 1688, Louis XIV announced tariffs on Dutch herring imports, along with plans to support the Royal Navy in the English Channel. James immediately denied making any such request, but fearing it was the prelude to a formal alliance, the Dutch began preparing a military intervention. On the pretext of needing additional resources to deal with French privateers, in July the States General authorised an additional 9,000 sailors and 21 new warships.

Invitation to William

English support was vital for a successful invasion, and at the end of April William met with Edward Russell, who was acting as unofficial envoy for the Whig opposition. In a conversation recorded by the exiled Gilbert Burnet, he asked for a formal invitation from key leaders asking him to "rescue the nation and the religion", with a projected date of end September. William later claimed he was 'forced' to take control of the conspiracy when Russell warned him the English would rise against James even without his help and he feared this would lead to a republic, depriving his wife of her inheritance. This version is disputed, but in June he sent Zuylestein to England once again, ostensibly to congratulate James on his new son, in reality to co-ordinate with his supporters.

The birth of the Prince of Wales and prospect of a Catholic successor ended the 'wait for better times' policy advocated by those like Halifax. This led to the production of the Invitation to William, signed by seven representatives from the key constituencies whose support William needed in order to commit to an invasion. They included the land magnates Danby and Devonshire, one a Whig, one a Tory; Henry Compton, Bishop of London, for the church; Shrewsbury and Lumley the army, and finally Russell and Sydney for the navy.

Intended for public consumption, the Invitation was drafted by Sidney, later described as "the great wheel on which the Revolution rolled". It claimed "nineteen parts of twenty...throughout the kingdom desired a change", that "much the greatest part of the nobility and gentry" were dissatisfied, that the army was divided, while "very many of the common soldiers do daily shew such an aversion to the Popish religion, that there is the greatest probability imaginable of great numbers of deserters ... and amongst the seamen...there is not one in ten who would do them any service in such a war". They promised to rally to William upon his landing in England and to "do all that lies in our power to prepare others to be in as much readiness as such an action is capable of"; finally, they stressed the importance of acting quickly.

On 30 June, the same day the bishops were acquitted, the Invitation was carried to The Hague by Rear Admiral Herbert, disguised as a common sailor. Meanwhile, William's confidante Willem Bentinck launched a propaganda campaign in England; in numerous pamphlets, William was presented as a true Stuart, but unlike James and his brother Charles, one free from the vices of crypto-Catholicism, absolutism, and

debauchery. Much of the "spontaneous" support for William on his landing was organised by Bentinck and his agents.

Dutch preparations: July to September 1688

William's key strategic purpose was containing French expansion, an objective not shared by the majority of his English supporters. In 1672, an alliance with the Electorate of Cologne enabled France to bypass Dutch forward defences and nearly over-run the Republic, so ensuring an anti-French ruler was vital to prevent a repetition.

As an ecclesiastical principality of the Holy Roman Empire, Cologne's ruler was nominated by Pope Innocent XI, in conjunction with Emperor Leopold. Both Louis and James were in dispute with Innocent over the right to appoint Catholic bishops and clergy; when the old Elector died in June 1688, Innocent and Leopold ignored the French candidate in favour of Joseph Clemens of Bavaria.

After 1678, France continued its expansion into the Rhineland, including the 1683 to 1684 War of the Reunions, demands in the Palatinate and construction of forts at Landau and Traben-Trarbach. This presented an existential threat to Habsburg dominance, guaranteeing Leopold's support for the Dutch, and negating French attempts to build German alliances. William's envoy Johann von Görtz assured Leopold English Catholics would not be persecuted and intervention was to elect a free Parliament, not depose James, a convenient fiction that allowed him to remain neutral.

Although his English supporters considered a token force sufficient, William assembled 260 transport ships and 14,000 men, nearly half the 30,000 strong Dutch States Army. With France on the verge of war, their absence was of great concern to the States General and Bentinck hired 13,616 German mercenaries to man Dutch border fortresses, freeing elite units like the Scots Brigade for use in England. The increase could be presented as a limited precaution against French aggression, as the Dutch would typically double or triple their army strength in wartime; William instructed his experienced deputy Schomberg to prepare for a campaign in Germany.

Decision to invade

At the beginning of September, an invasion remained in the balance, with the States General fearing a French attack via Flanders while their army was in England. However, the surrender of Belgrade on 6 September seemed to presage an Ottoman collapse and release Austrian resources for use in Germany. Hoping to act before Leopold could respond and relieve pressure on the Ottomans, Louis attacked Philippsburg. With France now committed in Germany, this greatly reduced the threat to the Dutch.

Instead, Louis attempted to intimidate the States General, and on 9 September, his envoy D'Avaux handed them two letters. The first warned an attack on James meant war with France, the second any interference with French operations in Germany would end with the destruction of the Dutch state. Both misfired; convinced Louis was trying to drag him into war, James told the Dutch there was no secret Anglo-French alliance against them, although his denials only increased

their suspicions. By confirming France's primary objective was the Rhineland, the second allowed William to move troops from the eastern border to the coast, even though most of the new mercenaries had yet to arrive.

On 22 September, the French seized over 100 Dutch ships, many owned by Amsterdam merchants; in response, on 26 September the Amsterdam City Council agreed to back William. This was a significant decision since the Council dominated the States of Holland, the most powerful political body in the Dutch Republic which contributed nearly 60% of its budget. French troops entered the Rhineland on 27 September and in a secret session held on 29th, William argued for a pre-emptive strike, as Louis and James would "attempt to bring this state to its ultimate ruin and subjugation, as soon as they find the occasion". This was accepted by the States, with the objective left deliberately vague, other than making the English "King and Nation live in a good relation, and useful to their friends and allies, and especially to this State".

Following their approval, the Amsterdam financial market raised a loan of four million guilders in only three days, with further financing coming from various sources, including two million guilders from the banker Francisco Lopes Suasso.

The biggest concern for Holland was the potential impact on the Dutch economy and politics of William becoming ruler of England; the claim he had no intention of "removing the King from the throne" was not believed. These fears were arguably justified; William's access to English resources permanently diminished Amsterdam's power within the Republic and its status as the world's leading commercial and financial centre.

English defensive strategy

Neither James nor Sunderland trusted Louis, correctly suspecting his support would continue only so long as it coincided with French interests, while Mary of Modena claimed his warnings were simply an attempt to drag England into an unwanted alliance. As a former naval commander, James appreciated the difficulties of a successful invasion, even in good weather, and as they moved into autumn the likelihood seemed to diminish. With the Dutch on the verge of war with France, he did not believe the States General would allow William to make the attempt; if they did, his army and navy were strong enough to defeat it.

Reasonable in theory, his reliance on the loyalty and efficiency of the military proved deeply flawed. Both remained overwhelmingly Protestant and anti-Catholic; in July, only personal intervention by James prevented a naval mutiny when a Catholic captain held Mass on his ship. The transfer of 2,500 Catholics from the Royal Irish Army to England in September led to clashes with Protestant troops, some of his most reliable units refused to obey orders, and many of their officers resigned.

When James demanded the repatriation of all six regiments of the Scots Brigade in January 1688, William refused but used the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 44 soldiers. Some may have been Williamite agents, such as Colonel Belasyse, a Protestant with over 15 years of service who returned to his family estates in Yorkshire and made contact with Danby. The promotion of Catholic former Brigade officers like Thomas Buchan and Alexander

Cannon to command positions led to the formation of the Association of Protestant Officers, which included senior veterans like Charles Trelawny, Churchill and Percy Kirke.

On 14 August, Churchill offered their support to William, helping convince him it was safe to risk an invasion; although James was aware of the conspiracy, he took no action. One reason may have been fears over the impact on the army; with a notional strength of 34,000, it looked impressive on paper but morale was brittle while many were untrained or lacked weapons. It also had to fill policing roles previously delegated to the militia, which had been deliberately allowed to decay; most of the 4,000 regular troops brought from Scotland in October had to be stationed in London to keep order. In October, attempts were made to restore the militia but many members were reportedly so angry at the changes made to local corporations, James was advised it was better not to raise them.

Widespread discontent and growing hostility to the Stuart regime was particularly apparent in North-East and South-West England, the two landing places identified by William. A Tory whose brother Jonathan was one of the Seven Bishops, Trelawny's commitment confirmed support from a powerful and well-connected West Country bloc, allowing access to the ports of Plymouth and Torbay. In the north, a force organised by Belasyse and Danby prepared to seize York, its most important city, and Hull, its largest port.

Herbert had been replaced by Dartmouth as commander of the fleet when he defected in June but many captains owed him their appointments and were of doubtful loyalty. Dartmouth

suspected Berkeley and Grafton of plotting to overthrow him; to monitor them, he placed their ships next to his and minimised contact between the other vessels to prevent conspiracy. Lack of funds meant exclusive of fireships and light scouting vessels, only 16 warships available in early October, all third rates or fourth rates, short of both men and supplies.

While The Downs was the best place to intercept a cross-Channel attack, it was also vulnerable to a surprise assault, even for ships fully manned and adequately provisioned. Instead,

James placed his ships in a strong defensive position near Chatham Dockyard, believing the Dutch would seek to establish naval superiority before committing to a landing. While this had been the original plan, winter storms meant conditions deteriorated rapidly for those on the transports; William therefore decided to sail in convoy and avoid battle. The easterly winds that allowed the Dutch to cross prevented the Royal Navy leaving the Thames estuary and intervening.

The English fleet was outnumbered 2:1, undermanned, short of supplies and in the wrong place. Key landing locations in the South-West and Yorkshire had been secured by sympathisers, while both army and navy were led by officers whose loyalty was questionable. Even early in 1686, foreign observers doubted the military would fight for James against a Protestant heir and William claimed only to be securing the inheritance of his wife Mary. While still a dangerous undertaking, the invasion was less risky than it seemed.

Invasion

Embarkation of the army and the Declaration of The Hague

The Dutch preparations, though carried out with great speed, could not remain secret. The English envoy Ignatius White, the Marquessd'Albeville, warned his country: "an absolute conquest is intended under the specious and ordinary pretences of religion, liberty, property and a free Parliament". Louis threatened an immediate declaration of war if William proceeded and sent James 300,000 livres.

Embarkations, started on 22 September (Gregorian calendar), had been completed on 8 October, and the expedition was that day openly approved by the States of Holland; the same day James issued a proclamation to the English nation that it should prepare for a Dutch invasion to ward off conquest. On 30 September/10 October (Julian/Gregorian calendars) William issued the *Declaration of The Hague* (actually written by Fagel), of which 60,000 copies of the English translation by Gilbert Burnet were distributed after the landing in England, in which he assured that his only aim was to maintain the Protestant religion, install a free parliament and investigate the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James. William declared:

It is both certain and evident to all men, that the public peace and happiness of any state or kingdom cannot be preserved, where the Laws, Liberties, and Customs, established by the lawful authority in it, are openly transgressed and annulled; more especially where the alteration of Religion is

endeavoured, and that a religion, which is contrary to law, is endeavoured to be introduced; upon which those who are most immediately concerned in it are indispensably bound to endeavour to preserve and maintain the established Laws, Liberties and customs, and, above all, the Religion and Worship of God, that is established among them; and to take such an effectual care, that the inhabitants of the said state or kingdom may neither be deprived of their Religion, nor of their Civil Rights.

- — *William of Orange.*

William went on to condemn James's advisers for overturning the religion, laws, and liberties of England, Scotland, and Ireland by the use of the suspending and dispensing power; the establishment of the "manifestly illegal" commission for ecclesiastical causes and its use to suspend the Bishop of London and to remove the Fellows of Magdalen College, Oxford. William also condemned James's attempt to repeal the Test Acts and the penal laws through pressuring individuals and waging an assault on parliamentary boroughs, as well as his purging of the judiciary. James's attempt to pack Parliament was in danger of removing "the last and great remedy for all those evils". "Therefore", William continued, "we have thought fit to go over to England, and to carry over with us a force sufficient, by the blessing of God, to defend us from the violence of those evil Counsellors ... this our Expedition is intended for no other design, but to have, a free and lawful Parliament assembled as soon as is possible".

On 4/14 October, William responded to the allegations by James in a second declaration, denying any intention to

become king or to conquer England. Whether he had intention any, at that moment, is still controversial.

The swiftness of the embarkations surprised all foreign observers. Louis had in fact delayed his threats against the Dutch until early September because he assumed it then would be too late in the season to set the expedition in motion anyway, if their reaction proved negative; typically such an enterprise would take at least some months. Being ready after the last week of September / first week of October would normally have meant that the Dutch could have profited from the last spell of good weather, as the autumn storms tend to begin in the third week of that month. However, this year they came early. For three weeks, the invasion fleet was prevented by adverse south-westerly gales from departing from the naval port of Hellevoetsluis and Catholics all over the Netherlands and the British kingdoms held prayer sessions that this "popish wind" might endure. However, on 14/24 October, it became the famous "Protestant Wind" by turning to the east.

