Anthony Johnson, an African, arrived in Virginia in 1621 with only the name Antonio. Caught as a young man in the Portuguese slave-trading net, he had passed from one trader to another in the New World until he reached Virginia. There he was purchased by Richard Bennett and sent to work at Warrasquoke, Bennett’s tobacco plantation on
the James River. In the next year, Antonio was brought face-to-face with the world of triracial contact and conflict that would shape the remainder of his life. On March 22, 1622, the Powhatan tribes of tidewater Virginia fell on the white colonizers in a determined attempt to drive them from the land. Of the 57 people on the Bennett plantation, only Antonio and four others survived.

Antonio—his name anglicized to Anthony—labored on the Bennett plantation for some 20 years, slave in fact if not in law, for legally defined bondage had not yet fully taken hold in the Virginia colony. During this time, he married Mary, another African trapped in the labyrinth of servitude, and fathered four children. In the 1640s, Anthony and Mary Johnson gained their freedom after half a lifetime of servitude. Probably at this point they chose a surname, Johnson, to signify their new status. Already past middle age, the Johnsons began carving out a niche for themselves on Virginia’s eastern shore. By 1650, they owned 250 acres, a small herd of cattle, and two black servants. In a world in which racial boundaries were not yet firmly marked, the Johnsons had entered the scramble of small planters for economic security.

By schooling themselves in the workings of the English legal process, carefully cultivating white patronage, and working industriously on the land, the Johnsons gained their freedom, acquired property, established a family, warded off contentious neighbors, and hammered out a decent existence. But by the late 1650s, as the lines of racial slavery tightened, the customs of the country began closing in on Virginia’s free blacks.

In 1664, convinced that ill winds were blowing away the chances for their children and grandchildren in Virginia, the Johnsons began selling their land to white neighbors. The following spring, most of the clan moved north to Maryland, where they rented land and again took up farming and cattle raising. Five years later, Anthony Johnson died, leaving his wife and four children. The growing racial prejudice of Virginia followed Johnson beyond the grave. A jury of white men in Virginia declared that because Johnson “was a Negro and by consequence an alien,” the 50 acres he had deeded to his son Richard before moving to Maryland should be awarded to a local white planter.

Johnson’s children and grandchildren, born in America, could not duplicate the modest success of the African-born patriarch. By the late seventeenth century, people of color faced much greater difficulties in extricating themselves from slavery. When they did, they found themselves forced to the margins of society. Anthony’s sons never rose higher than the level of tenant farmer or small freeholder. John Johnson moved farther north into Delaware in the 1680s, following a period of great conflict with Native Americans in the Chesapeake region. Members of his family married local Native Americans and became part of a triracial community that has survived to the present day. Richard Johnson stayed behind in Virginia. When he died in 1689, just after a series of colonial insurrections connected with the overthrow of James II in England, he had little to leave his four sons. They became tenant farmers and hired servants, laboring on plantations owned by whites. By now, slave ships were pouring Africans into Virginia and Maryland to replace white indentured servants, the backbone of the labor force for four generations. To be black had at first been a handicap. Now it became a fatal disability, an indelible mark of degradation and bondage.

Anthony and Mary Johnson’s story is one of thousands detailing the experiences of seventeenth-century immigrants who arrived in North America. Their story is not about those European immigrants who sought both spiritual and economic renewal in the New World. But their lives became intertwined with those who were trying to escape European war, despotism, material want, and religious corruption. Like free immigrants and indentured servants from Europe, the Johnsons had to cope with new environments, new social situations, and new mixings of people who before had lived on different continents. Mastering the
North American environment involved several processes that would echo down the corridors of American history. Prominent among them were the molding of an African labor force and the gradual subjection of Native American tribes who contested white expansion. Both developments occurred in the lifetimes of Anthony and Mary Johnson and their children. Both involved a level of violence that made this frontier of European expansion not a zone of pioneer equality and freedom but one of growing inequality and servitude.