Crossing and landing

The invasion was officially a private affair, with the States General allowing William use of the Dutch army and fleet. For propaganda purposes, English admiral Arthur Herbert was nominally in command, but in reality operational control remained with Lieutenant-Admiral CornelisEvertsen the Youngest and Vice-Admiral Philips van Almonde. Accompanied by Willem BastiaenszSchepers, the Rotterdam shipping magnate who organised the transport fleet, William boarded the frigate *Den Briel* on 16/26 October.

The invasion fleet consisted of 463 ships and 40,000 men on board, roughly twice the size of the Spanish Armada, with 49 warships, 76 transports carrying soldiers and 120 for the five thousand horses required by the cavalry and supply train. Having departed on 19/29 October, the expedition was halfway across the North Sea when it was scattered by a gale, forcing the *Brill* back to Hellevoetsluis on 21/31 October. William refused to go ashore and the fleet reassembled, having lost only one ship but nearly a thousand horses; press reports deliberately exaggerated the damage and claimed the expedition would be postponed till the spring.

Dartmouth and his senior commanders considered blockading Hellevoetsluis but decided against it, partly because the stormy weather made it dangerous but also because they could not rely on their men. William replaced his losses and departed when the wind changed on 1/11 November, this time heading for Harwich where Bentinck had prepared a landing site. It has been suggested this was a feint to divert some of Dartmouth's ships north, which proved to be the case and when the wind shifted again, the Dutch fleet sailed south into the Strait of Dover. In doing so they twice passed the English fleet, which was unable to intercept because of the adverse winds and tides.

On 3/13 November, the invasion fleet entered the English Channel in an enormous formation 25 ships deep, the troops lined up on deck, firing musket volleys, colours flying and military bands playing. Intended to awe observers with its size and power, Rapin de Thoyras later described it as "the most magnificent and affecting spectacle...ever seen by human eyes". The same wind blowing the Dutch down the Channel

kept Dartmouth confined in the Thames estuary; by the time he was able to make his way out, he was too far behind to stop William reaching Torbay on 5 November.

As anticipated, the French fleet remained in the Mediterranean, in order to support an attack on the Papal States if needed, while a south-westerly gale now forced Dartmouth to shelter in Portsmouth harbour and kept him there for two days, allowing William to complete his disembarkation undisturbed. His army totalled around 15,000 men, consisting of 11,212 infantry, among them nearly 5,000 members of the elite Anglo-Scots Brigade and Dutch Blue Guards, 3,660 cavalry and an artillery train of twenty-one 24-pounder cannon. He also brought weapons to equip 20,000 men, although he preferred deserters from the Royal Army and most of the 12,000 local volunteers who joined by 20 November were told to go home.

The collapse of James's rule

Panicked by the prospect of invasion, James met with the bishops on 28 September, offering concessions; five days later they presented demands returning the religious position to that of February 1685 and calling a free Parliament. They hoped this would be enough for James to remain king but there was little chance of this; at a minimum, James would have to disinherit his son, enforce the Test Acts and accept the supremacy of Parliament, all of which were unacceptable. By now his Whig opponents did not trust him to keep his promises, while Tories like Danby were too committed to William to escape punishment.

While his veterans were more than capable of defeating the Royal Army, William and his English supporters wanted to avoid bloodshed and allow the regime to collapse on its own. Landing in Torbay provided space and time for this, while heavy rainfall forced a slow advance regardless and to avoid alienating the local population by looting, his troops were well supplied and paid three months in advance. When he entered Exeter on 9 November in an elaborate procession, he publicly pronounced his objectives were securing the rights of his wife and a free Parliament; despite these precautions, there was little enthusiasm for either James or William and the general mood was one of confusion and distrust. After Danby had the *Declaration* publicly read in York on 12 November, much of the northern gentry confirmed their backing and the document was widely distributed.

On 19 November James joined his main force of 19,000 at Salisbury, but it soon became apparent his army was not eager to fight and the loyalty of his commanders doubtful. Three regiments sent out on 15th to make contact with William promptly defected, while supply problems left the rest short of food and ammunition. On 20 November, dragoons led by Irish Catholic Patrick Sarsfield clashed with Williamite scouts at Wincanton; along with a minor skirmish at Reading on 9 December, also featuring Sarsfield, these were the only substantial military actions of the campaign. After securing his rear by taking Plymouth on 18 November, William began his advance on 21st, while Danby and Belasyse captured York and Hull several days later.

James' commander Feversham and other senior officers advised retreat; lacking information on William's movements,

unable to rely on his own soldiers, worn out by lack of sleep and debilitating nose-bleeds, on 23rd James agreed. Next day Churchill, Grafton and Princess Anne's husband George deserted to William, followed by Anne herself on 26th. The next day, James held a meeting at Whitehall Palace with those peers still in London; with the exception of Melfort, Perth and other Catholics, they urged him to issue writs for a Parliamentary election and negotiate with William.

On 8 December, Halifax, Nottingham and Godolphin met with William at Hungerford to hear his demands, which included the dismissal of Catholics from public office and funding for his army. Many viewed these as a reasonable basis for a settlement but James decided to flee the country, convinced by Melfort and others his life was threatened, a suggestion generally dismissed by historians. William made it clear he would not allow James to be harmed, most Tories wanted him to retain his throne, while the Whigs simply wanted to drive him out of the country by imposing conditions he would refuse.

The Queen and Prince of Wales left for France on 9 December, James following separately on 10th. Accompanied only by Sir Edward Hales and Ralph Sheldon, he made his way to Faversham in Kent seeking passage to France, first dropping the Great Seal in the Thames in a last ditch attempt to prevent Parliament being summoned. In London, his flight and rumoursof a "Papist" invasion led to riots and destruction of Catholic property, which quickly spread throughout the country. To fill the power vacuum, the Earl of Rochester set up a temporary government including members of the Privy Council and City of London authorities, but it took them two days to restore order.

When news arrived James had been captured in Faversham on 11 December by local fishermen, Lord Ailesbury, one of his personal attendants, was sent to escort him back to London; on entering the city on 16th, he was welcomed by cheering crowds. By making it seem James remained in control, Tory loyalists hoped for a settlement which would leave them in government; to create an appearance of normality, he heard Mass and presided over a meeting of the Privy Council. However, James made it clear to the French ambassador he still intended to escape to France, while his few remaining supporters viewed his flight as cowardice, and failure to ensure law and order criminally negligent.

Happy to help him into exile, William recommended he relocate to Ham, London, largely because it was easy to escape from. James suggested Rochester instead, allegedly because his personal guard was there, in reality conveniently positioned for a ship to France. On 18 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before. On 22nd, Berwick arrived in Rochester with blank passports allowing them to leave England, while his guards were told that if James wanted to leave, "they should not prevent him, but allow him to gently slip through". Although Ailesbury and others begged him to stay, he left for France on 23 December.

The Revolutionary Settlement

James' departure significantly shifted the balance of power in favour of William, who took control of the provisional government on 28 December. Elections were held in early January for a Convention Parliament which assembled on

22nd; the Whigs had a slight majority in the Commons, the Lords was dominated by the Tories but both were led by moderates. Archbishop Sancroft and other Stuart loyalists wanted to preserve the line of succession; although they recognised keeping James on the throne was no longer possible, they preferred Mary either be appointed his regent or sole monarch.

The next two weeks were spent debating how to resolve this issue, much to the annoyance of William, who needed a swift resolution; the situation in Ireland was rapidly deteriorating, while the French had over-run large parts of the Rhineland and were preparing to attack the Dutch. At a meeting with Danby and Halifax on 3 February, he announced his intention to return home if the Convention did not appoint him joint monarch, while Mary let it be known she would only rule jointly with her husband. Faced with this ultimatum, on 6 February Parliament declared that in deserting his people James had abdicated and thus vacated the crown, which was therefore offered jointly to William and Mary.

Historian Tim Harris argues the most radical act of the 1688 Revolution was breaking the succession and establishing the idea of a "contract" between ruler and people, a fundamental rebuttal of the Stuart ideology of divine right. While this was a victory for the Whigs, other pieces of legislation were proposed by the Tories, often with moderate Whig support, designed to protect the Anglican establishment from being undermined by future monarchs, including the Calvinist William. The Declaration of Right was a tactical compromise, setting out where James had failed and establishing the rights of English

citizens, without agreeing their cause or offering solutions. In December 1689, this was incorporated into the Bill of Rights

However, there were two areas that arguably broke new constitutional ground, both responses to what were viewed as specific abuses by James. First, the Declaration of Right made keeping a standing army without Parliamentary consent illegal, overturning the 1661 and 1662 Militia Acts and vesting control of the military in Parliament, not the Crown. The second was the Coronation Oath Act 1688; the result of James' perceived failure to comply with that taken in 1685, it established obligations owed by the monarchy to the people. At their coronation on 11 April, William and Mary swore to "govern the people of this kingdom of England, and the dominions thereunto belonging, according to the statutes in Parliament agreed on, and the laws and customs of the same". They were also to maintain the Protestant Reformed faith and "preserve inviolable the settlement of the Church of England, and its doctrine, worship, discipline and government as by law established".

Scotland and Ireland

While Scotland was not involved in the landing, by November 1688 only a tiny minority actively supported James; many of those who accompanied William were Scots exiles, including Melville, the Argyll, his personal chaplain William Carstares and Gilbert Burnet. News of James's flight led to celebrations and anti-Catholic riots in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Most members of the Scottish Privy Council went to London; on 7 January 1689, they asked William to take over government. Elections were held in March for a Scottish Convention, which

was also a contest between Presbyterians and Episcopalians for control of the Kirk. While only 50 of the 125 delegates were classed as Episcopalian, they were hopeful of victory since William supported the retention of bishops.

However, on 16 March a Letter from James was read out to the convention, demanding obedience and threatening punishment for non-compliance.

Public anger at its tone meant some Episcopalians stopped attending the convention, claiming to fear for their safety and others changed sides. The 1689–1691 Jacobite Rising forced William to make concessions to the Presbyterians, ended Episcopacy in Scotland and excluded a significant portion of the political class. Many later returned to the Kirk but Non-JuringEpiscopalianism was the key determinant of Jacobite support in both 1715 and 1745.

The English Parliament held James 'abandoned' his throne; the Convention argued he 'forfeited' it by his actions, as listed in the Articles of Grievances. On 11 April, the Convention ended James' reign and adopted the Articles of Grievances and the Claim of Right Act, making Parliament the primary legislative power in Scotland.

On 11 May, William and Mary accepted the Crown of Scotland; after their acceptance, the *Claim* and the *Articles* were read aloud, leading to an immediate debate over whether or not an endorsement of these documents was implicit in that acceptance.

Under the 1542 Crown of Ireland Act, the English monarch was automatically king of Ireland as well. Tyrconnell had created a

largely Roman Catholic army and administration which was reinforced in March 1689 when James landed in Ireland with French military support; it took two years of fighting before the new regime controlled Ireland.

Anglo-Dutch alliance

Though he had carefully avoided making it public, William's main motive in organising the expedition had been the opportunity to bring England into an alliance against France. On 9 December 1688 he had already asked the States General to send a delegation of three to negotiate the conditions. On 18 February (Julian calendar) he asked the convention to support the Republic in its war against France; but it refused, only consenting to pay £600,000 for the continued presence of the Dutch army in England.

On 9 March (Gregorian calendar) the States General responded to Louis's earlier declaration of war by declaring war on France in return. On 19 April (Julian calendar) the Dutch delegation signed a naval treaty with England. It stipulated that the combined Anglo-Dutch fleet would always be commanded by an Englishman, even when of lower rank; also it specified that the two parties would contribute in the ratio of five English vessels against three Dutch vessels, meaning in practice that the Dutch navy in the future would be smaller than the English. The Navigation Acts were not repealed. On 18 May the new Parliament allowed William to declare war on France. On 9 September 1689 (Gregorian calendar), William as King of England joined the League of Augsburg against France.

The decline of the Dutch Republic

Having England as an ally meant that the military situation of the Republic was strongly improved, but this very fact induced William to be uncompromising in his position towards France. This policy led to a large number of very expensive campaigns which were largely paid for with Dutch funds. In 1712 the Republic was financially exhausted; it withdrew from international politics and was forced to let its fleet deteriorate, making what was by then the Kingdom of Great Britain the dominant maritime power of the world.

The Dutch economy, already burdened by the high national debt and concomitant high taxation, suffered from the other European states' protectionist policies, which its weakened fleet was no longer able to resist. To make matters worse, the main Dutch trading and banking houses moved much of their activity from Amsterdam to London after 1688. Between 1688 and 1720, world trade dominance shifted from the Republic to Britain.

Assessment and historiography

While the 1688 revolution was labeled "Glorious" by Protestant preachers two decades later, its historiography is complex, and its assessment disputed.

Thomas Macaulay's account of the Revolution in *The History of England from the Accession of James the Second* exemplifies the "Whig history" narrative of the Revolution as a largely consensual and bloodless triumph of English common sense, confirming and strengthening its institutions of tempered

popular liberty and limited monarchy. Edmund Burke set the tone for that interpretation when he proclaimed that:

The Revolution was made to preserve our ancient indisputable laws and liberties, and that ancient constitution of government which is our only security for law and liberty.

In addition to Burke and Macaulay, many other historians have endorsed that view, including more recently John Morrill, who captured the consensus of contemporary historiography well when he declared that "the Sensible Revolution of 1688–89 was a conservative Revolution".

An alternative narrative emphasizes William's successful foreign invasion from the Netherlands, and the size of the corresponding military operation. Several researchers have emphasized that aspect, particularly after the third centenary of the event in 1988. The invasion story is unusual because the establishment of a constitutional monarchy (a de facto republic, see Coronation Oath Act 1688) and Bill of Rights meant that the apparently invading monarchs, legitimate heirs to the throne, were prepared to govern with the English Parliament. It is difficult to classify the entire proceedings of 1687–1689 but it can be seen that the events occurred in three phases: conspiracy, invasion by Dutch forces, and "Glorious Revolution".

It has been argued that the invasion aspect had been downplayed as a result of a combination of British pride and successful Dutch propaganda, trying to depict the course of events as a largely internal English affair. As the invitation was initiated by figures who had little influence themselves, the legacy of the Glorious Revolution has been described as a

successful propaganda act by William to cover up and justify his successful invasion. The claim that William was fighting for the Protestant cause in England was used to great effect to disguise the military, cultural and political impact that the Dutch regime had on England at the time.

A third version, proposed by Steven Pincus (2009), underplays the invasion aspect but, unlike the Whig narrative, views the Revolution as a divisive and violent event that involved all classes of the English population, not just the main aristocratic protagonists. Pincus argues that his interpretation echoes the widely held view of the Revolution in its immediate aftermath, starting with its revolutionary labeling. Pincus argues that it was momentous especially when looking at the alternative that James was trying to enact – a powerful centralised autocratic state, using French-style "state-building".

England's role in Europe and the country's political economy in the 17th century refutes the view of many late-20th-century historians that nothing revolutionary occurred during the Glorious Revolution of 1688–89. Pincus says it was not a placid turn of events. In diplomacy and economics William III transformed the English state's ideology and policies. This occurred not because William III was an outsider who inflicted foreign notions on England but because foreign affairs and political economy were at the core of the English revolutionaries' agenda. The revolution of 1688–89 cannot be fathomed in isolation. It would have been inconceivable without the changes resulting from the events of the 1640s and 1650s. Indeed, the ideas accompanying the Glorious Revolution were rooted in the mid-century upheavals. Thus, the

17th century was a century of revolution in England, deserving of the same scholarly attention that 'modern' revolutions attract.

James II tried building a powerful militarised state on the mercantilist assumption that the world's wealth was necessarily finite and empires were created by taking land from other states. The East India Company was thus an ideal tool to create a vast new English imperial dominion by warring with the Dutch and the Mughal Empire in India. After 1689 came an alternative understanding of economics, which saw Britain as a commercial rather than an agrarian society. It led to the foundation of the Bank of England, the creation of Europe's first widely circulating credit currency, and the commencement of the "Age of Projectors". This subsequently gave weight to the view, advocated most famously by Adam Smith in 1776, that wealth was created by human endeavour and was thus potentially infinite.

Impact

With the passage of the Bill of Rights, the Glorious Revolution stamped out once and for all any possibility of a Catholic monarchy, and ended moves towards absolute monarchy in the British kingdoms by circumscribing the monarch's powers. These powers were greatly restricted; he or she could no longer suspend laws, levy taxes, make royal appointments, or maintain a standing army during peacetime without Parliament's permission – to this day the Army is known as the "British Army" not the "Royal Army" as it is, in some sense, Parliament's Army and not that of the King. (This is, however, a complex issue, as the Crown remains the source of all

executive authority in the British army, with legal implications for unlawful orders etc.) Since 1689, government under a system of constitutional monarchy in England, and later Great Britain and the United Kingdom, has been uninterrupted. Parliament's power has steadily increased, while that of the Crown's has steadily declined. Unlike in the English civil wars of the mid-seventeenth century, the "Glorious Revolution" did not involve the masses of ordinary people in England (the majority of the bloodshed occurred in Ireland).

This fact has led many historians, including Stephen Webb, to suggest that, in England at least, the events more closely resemble a coup d'état than a social revolution. This view of events does not contradict what was originally meant by "revolution": the coming round of an old system of values in a circular motion, back to its original position, as England's constitution was reasserted, rather than formed anew.

Prior to his arrival in England, the future king William III was not Anglican, but rather was a member of the Dutch Reformed Church. Consequently, as a Calvinist and Presbyterian he was now in the unenviable position of being the head of the Church of England, while also being a Nonconformist. This was, however, not his main motive for promoting religious toleration. More important in that respect was the need to keep happy his Roman Catholic allies in the coming struggle with Louis XIV. Though he had promised legal toleration for Roman Catholics in his *Declaration* of October 1688, William was ultimately unsuccessful in this respect, due to opposition by the Tories in the new Parliament. The Revolution led to the Act of Toleration of 1689, which granted toleration to

Nonconformist Protestants, but not to Roman Catholics. Catholic emancipation would be delayed for 140 years.

The Williamite War in Ireland can be seen as the source of later ethno-religious conflict, including The Troubles of the twentieth century. The Williamite victory in Ireland is still commemorated by the Orange Order for preserving British and Protestant supremacy in the country.

In North America, the Glorious Revolution precipitated the 1689 Boston revolt in which a well-organised "mob" of provincial militia and citizens successfully deposed the hated governor Edmund Andros. In New York, Leisler's Rebellion caused the colonial administrator, Francis Nicholson, to flee to England. A third event, Maryland's Protestant Rebellion was directed against the proprietary government, seen as Catholic-dominated.

Chapter 43

William III of England

William III (William Henry; Dutch: *Willem Hendrik*; 4 November 1650 – 8 March 1702), also widely known as **William of Orange**, was sovereign Prince of Orange from birth, Stadtholder of Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Guelders, and Overijssel in the Dutch Republic from the 1670s and King of England, Ireland, and Scotland from 1689 until his death in 1702. As King of Scotland, he is known as **William II**. He is sometimes informally known as "King Billy" in Ireland and Scotland.

His victory at the Battle of the Boyne in 1690 is commemorated by Unionists, who display orange colours in his honour. He ruled Britain alongside his wife and cousin Queen Mary II, and popular histories usually refer to their reign as that of "William and Mary".

William was the only child of William II, Prince of Orange, and Mary, Princess Royal and Princess of Orange, the daughter of Charles I of England, Scotland, and Ireland. His father died a week before his birth, making William III the Prince of Orange from birth. In 1677, he married Mary, the eldest daughter of his maternal uncle James, Duke of York, the younger brother of Charles II of England, Scotland, and Ireland. The Protestant William participated in several wars against the powerful Catholic French ruler, King Louis XIV, in coalition with both Protestant and Catholic powers in Europe. Many Protestants heralded William as a champion of their faith. In 1685, his

Catholic uncle and father-in-law, James, became king of England, Scotland, and Ireland. James's reign was unpopular with the Protestant majority in Britain, who feared a revival of Catholicism. Supported by a group of influential British political and religious leaders, William invaded England in what became known as the Glorious Revolution. In 1688, he landed at the south-western English port of Brixham. Shortly afterwards, James was deposed.

William's reputation as a staunch Protestant enabled him and his wife to take power. During the early years of his reign, William was occupied abroad with the Nine Years' War (1688–97), leaving Mary to govern Britain alone. She died in 1694. In 1696 the Jacobites, a faction loyal to the deposed James, plotted unsuccessfully to assassinate William and restore James to the throne. William's lack of children and the death in 1700 of his nephew Prince William, Duke of Gloucester, the son of his sister-in-law Anne, threatened the Protestant succession. The danger was averted by placing distant relatives, the Protestant Hanoverians, in line to the throne with the Act of Settlement 1701. Upon his death in 1702, the king was succeeded in Britain by Anne and as titular Prince of Orange by his cousin John William Friso, beginning the Second Stadtholderless period.

Early life

Birth and family

William III was born in The Hague in the Dutch Republic on 4 November 1650. Baptised William Henry (Dutch: *Willem Hendrik*), he was the only child of Mary, Princess Royal, and

stadtholder William II, Prince of Orange. His mother was the eldest daughter of King Charles I of England, Scotland and Ireland and sister of King Charles II and King James II and VII.

Eight days before William was born, his father died of smallpox; thus William was the sovereign Prince of Orange from the moment of his birth. Immediately, a conflict ensued between his mother and paternal grandmother, Amalia of Solms-Braunfels, over the name to be given to the infant. Mary wanted to name him Charles after her brother, but her mother-in-law insisted on giving him the name William (*Willem*) to bolster his prospects of becoming stadtholder. William II had appointed his wife as their son's guardian in his will; however, the document remained unsigned at William II's death and was void. On 13 August 1651, the *HogeRaad van Holland en Zeeland* (Supreme Court) ruled that guardianship would be shared between his mother, his paternal grandmother and Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg, whose wife, Louise Henriette, was William II's eldest sister.

Childhood and education

William's mother showed little personal interest in her son, sometimes being absent for years, and had always deliberately kept herself apart from Dutch society. William's education was first laid in the hands of several Dutch governesses, some of English descent, including Walburg Howard and the Scottish noblewoman, Lady Anna Mackenzie. From April 1656, the prince received daily instruction in the Reformed religion from the Calvinist preacher CornelisTrigland, a follower of the Contra-Remonstrant theologian GisbertusVoetius.

The ideal education for William was described in *Discours sur la nourriture de S. H. Monseigneur le Prince d'Orange*, a short treatise, perhaps by one of William's tutors, Constantijn Huygens. In these lessons, the prince was taught that he was predestined to become an instrument of Divine Providence, fulfilling the historical destiny of the House of Orange-Nassau.

From early 1659, William spent seven years at the University of Leiden for a formal education, under the guidance of ethics professor Hendrik Bornius (though never officially enrolling as a student). While residing in the *Prinsenhof* at Delft, William had a small personal retinue including Hans Willem Bentinck, and a new governor, Frederick Nassau de Zuylenstein, who (as an illegitimate son of stadtholder Frederick Henry of Orange) was his paternal uncle.

Grand Pensionary Johan de Witt and his uncle Cornelis de Graeff pushed the States of Holland to take charge of William's education and ensure that he would acquire the skills to serve in a future—though undetermined—state function; the States acted on 25 September 1660.

This first involvement of the authorities did not last long. On 23 December 1660, when William was ten years old, his mother died of smallpox at Whitehall Palace, London, while visiting her brother, the recently restored King Charles II. In her will, Mary requested that Charles look after William's interests, and Charles now demanded that the States of Holland end their interference. To appease Charles, they complied on 30 September 1661. That year, Zuylenstein began to work for Charles and induced William to write letters to his uncle asking him to help William become stadtholder someday. After

his mother's death, William's education and guardianship became a point of contention between his dynasty's supporters and the advocates of a more republican Netherlands.

The Dutch authorities did their best at first to ignore these intrigues, but in the Second Anglo-Dutch War one of Charles's peace conditions was the improvement of the position of his nephew. As a countermeasure in 1666, when William was sixteen, the States officially made him a ward of the government, or a "Child of State". All pro-English courtiers, including Zuylenstein, were removed from William's company. William begged De Witt to allow Zuylenstein to stay, but he refused. De Witt, the leading politician of the Republic, took William's education into his own hands, instructing him weekly in state matters and joining him for regular games of real tennis.