This chapter reconstructs the manner of settlement and the character of immigrant life in six areas of early colonization: Chesapeake Bay, southern New England, the French and Dutch area from the St. Lawrence River to the Hudson River, the Carolinas, Pennsylvania, and the Spanish toeholds on the southern fringe of North America. A comparison of these various colonies will show how the colonizers' backgrounds, ideologies, modes of settlement, and uses of labor—free, slave, and indentured—produced distinctly different societies in North America in the seventeenth century. The chapter also shows how these regional societies changed over the course of the seventeenth century and how they experienced internal strain, a series of Native American wars, a destructive and community-shattering witchcraft craze, and reactions to England's attempts to reorganize its overseas colonies.
THE CHESAPEAKE TOBACCO COAST

In 1607, a group of merchants established England’s first permanent colony in North America at Jamestown, Virginia. But for the first generation, its permanence was anything but assured; even into the second and third generation of settlement along the waters flowing into the Chesapeake Bay, the English colonizers were plagued with internal discord and violent clashes with the native peoples.

Jamestown, Sot Weed, and Indentured Servants

Under a charter from James I, the Virginia Company of London operated as a joint-stock company, an early kind of modern corporation that sold shares of stock and used the pooled capital to outfit and supply overseas expeditions. Although the king’s charter to the company began with a concern for bringing Christian religion to native people who “as yet live in darkness and miserable ignorance of the true knowledge of God,” most of the settlers probably agreed with Captain John Smith, who wrote that “We did admire how it was possible such wise men could so torment themselves with such absurdities, making religion their colour, when all their aim was profit.”

Profits in the early years proved elusive, however. Expecting to find gold, a rewarding trade with Native Americans for beaver and deer skins, and a water route to China, the original investors and settlers got a rude shock. Dysentery, malaria, drought, and malnutrition carried off most of the first colonists. More than 900 settlers, mostly men, arrived in the colony between 1607 and 1609; only 60 survived.

Seeking occupational diversity, the Virginia Company sent French silk artisans, Italian glass-makers, and Polish potash burners to Jamestown.
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Still, the Virginia Company of London poured in more money and settlers, many enticed with promises of free land after seven years’ labor for the company. In 1618, the company even offered 50 acres of land outright to anyone journeying to Virginia. To people on the margins of English society, the promise of free land seemed irresistible. More than 9,000 crossed the Atlantic between 1610 and 1622. Yet only 2,000 remained alive at the end of that period. “Instead of a plantation,” wrote one English critic, “Virginia will shortly get the name of a slaughter house.”

Beside the offer of free land, a crucial factor in the migration was the discovery that tobacco grew splendidly in Chesapeake soil. Francis Drake’s boatload of the “jovial weed” (so named for its intoxicating effect), procured in the West Indies in 1586, popularized it among the upper class and launched an addiction that continues to this day.

But one-third of the first immigrants were gold-seeking adventurers with unroughened hands, a proportion of gentlemen six times as great as in the English population. Many others were unskilled servants, some with criminal backgrounds, who (according to John Smith) “never did know what a day’s work was.” Both types adapted poorly to wilderness conditions, and Smith got few of the carpenters, fishermen, blacksmiths, and farmers he wanted.

The colony was also hampered by the assumption that Englishmen could exploit the Native Americans as Cortés and Pizarro had done. But the English found that the some 24,000 local Powhatan were not densely settled and could not be easily subjugated. Unlike Spain, England had sent neither an army of conquistadors nor an army of priests to subdue the natives. Instead, relations with the small groups that the able Powhatan had united into a confederacy turned bitter almost from the beginning. The Powhatan brought supplies of maize to the sick and starving Jamestown colony during the first autumn. However, John Smith, whose military experience in eastern Europe had schooled him in dealing with people he regarded as “barbarians,” raided Native American food supplies and tried to cow the local tribes. Amid one of the most severe droughts in centuries, which reduced the maize supply, the Powhatan withdrew from trade with the English and sniped at their flanks. Many settlers died in the “starving times” of the first years.
Even James I's denunciation of smoking as "loathsome to the eye, hateful to the nose, harmful to the brain, and dangerous to the lungs" failed to halt the smoking craze. The "sot weed" became Virginia's salvation. Planters shipped the first crop in 1617, and tobacco cultivation spread rapidly. Tobacco yielded enough profit for settlers to plant it even in the streets and market-place of Jamestown. By 1624, Virginia exported 200,000 pounds of the "stinking weed"; by 1638, though the price had plummeted, the crop exceeded 3 million pounds. Tobacco became to Virginia in the 1620s what sugar was to the West Indies and silver to Mexico and Peru. In London, men joked that Virginia was built on smoke.

Because tobacco required intensive care, Virginia's planters had to find a reliable supply of cheap labor. They found it by recruiting mostly English and Irish laborers to be indentured servants, who willingly sold years of their working lives in exchange for free passage to America. Nearly three-quarters of them were male, mostly between 15 and 24 years old, and nearly all came from the lower rungs of the social ladder at home.

Life for indentured servants often turned into a nightmare. Only about one in 20 realized the dream of freedom and land. If malarial fever or dysentery did not quickly kill them, they often succumbed to brutal work routines. Even by the middle of the seventeenth century, about half died during the first few years of "seasoning." Masters bought and sold their servants as property, gambled for them, and worked them to death, for there was little motive for keeping them alive beyond their term of service. "My Master Adkins," wrote one servant in 1623, "hath sold me..."
for £150 like a damned slave.” When servants neared the end of their contract, masters found ways to add time and were backed by courts that they controlled.

Contrary to English custom, masters often put women servants to work at the hoe. Sexual abuse was common, and servant women paid dearly for illegitimate pregnancies. The courts fined them heavily and ordered them to serve an extra year or two to repay the time lost during pregnancy and childbirth. They also deprived mothers of their illegitimate children, indenturing them out at an early age. Many servant women accepted the purchase of their indenture by any man who suggested marriage as the best release from this hard life.

Expansion and Indian War
As tobacco production caused Virginia’s population to increase, violence mounted between white colonizers and the Powhatan tribes. In 1614, the sporadic hostility of the early years ended temporarily with the arranged marriage of Chief Powhatan’s daughter, the fabled Pocahontas, to planter John Rolfe. However, the profitable cultivation of tobacco continued to create an intense demand for land. With settlers pushing inland, the local tribes pondered their future.

In 1617, when Powhatan retired, leadership of the Chesapeake tribes fell to Opechancanough. This proud and talented leader began preparing an all-out attack on his English enemies. The English murder of Nemattanew, a Powhatan war captain and religious prophet, triggered a fierce Native American assault in 1622 that dealt Virginia a staggering blow. More than one-quarter of the white population fell, and the casualties in cattle, crops, and buildings were equally severe.

The devastating attack bankrupted the Virginia Company. The king annulled its charter in 1624 and established a royal government, allowing the elected legislative body established in 1619, the House of Burgesses, to continue lawmaking in concert with the royal governor and his council.
The Native American assault of 1622 fortified the determination of the surviving planters to pursue a ruthless new Native American policy. John Smith, writing from England two years later, noted the grim satisfaction that had followed the attack. Many, he reported, believed that “now we have just cause to destroy them by all means possible.” Bolstered by instructions from London to “root out [the Native Americans] from being any longer a people,” the Virginians conducted annual military expeditions against the native villages.

Population growth after 1630 and settlers’ perpetual need for fresh acreage because tobacco quickly exhausted the soil intensified the pressure on Native American land. The tough, ambitious planters soon encroached on Indian territories, provoking war in 1644. The Chesapeake tribes, Virginians came to believe, were merely obstacles to be removed from the path of English settlement.

Proprietary Maryland

By the time Virginia had achieved commercial success in the 1630s, another colony on the Chesapeake took root. The founder’s main aim was not profit but rather a refuge for Catholics and a New World version of England’s manor-dotted countryside.

George Calvert, an English nobleman, designed and promoted the new colony. Closely connected to England’s royal family, he had received a huge grant of land in Newfoundland in 1628, just three years after James I had made him Lord Baltimore. In 1632, Charles I, James’ son, prepared to grant him a more hospitable domain of 10 million acres, which Calvert named Terra Maria, or Maryland, to honor the king’s Catholic wife, Henrietta Maria.

Catholics were an oppressed minority in England, and Calvert planned his colony as a haven for them. But knowing that he needed more than a small band of Catholic settlers, the proprietor invited others, too. Catholics, never a majority in his colony, were quickly overwhelmed by Protestants who jumped at the offer of free land with only a modest yearly fee to the Calverts.

Lord Baltimore died in 1632, leaving his 26-year-old son, Cecilius, to carry out his plans. The charter guaranteed the proprietor control over all branches of government, but young Calvert learned that his colonists would not be satisfied with fewer liberties than they enjoyed at home or could find in other colonies. Hence, the Lords Baltimore gave up their charter-given right to initiate all colonial laws, subject only to the advice and consent of the people.