Early offices

Exclusion from stadtholdership

After the death of William's father, most provinces had left the office of stadtholder vacant. At the demand of Oliver Cromwell, the Treaty of Westminster, which ended the First Anglo-Dutch War, had a secret annexe that required the Act of Seclusion, which forbade the province of Holland from appointing a member of the House of Orange as stadtholder. After the English Restoration, the Act of Seclusion, which had not remained a secret for long, was declared void as the English Commonwealth (with which the treaty had been concluded) no longer existed. In 1660, Mary and Amalia tried to persuade

several provincial States to designate William as their future stadtholder, but they all initially refused.

In 1667, as William III approached the age of 18, the Orangist party again attempted to bring him to power by securing for him the offices of stadtholder and Captain-General. To prevent the restoration of the influence of the House of Orange, De Witt, the leader of the States Party, allowed the pensionary of Haarlem, Gaspar Fagel, to induce the States of Holland to issue the Perpetual Edict. The Edict declared that the Captain-General or Admiral-General of the Netherlands could not serve as stadtholder in any province. Even so, William's supporters sought ways to enhance his prestige and, on 19 September 1668, the States of Zeeland appointed him as *First Noble*. To receive this honour, William had to escape the attention of his state tutors and travel secretly to Middelburg. A month later, Amalia allowed William to manage his own household and declared him to be of majority age.

The province of Holland, the centre of anti-Orangism, abolished the office of stadtholder and four other provinces followed suit in March 1670, establishing the so-called "Harmony". De Witt demanded an oath from each Holland regent (city council member) to uphold the Edict; all but one complied. William saw all this as a defeat, but the arrangement was a compromise: De Witt would have preferred to ignore the prince completely, but now his eventual rise to the office of supreme army commander was implicit. De Witt further conceded that William would be admitted as a member of the *Raad van State*, the Council of State, then the generality organ administering the defence budget. William was introduced to

the council on 31 May 1670 with full voting rights, despite De Witt's attempts to limit his role to that of an advisor.

Conflict with republicans

In November 1670, William obtained permission to travel to England to urge Charles to pay back at least a part of the 2,797,859 guilder debt the House of Stuart owed the House of Orange. Charles was unable to pay, but William agreed to reduce the amount owed to 1,800,000 guilders. Charles found his nephew to be a dedicated Calvinist and patriotic Dutchman, and reconsidered his desire to show him the Secret Treaty of Dover with France, directed at destroying the Dutch Republic and installing William as "sovereign" of a Dutch rump state. In addition to differing political outlooks, William found that his lifestyle differed from his uncles, Charles and James, who were more concerned with drinking, gambling, and cavorting with mistresses.

The following year, the Republic's security deteriorated quickly as an Anglo-French attack became imminent. In view of the threat, the States of Gelderland wanted William to be appointed Captain-General of the Dutch States Army as soon as possible, despite his youth and inexperience.

On 15 December 1671, the States of Utrecht made this their official policy. On 19 January 1672, the States of Holland made a counterproposal: to appoint William for just a single campaign. The prince refused this and on 25 February a compromise was reached: an appointment by the States General for one summer, followed by a permanent appointment on his 22nd birthday.

Meanwhile, William had written a secret letter to Charles in January 1672 asking his uncle to exploit the situation by exerting pressure on the States to appoint William stadtholder. In return, William would ally the Republic with England and serve Charles's interests as much as his "honour and the loyalty due to this state" allowed. Charles took no action on the proposal, and continued his war plans with his French ally.

Becoming stadtholder

"Disaster year": 1672

For the Dutch Republic, 1672 proved calamitous. It became known as the *Rampjaar* ("disaster year"), because in the Franco-Dutch War and the Third Anglo-Dutch War the Netherlands was invaded by France and its allies: England, Münster, and Cologne. Although the Anglo-French fleet was disabled by the Battle of Solebay, in June the French army quickly overran the provinces of Gelderland and Utrecht. On 14 June, William withdrew with the remnants of his field army into Holland, where the States had ordered the flooding of the Dutch Water Line on 8 June. Louis XIV of France, believing the war was over, began negotiations to extract as large a sum of money from the Dutch as possible. The presence of a large French army in the heart of the Republic caused a general panic, and the people turned against De Witt and his allies.

On 4 July, the States of Holland appointed William stadtholder, and he took the oath five days later. The next day, a special envoy from Charles II, Lord Arlington, met William in Nieuwerbrug and presented a proposal from Charles. In return

for William's capitulation to England and France, Charles would make William Sovereign Prince of Holland, instead of stadtholder (a mere civil servant). When William refused, Arlington threatened that William would witness the end of the Republic's existence. William answered famously: "There is one way to avoid this: to die defending it in the last ditch." On 7 July, the inundations were complete and the further advance of the French army was effectively blocked. On 16 July, Zeeland offered the stadtholdership to William.

Johan de Witt had been unable to function as Grand Pensionary after being wounded by an attempt on his life on 21 June. On 15 August, William published a letter from Charles, in which the English king stated that he had made war because of the aggression of the De Witt faction. The people thus incited, De Witt and his brother, Cornelis, were brutally murdered by an Orangist civil militia in The Hague on 20 August. Subsequently, William replaced many of the Dutch regents with his followers.

Though William's complicity in the lynching has never been proved (and some 19th-century Dutch historians have made an effort to disprove that he was an accessory) he thwarted attempts to prosecute the ringleaders, and even rewarded some, like Hendrik Verhoeff, with money, and others, like Johan van Banchem and Johan Kievit, with high offices. This damaged his reputation in the same fashion as his later actions at Glencoe.

William continued to fight against the invaders from England and France, allying himself with Spain and Brandenburg. In November 1672, he took his army to Maastricht to threaten the

French supply lines. By 1673, the Dutch situation further improved. Although Louis took Maastricht and William's attack against Charleroi failed, Lieutenant-Admiral Michiel de Ruyter defeated the Anglo-French fleet three times, forcing Charles to end England's involvement by the Treaty of Westminster; after 1673, France slowly withdrew from Dutch territory (with the exception of Maastricht), while making gains elsewhere.

Fagel now proposed to treat the liberated provinces of Utrecht, Gelderland and Overijssel as conquered territory (Generality Lands), as punishment for their quick surrender to the enemy. William refused but obtained a special mandate from the States General to appoint all delegates in the States of these provinces anew. William's followers in the States of Utrecht on 26 April 1674 appointed him hereditary stadtholder. On 30 January 1675, the States of Gelderland offered him the titles of Duke of Guelders and Count of Zutphen. The negative reactions to this from Zeeland and the city of Amsterdam made William ultimately decide to decline these honours; he was instead appointed stadtholder of Gelderland and Overijssel.

Marriage

During the war with France William tried to improve his position by marrying in 1677, his first cousin Mary, elder surviving daughter of the Duke of York, later King James II of England (James VII of Scotland). Mary was eleven years his junior and he anticipated resistance to a Stuart match from the Amsterdam merchants who had disliked his mother (another Mary Stuart), but William believed that marrying Mary would increase his chances of succeeding to Charles's kingdoms, and would draw England's monarch away from his

pro-French policies. James was not inclined to consent, but Charles II pressured his brother to agree. Charles wanted to use the possibility of marriage to gain leverage in negotiations relating to the war, but William insisted that the two issues be decided separately. Charles relented, and Bishop Henry Compton married the couple on 4 November 1677. Mary became pregnant soon after the marriage, but miscarried. After a further illness later in 1678, she never conceived again.

Throughout William and Mary's marriage, William had only one reputed mistress, Elizabeth Villiers, in contrast to the many mistresses his uncles openly kept.

Peace with France, intrigue with England

By 1678, Louis XIV sought peace with the Dutch Republic. Even so, tensions remained: William remained suspicious of Louis, thinking that the French king desired "universal kingship" over Europe; Louis described William as "my mortal enemy" and saw him as an obnoxious warmonger. France's annexations in the Southern Netherlands and Germany (the *Réunion* policy) and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, caused a surge of Huguenot refugees to the Republic. This led William III to join various anti-French alliances, such as the Association League, and ultimately the League of Augsburg (an anti-French coalition that also included the Holy Roman Empire, Sweden, Spain and several German states) in 1686.

After his marriage in November 1677, William became a strong candidate for the English throne should his father-in-law (and uncle) James be excluded because of his Catholicism. During

the crisis concerning the Exclusion Bill in 1680, Charles at first invited William to come to England to bolster the king's position against the exclusionists, then withdrew his invitation—after which Lord Sunderland also tried unsuccessfully to bring William over, but now to put pressure on Charles. Nevertheless, William secretly induced the States General to send Charles the "Insinuation", a plea beseeching the king to prevent any Catholics from succeeding him, without explicitly naming James. After receiving indignant reactions from Charles and James, William denied any involvement.

In 1685, when James II succeeded Charles, William at first attempted a conciliatory approach, at the same time trying not to offend the Protestants in England. William, ever looking for ways to diminish the power of France, hoped that James would join the League of Augsburg, but by 1687 it became clear that James would not join the anti-French alliance. Relations worsened between William and James thereafter. In November, James's second wife, Mary of Modena, was announced to be pregnant. That month, to gain the favour of English Protestants, William wrote an open letter to the English people in which he disapproved of James's pro-Roman Catholic policy of religious toleration. Seeing him as a friend, and often having maintained secret contacts with him for years, many English politicians began to urge an armed invasion of England.

Glorious Revolution

Invasion of England

William at first opposed the prospect of invasion, but most historians now agree that he began to assemble an

expeditionary force in April 1688, as it became increasingly clear that France would remain occupied by campaigns in Germany and Italy, and thus unable to mount an attack while William's troops would be occupied in Britain. Believing that the English people would not react well to a foreign invader, he demanded in a letter to Rear-Admiral Arthur Herbert that the most eminent English Protestants first invite him to invade. In June, Mary of Modena, after a string of miscarriages, gave birth to a son, James Francis Edward Stuart, who displaced William's

Protestant wife to become first in the line of succession and raised the prospect of an ongoing Catholic monarchy. Public anger also increased because of the trial of seven bishops who had publicly opposed James's Declaration of Indulgence granting religious liberty to his subjects, a policy which appeared to threaten the establishment of the Anglican Church.

On 30 June 1688—the same day the bishops were acquitted—a group of political figures, known afterward as the "Immortal Seven", sent William a formal invitation. William's intentions to invade were public knowledge by September 1688. With a Dutch army, William landed at Brixham in southwest England on 5 November 1688. He came ashore from the ship *Brill*, proclaiming "the liberties of England and the Protestant religion I will maintain". William's fleet was vastly larger than the Spanish Armada 100 years earlier: approximately 250 carrier ships and 60 fishing boats carried 35,000 men, including 11,000 foot soldiers and 4,000 cavalry. James's support began to dissolve almost immediately upon William's arrival; Protestant officers defected from the English army (the

most notable of whom was Lord Churchill of Eyemouth, James's most able commander), and influential noblemen across the country declared their support for the invader.

James at first attempted to resist William, but saw that his efforts would prove futile. He sent representatives to negotiate with William, but secretly attempted to flee on 11/21 December, throwing the Great Seal into the Thames on his way. He was discovered and brought back to London by a group of fishermen. He was allowed to leave for France in a second escape attempt on 23 December. William permitted James to leave the country, not wanting to make him a martyr for the Roman Catholic cause; it was in his interests for James to be perceived as having left the country of his own accord, rather than having been forced or frightened into fleeing. William is the last person to successfully invade England by force of arms.

Proclaimed king

William summoned a Convention Parliament in England, which met on 22 January 1689, to discuss the appropriate course of action following James's flight. William felt insecure about his position; though his wife preceded him in the line of succession to the throne, he wished to reign as king in his own right, rather than as a mere consort. The only precedent for a joint monarchy in England dated from the 16th century, when Queen Mary I married Philip of Spain. Philip remained king only during his wife's lifetime, and restrictions were placed on his power. William, on the other hand, demanded that he remain as king even after his wife's death. When the majority of Tory Lords proposed to acclaim her as sole ruler, William

threatened to leave the country immediately. Furthermore, Mary, remaining loyal to her husband, refused.

The House of Commons, with a Whig majority, quickly resolved that the throne was vacant, and that it was safer if the ruler were Protestant. There were more Tories in the House of Lords, which would not initially agree, but after William refused to be a regent or to agree to remain king only in his wife's lifetime, there were negotiations between the two houses and the Lords agreed by a narrow majority that the throne was vacant. On 13 February 1689, Parliament passed the Bill of Rights 1689, in which it deemed that James, by attempting to flee, had abdicated the government of the realm, thereby leaving the throne vacant.

The Crown was not offered to James's infant son, who would have been the heir apparent under normal circumstances, but to William and Mary as joint sovereigns. It was, however, provided that "the sole and full exercise of the regal power be only in and executed by the said Prince of Orange in the names of the said Prince and Princess during their joint lives".