Arriving in 1634, immigrants ignored Calvert’s plans for 6,000-acre manors for his relatives and 3,000-acre manors for lesser aristocrats, each to be worked by serflike tenants. The settlers took up their free land, imported as many indentured servants as they could afford, maintained generally peaceful relations with local native tribes, grew tobacco on scattered riverfront plantations like their Virginia neighbors, and governed themselves locally as much as possible. Although Maryland grew slowly at first—in 1650, it had a population of only 600—it developed rapidly in the second half of the seventeenth century. By 1700, its population of 33,000 was half that of Virginia.

Daily Life on the Chesapeake

Though immigrants to the Chesapeake Bay region dreamed of bettering the life they had known in England, most found life dismal. Only a minority...
could marry and rear a family, because marriage had to be deferred until the indenture was completed. And there were three times as many men as women. Marriages were fragile. Either husband or wife was likely to die of disease within about seven years. The vulnerability of pregnant women to malaria frequently terminated marriages, and death claimed half the children before they reached adulthood. Few children had two living parents while growing up. Grandparents were almost unknown.

In a society so numerically dominated by men, widows were prized and often remarried quickly. Such conditions produced complex families, full of stepchildren, stepparents, half-sisters, and half-brothers.

The household of Robert Beverley of Middlesex County illustrates the tangled family relationships in this death-filled society. When Beverley married Mary Keeble in 1666, she was a 29-year-old widow who had borne seven children during her first marriage. At least four of them were still alive to join the household of their mother’s new husband. They gained five half-brothers and half-sisters during their mother’s 12-year marriage to Beverley. When Mary Keeble Beverley died at age 41, her husband quickly remarried a recent widow, Katherine Hone. Beverley’s second wife brought her son into the household and in the next nine years produced four more children with Beverley before his death in 1687. Thus, between 1666 and 1687, Beverley had married two widows who bore him nine children and had been stepfather to the eight children his two wives had produced with previous husbands. Not one of these 17 children, from an interlocking set of four marriages, reached adulthood with both a living mother and father.

Plagued by horrendous mortality, the Chesapeake remained, for most of the seventeenth century, a land of immigrants rather than a land of settled families. Churches and schools took root very slowly. The large number of indentured servants further destabilized community life. Strangers in a household, they served their time and moved on, or died, replaced by other strangers, purchased fresh from England.

The region’s architecture reflected the difficult conditions. Life was too uncertain, the tobacco economy too volatile, and the desire to invest every available shilling in field labor too great for men to build grandly. At first they lived in primitive huts and shanties, hardly more than windbreaks. Even by the early eighteenth century, most Chesapeake families lived in crude houses without interior partitions. Eating, dressing, working, and loving all took place with hardly a semblance of privacy. For nearly two centuries, most ordinary Virginians and Marylanders were “pigg’d lovingly together,” as one planter put it. Even prosperous planters did not begin constructing fully framed, substantial homesteads until a century after the colony was founded.

The crudity of life also showed in the household possessions of the Chesapeake colonists. Struggling farmers and tenants were likely to own only a straw mattress, a simple storage chest, and the tools for food preparation and eating—a mortar and pestle to grind corn, knives for butchering, a pot or two for cooking stews and porridges, and wooden trenchers and spoons for eating. Most ordinary settlers owned no chairs, dressers, plates, or silverware. Among middling planters, the standard of living was raised only by possession of a flock mattress, coarse earthenware for milk and butter, a few pewter plates and porrings, a frying pan or two, and a few rough tables and chairs. To be near the top of Chesapeake society meant having three or four rooms, sleeping more comfortably, sitting on chairs rather than squatting on the floor, and owning such ordinary decencies as chamber pots, candlesticks, bed linen, a chest of drawers, and a desk. Only a few boasted such luxuries as clocks, books, punch bowls, wine-glasses, and imported furniture. Four generations elapsed in the Chesapeake settlements before the frontier quality of life slowly gave way to more refined living.