William and Mary were crowned together at Westminster Abbey on 11 April 1689 by the Bishop of London, Henry Compton. Normally, the coronation is performed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, but the Archbishop at the time, William Sancroft, refused to recognise James's removal.

William also summoned a Convention of the Estates of Scotland, which met on 14 March 1689 and sent a conciliatory letter, while James sent haughty uncompromising orders, swaying a majority in favour of William. On 11 April, the day of the English coronation, the Convention finally declared that

James was no longer King of Scotland. William and Mary were offered the Scottish Crown; they accepted on 11 May.

Revolution settlement

William encouraged the passage of the Toleration Act 1689, which guaranteed religious toleration to Protestant nonconformists. It did not, however, extend toleration as far as he wished, still restricting the religious liberty of Roman Catholics, non-trinitarians, and those of non-Christian faiths. In December 1689, one of the most important constitutional documents in English history, the Bill of Rights, was passed. The Act, which restated and confirmed many provisions of the earlier Declaration of Right, established restrictions on the royal prerogative. It provided, amongst other things, that the Sovereign could not suspend laws passed by Parliament, levy taxes without parliamentary consent,

infringe the right to petition, raise a standing army during peacetime without parliamentary consent, deny the right to bear arms to Protestant subjects, unduly interfere with parliamentary elections, punish members of either House of Parliament for anything said during debates, require excessive bail or inflict cruel and unusual punishments. William was opposed to the imposition of such constraints, but he chose not to engage in a conflict with Parliament and agreed to abide by the statute.

The Bill of Rights also settled the question of succession to the Crown. After the death of either William or Mary, the other would continue to reign. Next in the line of succession was Mary II's sister, Anne, and her issue, followed by any children

William might have had by a subsequent marriage. Roman Catholics, as well as those who married Catholics, were excluded.

Rule with Mary II

Resistance to validity of rule

- Although most in Britain accepted William and Mary as sovereigns, a significant minority refused to acknowledge their claim to the throne, instead believing in the divine right of kings, which held that the monarch's authority derived directly from God rather than being delegated to the monarch by Parliament. Over the next 57 years Jacobites pressed for restoration of James and his heirs. Nonjurors in England and Scotland, including over 400 clergy and several bishops of the Church of England and Scottish Episcopal Church as well as numerous laymen, refused to take oaths of allegiance to William.

Ireland was controlled by Roman Catholics loyal to James, and Franco-Irish Jacobites arrived from France with French forces in March 1689 to join the war in Ireland and contest Protestant resistance at the siege of Derry. William sent his navy to the city in July, and his army landed in August. After progress stalled, William personally intervened to lead his armies to victory over James at the Battle of the Boyne on 1 July 1690, after which James fled back to France.

Upon William's return to England, his close friend Dutch General Godert de Ginkell, who had accompanied William to Ireland and had commanded a body of Dutch cavalry at the Battle of the Boyne, was named Commander in Chief of William's forces in Ireland and entrusted with further conduct of the war there.

Ginkell took command in Ireland in the spring of 1691, and following several ensuing battles, succeeded in capturing both Galway and Limerick, thereby effectively suppressing the Jacobite forces in Ireland within a few more months. After difficult negotiations a capitulation was signed on 3 October 1691—the Treaty of Limerick. Thus concluded the Williamite pacification of Ireland, and for his services the Dutch general received the formal thanks of the House of Commons, and was awarded the title of Earl of Athlone by the king.

A series of Jacobite risings also took place in Scotland, where Viscount Dundee raised Highland forces and won a victory on 27 July 1689 at the Battle of Killiecrankie, but he died in the fight and a month later Scottish Cameronian forces subdued the rising at the Battle of Dunkeld. William offered Scottish clans that had taken part in the rising a pardon provided that they signed allegiance by a deadline, and his government in Scotland punished a delay with the Massacre of Glencoe of 1692, which became infamous in Jacobite propaganda as William had countersigned the orders. Bowing to public opinion, William dismissed those responsible for the massacre, though they still remained in his favour; in the words of the historian John Dalberg-Acton, "one became a colonel, another a knight, a third a peer, and a fourth an earl."

William's reputation in Scotland suffered further damage when he refused English assistance to the Darien scheme, a Scottish colony (1698–1700) that failed disastrously.

Parliament and faction

Although the Whigs were William's strongest supporters, he initially favoured a policy of balance between the Whigs and Tories. The Marquess of Halifax, a man known for his ability to chart a moderate political course, gained William's confidence early in his reign. The Whigs, a majority in Parliament, had expected to dominate the government, and were disappointed that William denied them this chance. This "balanced" approach to governance did not last beyond 1690, as the conflicting factions made it impossible for the government to pursue effective policy, and William called for new elections early that year.

After the Parliamentary elections of 1690, William began to favour the Tories, led by Danby and Nottingham. While the Tories favoured preserving the king's prerogatives, William found them unaccommodating when he asked Parliament to support his continuing war with France. As a result, William began to prefer the Whig faction known as the Junto. The Whig government was responsible for the creation of the Bank of England following the example of the Bank of Amsterdam. William's decision to grant the Royal Charter in 1694 to the Bank of England, a private institution owned by bankers, is his most relevant economic legacy. It laid the financial foundation of the English take-over of the central role of the Dutch Republic and Bank of Amsterdam in global commerce in the 18th century.

William dissolved Parliament in 1695, and the new Parliament that assembled that year was led by the Whigs. There was a considerable surge in support for William following the exposure of a Jacobite plan to assassinate him in 1696. Parliament passed a bill of attainder against the ringleader, John Fenwick, and he was beheaded in 1697.

War in Europe

William continued to absent himself from Britain for extended periods during his Nine Years' War (1688–1697) against France, leaving each spring and returning to England each autumn. England joined the League of Augsburg, which then became known as the Grand Alliance. Whilst William was away fighting, his wife, Mary II, governed the realm, but acted on his advice. Each time he returned to England, Mary gave up her power to him without reservation, an arrangement that lasted for the rest of Mary's life.

After the Anglo-Dutch fleet defeated a French fleet at La Hogue in 1692, the allies for a short period controlled the seas, and the Treaty of Limerick (1691) pacified Ireland. At the same time, the Grand Alliance fared poorly in Europe, as William lost Namur in the Spanish Netherlands in 1692, and the French under the command of the Duke of Luxembourg beat him badly at the Battle of Landen in 1693.

Later years

Mary II died of smallpox on 28 December 1694, leaving William III to rule alone. William deeply mourned his wife's death.

Despite his conversion to Anglicanism, William's popularity in England plummeted during his reign as a sole monarch.

Rumours of homosexuality

During the 1690s rumours grew of William's alleged homosexual inclinations and led to the publication of many satirical pamphlets by his Jacobite detractors. He did have several close male associates, including two Dutch courtiers to whom he granted English titles: Hans Willem Bentinck became Earl of Portland, and Arnold Joost van Keppel was created Earl of Albemarle. These relationships with male friends, and his apparent lack of mistresses, led William's enemies to suggest that he might prefer homosexual relationships. William's modern biographers disagree on the veracity of these allegations. Some believe there may have been truth to the rumours, while others affirm that they were no more than figments of his enemies' imaginations, as it was common for someone childless like William adopting or evincing paternal affections for a younger man.

Whatever the case, Bentinck's closeness to William did arouse jealousies at the royal court. William's young protégé, Keppel, aroused more gossip and suspicion, being 20 years William's junior, strikingly handsome, and having risen from the post of a royal page to an earldom with some ease. Portland wrote to William in 1697 that "the kindness which your Majesty has for a young man, and the way in which you seem to authorise his liberties ... make the world say things I am ashamed to hear." This, he said, was "tarnishing a reputation which has never before been subject to such accusations". William tersely dismissed these suggestions, however, saying, "It seems to me

very extraordinary that it should be impossible to have esteem and regard for a young man without it being criminal."

Peace with France

In 1696 the Dutch territory of Drenthe made William its Stadtholder. In the same year, Jacobites plotted to assassinate William III in an attempt to restore James to the English throne, but failed. In accordance with the Treaty of Rijswijk (20 September 1697), which ended the Nine Years' War, the French King Louis XIV recognised William III as King of England, and undertook to give no further assistance to James II. Thus deprived of French dynastic backing after 1697, Jacobites posed no further serious threats during William's reign.

As his life drew towards its conclusion, William, like many other contemporary European rulers, felt concern over the question of succession to the throne of Spain, which brought with it vast territories in Italy, the Low Countries and the New World. King Charles II of Spain was an invalid with no prospect of having children; some of his closest relatives included Louis XIV and Leopold I, Holy Roman Emperor. William sought to prevent the Spanish inheritance from going to either monarch, for he feared that such a calamity would upset the balance of power. William and Louis XIV agreed to the First Partition Treaty (1698), which provided for the division of the Spanish Empire: Joseph Ferdinand, Electoral Prince of Bavaria, would obtain Spain, while France and the Holy Roman Emperor would divide the remaining territories between them. Charles II accepted the nomination of Joseph Ferdinand as his heir, and war appeared to be averted.

When, however, Joseph Ferdinand died of smallpox in February 1699, the issue re-opened. In 1700 William and Louis XIV agreed to the Second Partition Treaty (also called the Treaty of London), under which the territories in Italy would pass to a son of the King of France, and the other Spanish territories would be inherited by a son of the Holy Roman Emperor. This arrangement infuriated both the Spanish, who still sought to prevent the dissolution of their empire, and the Holy Roman Emperor, who regarded the Italian territories as much more useful than the other lands. Unexpectedly, Charles II of Spain interfered as he lay dying in late 1700. Unilaterally, he willed all Spanish territories to Philip, the Duke of Anjou, a grandson of Louis XIV.

The French conveniently ignored the Second Partition Treaty and claimed the entire Spanish inheritance. Furthermore, Louis XIV alienated William III by recognising James Francis Edward Stuart, the son of the former King James II (who died in September 1701), as *de jure* King of England. The subsequent conflict, known as the War of the Spanish Succession, broke out in July 1701 and continued until 1713/1714.

English royal succession

Another royal inheritance, apart from that of Spain, also concerned William. His marriage with Mary had not produced any children, and he did not seem likely to remarry. Mary's sister, Anne, had borne numerous children, all of whom died during childhood. The death of her last surviving child (Prince William, Duke of Gloucester) in 1700 left her as the only individual in the line of succession established by the Bill of

Rights. As the complete exhaustion of the defined line of succession would have encouraged a restoration of James II's line, Parliament passed the Act of Settlement 1701, which provided that if Anne died without surviving issue and William failed to have surviving issue by any subsequent marriage, the Crown would pass to a distant relative, Sophia, Electress of Hanover (a granddaughter of James I) and to her Protestant heirs. The Act debarred Roman Catholics from the throne, thereby excluding the candidacy of several dozen people more closely related to Mary and Anne than Sophia. The Act extended to England and Ireland, but not to Scotland, whose Estates had not been consulted before the selection of Sophia.

Death

In 1702, William died of pneumonia, a complication from a broken collarbone following a fall from his horse, Sorrel. The horse had been confiscated from Sir John Fenwick, one of the Jacobites who had conspired against William. Because his horse had stumbled into a mole's burrow, many Jacobites toasted "the little gentleman in the black velvet waistcoat". Years later, Winston Churchill, in his *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, stated that the fall "opened the door to a troop of lurking foes". William was buried in Westminster Abbey alongside his wife. His sister-in-law and cousin, Anne, became queen regnant of England, Scotland and Ireland.

William's death meant that he would remain the only member of the Dutch House of Orange to reign over England. Members of this House had served as stadtholder of Holland and the majority of the other provinces of the Dutch Republic since the time of William the Silent (William I). The five provinces of

which William III was stadtholder—Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland, and Overijssel—all suspended the office after his death. Thus, he was the last patrilineal descendant of William I to be named stadtholder for the majority of the provinces. Under William III's will, John William Friso stood to inherit the Principality of Orange as well as several lordships in the Netherlands.

He was William's closest agnatic relative, as well as grandson of William's aunt Henriette Catherine. However, King Frederick I of Prussia also claimed the Principality as the senior cognatic heir, his mother Louise Henriette being Henriette Catherine's older sister. Under the Treaty of Utrecht (1713), Frederick I's successor, Frederick William I of Prussia, ceded his territorial claim to King Louis XIV of France, keeping only a claim to the title. Friso's posthumous son, William IV, succeeded to the title at his birth in 1711; in the Treaty of Partition (1732) he agreed to share the title "Prince of Orange" with Frederick William.

Legacy

William's primary achievement was to contain France when it was in a position to impose its will across much of Europe. His life's aim was largely to oppose Louis XIV of France. This effort continued after his death during the War of the Spanish Succession. Another important consequence of William's reign in England involved the ending of a bitter conflict between Crown and Parliament that had lasted since the accession of the first English monarch of the House of Stuart, James I, in 1603. The conflict over royal and parliamentary power had led to the English Civil War during the 1640s and the Glorious

Revolution of 1688. During William's reign, however, the conflict was settled in Parliament's favour by the Bill of Rights 1689, the Triennial Act 1694 and the Act of Settlement 1701.

William endowed the College of William and Mary (in present-day Williamsburg, Virginia) in 1693. Nassau County, New York, a county on Long Island, is a namesake. Long Island itself was also known as Nassau during early Dutch rule. Though many alumni of Princeton University think that the town of Princeton, New Jersey (and hence the university), were named in his honour, this is probably untrue, although Nassau Hall, the college's first building, is named for him. New York City was briefly renamed New Orange for him in 1673 after the Dutch recaptured the city, which had been renamed New York by the British in 1665. His name was applied to the fort and administrative centre for the city on two separate occasions reflecting his different sovereign status—first as Fort Willem Hendrick in 1673, and then as Fort William in 1691 when the English evicted Colonists who had seized the fort and city. Nassau, the capital of The Bahamas, is named after Fort Nassau, which was renamed in 1695 in his honour.

Titles, styles, and arms

Titles and styles

- 4 November 1650 – 9 July 1672: His Highness The Prince of Orange, Count of Nassau
- 9–16 July 1672: His Highness The Prince of Orange, Stadtholder of Holland
- 16 July 1672 – 26 April 1674: His Highness The Prince of Orange, Stadtholder of Holland and Zeeland

- 26 April 1674 – 13 February 1689: His Highness The Prince of Orange, Stadtholder of Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Gelderland and Overijssel
- 13 February 1689 – 8 March 1702: His Majesty The King

By 1674, William was fully styled as "Willem III, by God's grace Prince of Orange, Count of Nassau etc., Stadtholder of Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht etc., Captain- and Admiral-General of the United Netherlands". After their accession in Great Britain in 1689, William and Mary used the titles "King and Queen of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, Defenders of the Faith, etc."

Arms

As Prince of Orange, William's coat of arms was: Quarterly, I Azure billetty a lion rampant Or (for Nassau); II Or a lion rampant guardant Gules crowned Azure (Katzenelnbogen); III Gules a fess Argent (Vianden), IV Gules two lions passant guardant Or, armed and langued azure (Dietz); between the I and II quarters an inescutcheon, Or a fess Sable (Moers); at the fess point an inescutcheon, quarterly I and IV Gules, a bend Or (Châlons); II and III Or a bugle horn Azure, stringed Gules (Orange) with an inescutcheon, Nine pieces Or and Azure (Geneva); between the III and IV quarters, an inescutcheon, Gules a fess counter embattled Argent (Buren).

The coat of arms used by the king and queen was: Quarterly, I and IV Grand quarterly, Azure three fleurs-de-lis Or (for France) and Gules three lions passant guardant in pale Or (for England); II Or a lion rampant within a double tressureflory-

counter-flory Gules (for Scotland); III Azure a harp Or stringed Argent (for Ireland); overall an escutcheon Azure billetty a lion rampant Or. In his later coat of arms, William used the motto: *Je Maintiendrai* (medieval French for "I will maintain"). The motto represents the House of Orange-Nassau, since it came into the family with the Principality of Orange.

Chapter 44

United States Bill of Rights

The **United States Bill of Rights** comprises the first ten amendments to the United States Constitution. Proposed following the often bitter 1787–88 debate over the ratification of the Constitution, and written to address the objections raised by Anti-Federalists, the Bill of Rights amendments add to the Constitution specific guarantees of personal freedoms and rights, clear limitations on the government's power in judicial and other proceedings, and explicit declarations that all powers not specifically granted to the U.S. Congress by the Constitution are reserved for the states or the people.

The concepts codified in these amendments are built upon those found in earlier documents, especially the Virginia Declaration of Rights (1776), as well as the Northwest Ordinance (1787), the English Bill of Rights (1689), and the Magna Carta (1215).

Due largely to the efforts of Representative James Madison, who studied the deficiencies of the Constitution pointed out by anti-federalists and then crafted a series of corrective proposals, Congress approved twelve articles of amendment on September 25, 1789, and submitted them to the states for ratification. Contrary to Madison's proposal that the proposed amendments be incorporated into the main body of the Constitution (at the relevant articles and sections of the document), they were proposed as supplemental additions (codicils) to it. Articles Three through Twelve were ratified as

additions to the Constitution on December 15, 1791, and became Amendments One through Ten of the Constitution. Article Two became part of the Constitution on May 5, 1992, as the Twenty-seventh Amendment. Article One is still pending before the states.

Although Madison's proposed amendments included a provision to extend the protection of some of the Bill of Rights to the states, the amendments that were finally submitted for ratification applied only to the federal government. The door for their application upon state governments was opened in the 1860s, following ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment. Since the early 20th century both federal and state courts have used the Fourteenth Amendment to apply portions of the Bill of Rights to state and local governments. The process is known as incorporation.

There are several original engrossed copies of the Bill of Rights still in existence. One of these is on permanent public display at the National Archives in Washington, D.C.

Background

Philadelphia Convention

Prior to the ratification and implementation of the United States Constitution, the thirteen sovereign states followed the Articles of Confederation, created by the Second Continental Congress and ratified in 1781. However, the national government that operated under the Articles of Confederation was too weak to adequately regulate the various conflicts that arose between the states. The Philadelphia Convention set out

to correct weaknesses of the Articles that had been apparent even before the American Revolutionary War had been successfully concluded.

The convention took place from May 14 to September 17, 1787, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Although the Convention was purportedly intended only to revise the Articles, the intention of many of its proponents, chief among them James Madison of Virginia and Alexander Hamilton of New York, was to create a new government rather than fix the existing one. The convention convened in the Pennsylvania State House, and George Washington of Virginia was unanimously elected as president of the convention. The 55 delegates who drafted the Constitution are among the men known as the Founding Fathers of the new nation. Thomas Jefferson, who was Minister to France during the convention, characterized the delegates as an assembly of "demi-gods." Rhode Island refused to send delegates to the convention.

On September 12, George Mason of Virginia suggested the addition of a Bill of Rights to the Constitution modeled on previous state declarations, and Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts made it a formal motion. However, after only a brief discussion where Roger Sherman pointed out that State Bills of Rights were not repealed by the new Constitution, the motion was defeated by a unanimous vote of the state delegations. Madison, then an opponent of a Bill of Rights, later explained the vote by calling the state bills of rights "parchment barriers" that offered only an illusion of protection against tyranny. Another delegate, James Wilson of Pennsylvania, later argued that the act of enumerating the rights of the people would have been dangerous, because it

would imply that rights not explicitly mentioned did not exist; Hamilton echoed this point in *Federalist* No. 84.

Because Mason and Gerry had emerged as opponents of the proposed new Constitution, their motion—introduced five days before the end of the convention—may also have been seen by other delegates as a delaying tactic. The quick rejection of this motion, however, later endangered the entire ratification process. Author David O. Stewart characterizes the omission of a Bill of Rights in the original Constitution as "a political blunder of the first magnitude" while historian Jack N. Rakove calls it "the one serious miscalculation the framers made as they looked ahead to the struggle over ratification".

Thirty-nine delegates signed the finalized Constitution. Thirteen delegates left before it was completed, and three who remained at the convention until the end refused to sign it: Mason, Gerry, and Edmund Randolph of Virginia. Afterward, the Constitution was presented to the Articles of Confederation Congress with the request that it afterwards be submitted to a convention of delegates, chosen in each State by the people, for their assent and ratification.

Anti-Federalists

Following the Philadelphia Convention, some leading revolutionary figures such as Patrick Henry, Samuel Adams, and Richard Henry Lee publicly opposed the new frame of government, a position known as "Anti-Federalism". Elbridge Gerry wrote the most popular Anti-Federalist tract,

"Hon. Mr. Gerry's Objections", which went through 46 printings; the essay particularly focused on the lack of a bill of

rights in the proposed Constitution. Many were concerned that a strong national government was a threat to individual rights and that the President would become a king. Jefferson wrote to Madison advocating a Bill of Rights: "Half a loaf is better than no bread.

If we cannot secure all our rights, let us secure what we can." The pseudonymous Anti-Federalist "Brutus" (probably Robert Yates) wrote,

We find they have, in the ninth section of the first article declared, that the writ of habeas corpus shall not be suspended, unless in cases of rebellion—that no bill of attainder, or ex post facto law, shall be passed—that no title of nobility shall be granted by the United States, etc. If every thing which is not given is reserved, what propriety is there in these exceptions? Does this Constitution any where grant the power of suspending the habeas corpus, to make ex post facto laws, pass bills of attainder, or grant titles of nobility? It certainly does not in express terms.

The only answer that can be given is, that these are implied in the general powers granted. With equal truth it may be said, that all the powers which the bills of rights guard against the abuse of, are contained or implied in the general ones granted by this Constitution.

He continued with this observation:

Ought not a government, vested with such extensive and indefinite authority, to have been restricted by a declaration of rights? It certainly ought. So clear a point is this, that I cannot help suspecting that persons who attempt to persuade people

that such reservations were less necessary under this Constitution than under those of the States, are wilfully endeavoring to deceive, and to lead you into an absolute state of vassalage.

Federalists

Supporters of the Constitution, known as Federalists, opposed a bill of rights for much of the ratification period, in part due to the procedural uncertainties it would create.

Madison argued against such an inclusion, suggesting that state governments were sufficient guarantors of personal liberty, in No. 46 of *The Federalist Papers*, a series of essays promoting the Federalist position. Hamilton opposed a bill of rights in *The Federalist No. 84*, stating that "the constitution is itself in every rational sense, and to every useful purpose, a bill of rights." He stated that ratification did not mean the American people were surrendering their rights, making protections unnecessary: "Here, in strictness, the people surrender nothing, and as they retain everything, they have no need of particular reservations." Patrick Henry criticized the Federalist point of view, writing that the legislature must be firmly informed "of the extent of the rights retained by the people ... being in a state of uncertainty, they will assume rather than give up powers by implication."

Other anti-Federalists pointed out that earlier political documents, in particular the Magna Carta, had protected specific rights. In response, Hamilton argued that the Constitution was inherently different:

Bills of rights are in their origin, stipulations between kings and their subjects, abridgments of prerogative in favor of privilege, reservations of rights not surrendered to the prince. Such was the Magna Charta, obtained by the Barons, swords in hand, from King John.

Massachusetts compromise

In December 1787 and January 1788, five states—Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut—ratified the Constitution with relative ease, though the bitter minority report of the Pennsylvania opposition was widely circulated. In contrast to its predecessors, the Massachusetts convention was angry and contentious, at one point erupting into a fistfight between Federalist delegate Francis Dana and Anti-Federalist Elbridge Gerry when the latter was not allowed to speak. The impasse was resolved only when revolutionary heroes and leading Anti-Federalists Samuel Adams and John Hancock agreed to ratification on the condition that the convention also propose amendments. The convention's proposed amendments included a requirement for grand jury indictment in capital cases, which would form part of the Fifth Amendment, and an amendment reserving powers to the states not expressly given to the federal government, which would later form the basis for the Tenth Amendment.

Following Massachusetts' lead, the Federalist minorities in both Virginia and New York were able to obtain ratification in convention by linking ratification to recommended amendments. A committee of the Virginia convention headed by law professor George Wythe forwarded forty recommended amendments to Congress, twenty of which enumerated

individual rights and another twenty of which enumerated states' rights. The latter amendments included limitations on federal powers to levy taxes and regulate trade.

A minority of the Constitution's critics, such as Maryland's Luther Martin, continued to oppose ratification. However, Martin's allies, such as New York's John Lansing, Jr., dropped moves to obstruct the Convention's process. They began to take exception to the Constitution "as it was," seeking amendments. Several conventions saw supporters for "amendments before" shift to a position of "amendments after" for the sake of staying in the Union. Ultimately, only North Carolina and Rhode Island waited for amendments from Congress before ratifying.

Article Seven of the proposed Constitution set the terms by which the new frame of government would be established. The new Constitution would become operational when ratified by at least nine states. Only then would it replace the existing government under the Articles of Confederation and would apply only to those states that ratified it.

Following contentious battles in several states, the proposed Constitution reached that nine-state ratification plateau in June 1788. On September 13, 1788, the Articles of Confederation Congress certified that the new Constitution had been ratified by more than enough states for the new system to be implemented and directed the new government to meet in New York City on the first Wednesday in March the following year. On March 4, 1789, the new frame of government came into force with eleven of the thirteen states participating.

New York Circular Letter

In New York, the majority of the Ratifying Convention was Anti-Federalist and they were not inclined to follow the Massachusetts Compromise.

Led by Melancton Smith, they were inclined to make the ratification of New York conditional on prior proposal of amendments or, perhaps, insist on the right to secede from the union if amendments are not promptly proposed. Hamilton, after consulting with Madison, informed the Convention that this would not be accepted by Congress.

After ratification by the ninth state, New Hampshire, followed shortly by Virginia, it was clear the Constitution would go into effect with or without New York as a member of the Union. In a compromise, the New York Convention proposed to ratify with in confidence that the states would call for new amendments using the convention procedure in Article V, rather than making this a condition of ratification by New York. John Jay wrote the New York Circular Letter calling for the use of this procedure, which was then sent to all the States.

The legislatures in New York and Virginia passed resolutions calling for the convention to propose amendments that had been demanded by the States while several other states tabled the matter to consider in a future legislative session. Madison wrote the Bill of Rights partially in response to this action from the States.

Proposal and ratification

Anticipating amendments

The 1st United States Congress, which met in New York City's Federal Hall, was a triumph for the Federalists. The Senate of eleven states contained 20 Federalists with only two Anti-Federalists, both from Virginia.

The House included 48 Federalists to 11 Anti-Federalists, the latter of whom were from only four states: Massachusetts, New York, Virginia and South Carolina. Among the Virginia delegation to the House was James Madison, Patrick Henry's chief opponent in the Virginia ratification battle. In retaliation for Madison's victory in that battle at Virginia's ratification convention, Henry and other Anti-Federalists, who controlled the Virginia House of Delegates, had gerrymandered a hostile district for Madison's planned congressional run and recruited Madison's future presidential successor, James Monroe, to oppose him. Madison defeated Monroe after offering a campaign pledge that he would introduce constitutional amendments forming a bill of rights at the First Congress.

Originally opposed to the inclusion of a bill of rights in the Constitution, Madison had gradually come to understand the importance of doing so during the often contentious ratification debates. By taking the initiative to propose amendments himself through the Congress, he hoped to preempt a second constitutional convention that might, it was feared, undo the difficult compromises of 1787, and open the entire Constitution to reconsideration, thus risking the dissolution of the new federal government. Writing to

Jefferson, he stated, "The friends of the Constitution, some from an approbation of particular amendments, others from a spirit of conciliation, are generally agreed that the System should be revised.

But they wish the revisal to be carried no farther than to supply additional guards for liberty." He also felt that amendments guaranteeing personal liberties would "give to the Government its due popularity and stability". Finally, he hoped that the amendments "would acquire by degrees the character of fundamental maxims of free government, and as they become incorporated with the national sentiment, counteract the impulses of interest and passion".

Historians continue to debate the degree to which Madison considered the amendments of the Bill of Rights necessary, and to what degree he considered them politically expedient; in the outline of his address, he wrote, "Bill of Rights—useful—not essential—".

On the occasion of his April 30, 1789 inauguration as the nation's first president, George Washington addressed the subject of amending the Constitution. He urged the legislators,

whilst you carefully avoid every alteration which might endanger the benefits of an united and effective government, or which ought to await the future lessons of experience; a reverence for the characteristic rights of freemen, and a regard for public harmony, will sufficiently influence your deliberations on the question, how far the former can be impregnably fortified or the latter be safely and advantageously promoted.

Madison's proposed amendments

James Madison introduced a series of Constitutional amendments in the House of Representatives for consideration. Among his proposals was one that would have added introductory language stressing natural rights to the preamble. Another would apply parts of the Bill of Rights to the states as well as the federal government. Several sought to protect individual personal rights by limiting various Constitutional powers of Congress. Like Washington, Madison urged Congress to keep the revision to the Constitution "a moderate one", limited to protecting individual rights.

Madison was deeply read in the history of government and used a range of sources in composing the amendments. The English Magna Carta of 1215 inspired the right to petition and to trial by jury, for example, while the English Bill of Rights of 1689 provided an early precedent for the right to keep and bear arms (although this applied only to Protestants) and prohibited cruel and unusual punishment.

The greatest influence on Madison's text, however, was existing state constitutions. Many of his amendments, including his proposed new preamble, were based on the Virginia Declaration of Rights drafted by Anti-Federalist George Mason in 1776. To reduce future opposition to ratification, Madison also looked for recommendations shared by many states.

He did provide one, however, that no state had requested: "No state shall violate the equal rights of conscience, or the freedom of the press, or the trial by jury in criminal cases." He did not include an amendment that every state had asked for,

one that would have made tax assessments voluntary instead of contributions. Madison proposed the following constitutional amendments:

First. That there be prefixed to the Constitution a declaration, that all power is originally vested in, and consequently derived from, the people.

That Government is instituted and ought to be exercised for the benefit of the people; which consists in the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the right of acquiring and using property, and generally of pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety.

That the people have an indubitable, unalienable, and indefeasible right to reform or change their Government, whenever it be found adverse or inadequate to the purposes of its institution.

Secondly. That in article 1st, section 2, clause 3, these words be struck out, to wit: "The number of Representatives shall not exceed one for every thirty thousand, but each State shall have at least one Representative, and until such enumeration shall be made;" and in place thereof be inserted these words, to wit: "After the first actual enumeration, there shall be one Representative for every thirty thousand, until the number amounts to—, after which the proportion shall be so regulated by Congress, that the number shall never be less than—, nor more than—, but each State shall, after the first enumeration, have at least two Representatives; and prior thereto."

Thirdly. That in article 1st, section 6, clause 1, there be added to the end of the first sentence, these words, to wit: "But no

law varying the compensation last ascertained shall operate before the next ensuing election of Representatives."

Fourthly. That in article 1st, section 9, between clauses 3 and 4, be inserted these clauses, to wit: The civil rights of none shall be abridged on account of religious belief or worship, nor shall any national religion be established, nor shall the full and equal rights of conscience be in any manner, or on any pretext, infringed.

The people shall not be deprived or abridged of their right to speak, to write, or to publish their sentiments; and the freedom of the press, as one of the great bulwarks of liberty, shall be inviolable.

The people shall not be restrained from peaceably assembling and consulting for their common good; nor from applying to the legislature by petitions, or remonstrances for redress of their grievances. The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed; a well armed and well regulated militia being the best security of a free country: but no person religiously scrupulous of bearing arms shall be compelled to render military service in person.

No soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner; nor at any time, but in a manner warranted by law.

No person shall be subject, except in cases of impeachment, to more than one punishment, or one trial for the same offence; nor shall be compelled to be a witness against himself; nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor be obliged to relinquish his property, where it may be

necessary for public use, without a just compensation. Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

The rights of the people to be secured in their persons, their houses, their papers, and their other property, from all unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated by warrants issued without probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, or not particularly describing the places to be searched, or the persons or things to be seized.

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, to be informed of the cause and nature of the accusation, to be confronted with his accusers, and the witnesses against him; to have a compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor; and to have the assistance of counsel for his defence.

The exceptions here or elsewhere in the Constitution, made in favor of particular rights, shall not be so construed as to diminish the just importance of other rights retained by the people, or as to enlarge the powers delegated by the Constitution; but either as actual limitations of such powers, or as inserted merely for greater caution.

Fifthly. That in article 1st, section 10, between clauses 1 and 2, be inserted this clause, to wit: No State shall violate the equal rights of conscience, or the freedom of the press, or the trial by jury in criminal cases.

Sixthly. That, in article 3d, section 2, be annexed to the end of clause 2d, these words, to wit: But no appeal to such court shall be allowed where the value in controversy shall not

amount to — dollars: nor shall any fact triable by jury, according to the course of common law, be otherwise re-examinable than may consist with the principles of common law.

Seventhly. That in article 3d, section 2, the third clause be struck out, and in its place be inserted the clauses following, to wit: The trial of all crimes (except in cases of impeachments, and cases arising in the land or naval forces, or the militia when on actual service, in time of war or public danger) shall be by an impartial jury of freeholders of the vicinage, with the requisite of unanimity for conviction, of the right with the requisite of unanimity for conviction, of the right of challenge, and other accustomed requisites; and in all crimes punishable with loss of life or member, presentment or indictment by a grand jury shall be an essential preliminary, provided that in cases of crimes committed within any county which may be in possession of an enemy, or in which a general insurrection may prevail, the trial may by law be authorized in some other county of the same State, as near as may be to the seat of the offence.
In cases of crimes committed not within any county, the trial may by law be in such county as the laws shall have prescribed. In suits at common law, between man and man, the trial by jury, as one of the best securities to the rights of the people, ought to remain inviolate.

Eighthly. That immediately after article 6th, be inserted, as article 7th, the clauses following, to wit: The powers delegated by this Constitution are appropriated to the departments to which they are respectively distributed: so that the Legislative Department shall never exercise the powers vested in the

Executive or Judicial, nor the Executive exercise the powers vested in the Legislative or Judicial, nor the Judicial exercise the powers vested in the Legislative or Executive Departments.

The powers not delegated by this Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the States respectively.

Ninthly. That article 7th, be numbered as article 8th.

Crafting amendments

Federalist representatives were quick to attack Madison's proposal, fearing that any move to amend the new Constitution so soon after its implementation would create an appearance of instability in the government. The House, unlike the Senate, was open to the public, and members such as Fisher Ames warned that a prolonged "dissection of the constitution" before the galleries could shake public confidence. A procedural battle followed, and after initially forwarding the amendments to a select committee for revision, the House agreed to take Madison's proposal up as a full body beginning on July 21, 1789.

The eleven-member committee made some significant changes to Madison's nine proposed amendments, including eliminating most of his preamble and adding the phrase "freedom of speech, and of the press".

The House debated the amendments for eleven days. Roger Sherman of Connecticut persuaded the House to place the amendments at the Constitution's end so that the document would "remain inviolate", rather than adding them throughout, as Madison had proposed. The amendments, revised and

condensed from twenty to seventeen, were approved and forwarded to the Senate on August 24, 1789.

The Senate edited these amendments still further, making 26 changes of its own. Madison's proposal to apply parts of the Bill of Rights to the states as well as the federal government was eliminated, and the seventeen amendments were condensed to twelve, which were approved on September 9, 1789. The Senate also eliminated the last of Madison's proposed changes to the preamble.

On September 21, 1789, a House–Senate Conference Committee convened to resolve the numerous differences between the two Bill of Rights proposals. On September 24, 1789, the committee issued this report, which finalized 12 Constitutional Amendments for House and Senate to consider. This final version was approved by joint resolution of Congress on September 25, 1789, to be forwarded to the states on September 28.

By the time the debates and legislative maneuvering that went into crafting the Bill of Rights amendments was done, many personal opinions had shifted. A number of Federalists came out in support, thus silencing the Anti-Federalists' most effective critique. Many Anti-Federalists, in contrast, were now opposed, realizing that Congressional approval of these amendments would greatly lessen the chances of a second constitutional convention. Anti-Federalists such as Richard Henry Lee also argued that the Bill left the most objectionable portions of the Constitution, such as the federal judiciary and direct taxation, intact.

Madison remained active in the progress of the amendments throughout the legislative process. Historian Gordon S. Wood writes that "there is no question that it was Madison's personal prestige and his dogged persistence that saw the amendments through the Congress. There might have been a federal Constitution without Madison but certainly no Bill of Rights."

Ratification process

The twelve articles of amendment approved by congress were officially submitted to the Legislatures of the several States for consideration on September 28, 1789. The following states ratified some or all of the amendments:

- New Jersey: Articles One and Three through Twelve on November 20, 1789, and Article Two on May 7, 1992
- Maryland: Articles One through Twelve on December 19, 1789
- North Carolina: Articles One through Twelve on December 22, 1789
- South Carolina: Articles One through Twelve on January 19, 1790
- New Hampshire: Articles One and Three through Twelve on January 25, 1790, and Article Two on March 7, 1985
- Delaware: Articles Two through Twelve on January 28, 1790
- New York: Articles One and Three through Twelve on February 24, 1790

- Pennsylvania: Articles Three through Twelve on March 10, 1790, and Article One on September 21, 1791
- Rhode Island: Articles One and Three through Twelve on June 7, 1790, and Article Two on June 10, 1993
- Vermont: Articles One through Twelve on November 3, 1791
- Virginia: Article One on November 3, 1791, and Articles Two through Twelve on December 15, 1791 (After failing to ratify the 12 amendments during the 1789 legislative session.)

Having been approved by the requisite three-fourths of the several states, there being 14 States in the Union at the time (as Vermont had been admitted into the Union on March 4, 1791), the ratification of Articles Three through Twelve was completed and they became Amendments 1 through 10 of the Constitution. President Washington informed Congress of this on January 18, 1792.

As they had not yet been approved by 11 of the 14 states, the ratification of Article One (ratified by 10) and Article Two (ratified by 6) remained incomplete. The ratification plateau they needed to reach soon rose to 12 of 15 states when Kentucky joined the Union (June 1, 1792). On June 27, 1792, the Kentucky General Assembly ratified all 12 amendments, however this action did not come to light until 1996.

Article One came within one state of the number needed to become adopted into the Constitution on two occasions between 1789 and 1803. Despite coming close to ratification early on, it has never received the approval of enough states to

become part of the Constitution. As Congress did not attach a ratification time limit to the article, it is still pending before the states. Since no state has approved it since 1792, ratification by an additional 27 states would now be necessary for the article to be adopted.

Article Two, initially ratified by seven states through 1792 (including Kentucky), was not ratified by another state for eighty years. The Ohio General Assembly ratified it on May 6, 1873 in protest of an unpopular Congressional pay raise. A century later, on March 6, 1978, the Wyoming Legislature also ratified the article. Gregory Watson, a University of Texas at Austin undergraduate student, started a new push for the article's ratification with a letter-writing campaign to state legislatures. As a result, by May 1992, enough states had approved Article Two (38 of the 50 states in the Union) for it to become the Twenty-seventh Amendment to the United States Constitution. The amendment's adoption was certified by Archivist of the United States Don W. Wilson and subsequently affirmed by a vote of Congress on May 20, 1992.

Three states did not complete action on the twelve articles of amendment when they were initially put before the states. Georgia found a Bill of Rights unnecessary and so refused to ratify. Both chambers of the Massachusetts General Court ratified a number of the amendments (the Senate adopted 10 of 12 and the House 9 of 12), but failed to reconcile their two lists or to send official notice to the Secretary of State of the ones they did agree upon. Both houses of the Connecticut General Assembly voted to ratify Articles Three through Twelve but failed to reconcile their bills after disagreeing over whether to ratify Articles One and Two. All three later ratified the

Constitutional amendments originally known as Articles Three through Twelve as part of the 1939 commemoration of the Bill of Rights' sesquicentennial: Massachusetts on March 2, Georgia on March 18, and Connecticut on April 19. Connecticut and Georgia would also later ratify Article Two, on May 13, 1987 and February 2, 1988 respectively.

Application and text

The Bill of Rights had little judicial impact for the first 150 years of its existence; in the words of Gordon S. Wood, "After ratification, most Americans promptly forgot about the first ten amendments to the Constitution." The Court made no important decisions protecting free speech rights, for example, until 1931.

Historian Richard Labunski attributes the Bill's long legal dormancy to three factors: first, it took time for a "culture of tolerance" to develop that would support the Bill's provisions with judicial and popular will; second, the Supreme Court spent much of the 19th century focused on issues relating to intergovernmental balances of power; and third, the Bill initially only applied to the federal government, a restriction affirmed by *Barron v. Baltimore* (1833). In the twentieth century, however, most of the Bill's provisions were applied to the states via the Fourteenth Amendment—a process known as incorporation—beginning with the freedom of speech clause, in *Gitlow v. New York* (1925). In *Talton v. Mayes* (1896), the Court ruled that Constitutional protections, including the provisions of the Bill of Rights, do not apply to the actions of American Indian tribal governments. Through the incorporation process the United States Supreme Court succeeded in extending to the

States almost all of the protections in the Bill of Rights, as well as other, unenumerated rights. The Bill of Rights thus imposes legal limits on the powers of governments and acts as an anti-majoritarian/minoritarian safeguard by providing deeply entrenched legal protection for various civil liberties and fundamental rights.

The Supreme Court for example concluded in the *West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette* (1943) case that the founders intended the Bill of Rights to put some rights out of reach from majorities, ensuring that some liberties would endure beyond political majorities. As the Court noted, the idea of the Bill of Rights "was to withdraw certain subjects from the vicissitudes of political controversy, to place them beyond the reach of majorities and officials and to establish them as legal principles to be applied by the courts." This is why "fundamental rights may not be submitted to a vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections."

First Amendment

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

The First Amendment prohibits the making of any law respecting an establishment of religion, impeding the free exercise of religion, abridging the freedom of speech, infringing on the freedom of the press, interfering with the right to peaceably assemble or prohibiting the petitioning for a

governmental redress of grievances. Initially, the First Amendment applied only to laws enacted by Congress, and many of its provisions were interpreted more narrowly than they are today.

In *Everson v. Board of Education* (1947), the Court drew on Thomas Jefferson's correspondence to call for "a wall of separation between church and State", though the precise boundary of this separation remains in dispute. Speech rights were expanded significantly in a series of 20th- and 21st-century court decisions that protected various forms of political speech, anonymous speech, campaign financing, pornography, and school speech; these rulings also defined a series of exceptions to First Amendment protections.

The Supreme Court overturned English common law precedent to increase the burden of proof for libel suits, most notably in *New York Times Co. v. Sullivan* (1964). Commercial speech is less protected by the First Amendment than political speech, and is therefore subject to greater regulation.

The Free Press Clause protects publication of information and opinions, and applies to a wide variety of media. In *Near v. Minnesota* (1931) and *New York Times v. United States* (1971), the Supreme Court ruled that the First Amendment protected against prior restraint—pre-publication censorship—in almost all cases. The Petition Clause protects the right to petition all branches and agencies of government for action. In addition to the right of assembly guaranteed by this clause, the Court has also ruled that the amendment implicitly protects freedom of association.

Second Amendment

A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed.

The Second Amendment protects the individual right to keep and bear arms. The concept of such a right existed within English common law long before the enactment of the Bill of Rights. First codified in the English Bill of Rights of 1689 (but there only applying to Protestants), this right was enshrined in fundamental laws of several American states during the Revolutionary era, including the 1776 Virginia Declaration of Rights and the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1776. Long a controversial issue in American political, legal, and social discourse, the Second Amendment has been at the heart of several Supreme Court decisions.

- In *United States v. Cruikshank* (1876), the Court ruled that "[t]he right to bear arms is not granted by the Constitution; neither is it in any manner dependent upon that instrument for its existence. The Second Amendment means no more than that it shall not be infringed by Congress, and has no other effect than to restrict the powers of the National Government."
- In *United States v. Miller* (1939), the Court ruled that the amendment "[protects arms that had a] reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia".
- In *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008), the Court ruled that the Second Amendment "codified a pre-

existing right" and that it "protects an individual right to possess a firearm unconnected with service in a militia, and to use that arm for traditionally lawful purposes, such as self-defense within the home" but also stated that "the right is not unlimited. It is not a right to keep and carry any weapon whatsoever in any manner whatsoever and for whatever purpose".

- In *McDonald v. Chicago* (2010), the Court ruled that the Second Amendment limits state and local governments to the same extent that it limits the federal government.

Third Amendment

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

The Third Amendment restricts the quartering of soldiers in private homes, in response to Quartering Acts passed by the British parliament during the Revolutionary War. The amendment is one of the least controversial of the Constitution, and, as of 2018, has never been the primary basis of a Supreme Court decision.

Fourth Amendment

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by Oath or affirmation,

and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized. The Fourth Amendment guards against unreasonable searches and seizures, along with requiring any warrant to be judicially sanctioned and supported by probable cause. It was adopted as a response to the abuse of the writ of assistance, which is a type of general search warrant, in the American Revolution. Search and seizure (including arrest) must be limited in scope according to specific information supplied to the issuing court, usually by a law enforcement officer who has sworn by it. The amendment is the basis for the exclusionary rule, which mandates that evidence obtained illegally cannot be introduced into a criminal trial. The amendment's interpretation has varied over time; its protections expanded under left-leaning courts such as that headed by Earl Warren and contracted under right-leaning courts such as that of William Rehnquist.

Fifth Amendment

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the Militia, when in actual service in time of War or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offence to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

The Fifth Amendment protects against double jeopardy and self-incrimination and guarantees the rights to due process,

grand jury screening of criminal indictments, and compensation for the seizure of private property under eminent domain. The amendment was the basis for the court's decision in *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966), which established that defendants must be informed of their rights to an attorney and against self-incrimination prior to interrogation by police.

Sixth Amendment

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defense.

The Sixth Amendment establishes a number of rights of the defendant in a criminal trial:

- to a speedy and public trial
- to trial by an impartial jury
- to be informed of criminal charges
- to confront witnesses
- to compel witnesses to appear in court
- to assistance of counsel

In *Gideon v. Wainwright* (1963), the Court ruled that the amendment guaranteed the right to legal representation in all felony prosecutions in both state and federal courts.

Seventh Amendment

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by a jury, shall be otherwise re-examined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

The Seventh Amendment guarantees jury trials in federal civil cases that deal with claims of more than twenty dollars. It also prohibits judges from overruling findings of fact by juries in federal civil trials. In *Colgrove v. Battin* (1973), the Court ruled that the amendment's requirements could be fulfilled by a jury with a minimum of six members. The Seventh is one of the few parts of the Bill of Rights not to be incorporated (applied to the states).

Eighth Amendment

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

The Eighth Amendment forbids the imposition of excessive bails or fines, though it leaves the term "excessive" open to interpretation. The most frequently litigated clause of the amendment is the last, which forbids cruel and unusual punishment. This clause was only occasionally applied by the Supreme Court prior to the 1970s, generally in cases dealing with means of execution. In *Furman v. Georgia* (1972), some members of the Court found capital punishment itself in violation of the amendment, arguing that the clause could reflect "evolving standards of decency" as public opinion

changed; others found certain practices in capital trials to be unacceptably arbitrary, resulting in a majority decision that effectively halted executions in the United States for several years. Executions resumed following *Gregg v. Georgia* (1976), which found capital punishment to be constitutional if the jury was directed by concrete sentencing guidelines. The Court has also found that some poor prison conditions constitute cruel and unusual punishment, as in *Estelle v. Gamble* (1976) and *Brown v. Plata* (2011).

Ninth Amendment

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

The Ninth Amendment declares that there are additional fundamental rights that exist outside the Constitution. The rights enumerated in the Constitution are not an explicit and exhaustive list of individual rights. It was rarely mentioned in Supreme Court decisions before the second half of the 20th century, when it was cited by several of the justices in *Griswold v. Connecticut* (1965). The Court in that case voided a statute prohibiting use of contraceptives as an infringement of the right of marital privacy. This right was, in turn, the foundation upon which the Supreme Court built decisions in several landmark cases, including, *Roe v. Wade* (1973), which overturned a Texas law making it a crime to assist a woman to get an abortion, and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* (1992), which invalidated a Pennsylvania law that required spousal awareness prior to obtaining an abortion.

Tenth Amendment

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

The Tenth Amendment reinforces the principles of separation of powers and federalism by providing that powers not granted to the federal government by the Constitution, nor prohibited to the states, are reserved to the states or the people. The amendment provides no new powers or rights to the states, but rather preserves their authority in all matters not specifically granted to the federal government nor explicitly forbidden to the states.

Display and honoring of the Bill of Rights

George Washington had fourteen handwritten copies of the Bill of Rights made, one for Congress and one for each of the original thirteen states. The copies for Georgia, Maryland, New York, and Pennsylvania went missing. The New York copy is thought to have been destroyed in a fire. Two unidentified copies of the missing four (thought to be the Georgia and Maryland copies) survive; one is in the National Archives, and the other is in the New York Public Library. North Carolina's copy was stolen from the State Capitol by a Union soldier following the Civil War. In an FBI sting operation, it was recovered in 2003. The copy retained by the First Congress has been on display (along with the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence) in the *Rotunda for the Charters of Freedom* room at the National Archives Building in Washington, D.C. since December 13, 1952.

After fifty years on display, signs of deterioration in the casing were noted, while the documents themselves appeared to be well preserved. Accordingly, the casing was updated and the Rotunda rededicated on September 17, 2003. In his dedicatory remarks, President George W. Bush stated, "The true [American] revolution was not to defy one earthly power, but to declare principles that stand above every earthly power—the equality of each person before God, and the responsibility of government to secure the rights of all."

In 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt declared December 15 to be Bill of Rights Day, commemorating the 150th anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights. In 1991, the Virginia copy of the Bill of Rights toured the country in honor of its bicentennial, visiting the capitals of all fifty states.