Bacon’s Rebellion Engulfs Virginia

The rough and crooked road that the Chesapeake colonies had followed in the seventeenth century reached an explosive point in 1675–1676 when a war fought both between the native and white populations and among the colonizers occurred. Before it all ended, hundreds of whites and Native Americans lay dead in Virginia and Maryland, Virginia’s capital of Jamestown lay smoldering, and English troops were crossing the Atlantic to suppress what the king labeled an outright rejection of his authority. This tangled conflict was called Bacon’s Rebellion after the headstrong Cambridge-educated planter Nathaniel Bacon, who arrived in Virginia at age 28.

Bacon and many other ambitious young planters detested the Native American policy of Virginia’s royal governor, Sir William Berkeley. In 1646, after the second Native uprising against the Virginians, the Powhatan tribes had been granted exclusive rights to territory beyond the limits of white settlement. Stable Native American relations suited the established planters, some of whom traded profitably with the natives, but became obnoxious to new settlers. Nor did harmonious conditions please...
Homesteading is central to our national experience. For 300 years after the founding of the first colonies, most Americans were involved in taming and settling the land. On every frontier, families faced the tasks of clearing the fields, beginning farming operations, and building shelter for themselves and their livestock. The kinds of structures they built depended on available materials, their resources and aspirations, and their notions of a “fair” dwelling. The plan of a house and the materials used in its construction reveal much about the needs, resources, priorities, and values of the people who built it.

By examining archaeological remains of early ordinary structures and by studying houses that are still standing, historians are reaching new understandings of the social life of pioneering societies. Since the 1960s, archaeologists and architectural historians have been studying seventeenth-century housing in the Chesapeake Bay and New England regions. They have discovered a familiar sequence of house types—from temporary shanties and lean-tos to rough cabins and simple frame houses to larger and more substantial dwellings of brick and finished timber. This hovel-to-house-to-home pattern existed on every frontier, as sodbusters, gold miners, planters, and cattle raisers secured their hold on the land and then struggled to move from subsistence to success.

What is unusual in the findings of the Chesapeake researchers is the discovery that the second phase in the sequence—the use of temporary, rough-built structures—lasted for more than a century. Whereas many New Englanders had rebuilt and extended their temporary clapboard houses into timber-framed, substantial dwellings by the 1680s, Chesapeake settlers continued to construct small, rickety buildings that had to be repaired continually or abandoned altogether every 10 to 15 years.
The William Boardman house shown opposite, built around 1687, is an example of the “orderly, fair, and well-built” houses of late-seventeenth-century Massachusetts. Its plan shows a typical arrangement of space: the hall, used for cooking, eating, working, and socializing; the parlor; a sleeping room for the parents; and a lean-to for kitchen chores and activities such as dairying. The great central chimney warmed the main downstairs room. Upstairs were two rooms used for both storage and sleeping. As you examine the exterior of the building, note the materials that have been used and the arrangement and treatment of windows, doors, and chimney. What impression of the Boardman family might visitors have as they approached the house? What kind of privacy and comfort did the house provide for family members?

The house shown above is a typical reconstructed tobacco planter’s house. It has some of the same features as the Boardman house, for both are products of an English building tradition. But there are some major differences between the two. In the Chesapeake house, the chimney is built not of brick but of mud and wood, and there is no window glass, only small shutters. The exterior is rough, unfinished planking. The placement of doors and windows and the overall dimensions indicate that this house has only one room downstairs and a loft above. The builders of this house clearly enjoyed less privacy and comfort than the Boardmans.

Historians have puzzled over this contrast between the architecture of the two regions. Part of the explanation may lie in the different climatic conditions and different immigration patterns of New England and the Chesapeake. In the southern region, disease killed thousands of settlers in the early decades. The imbalance of men and women produced a stunted and unstable family life, hardly conducive to an emphasis on constructing fine homes. In New England, good health prevailed almost from the beginning, and the family was at the heart of society. It made more sense, in this environment, to make a substantial investment in larger and more permanent houses. Some historians argue, moreover, that the Puritan work ethic impelled New Englanders to build solid homes—a compulsion unknown in the culturally backward, “lazy” South.

Archaeological evidence combined with data recovered from land, tax, and court records, however, suggests another reason for the impermanence of housing in the Chesapeake region. Living in a labor-intensive tobacco world, it is argued, planters large and small economized on everything possible in order to buy as many indentured servants and slaves as they could. Better to live in a shanty and have 10 slaves than to have a handsome dwelling and nobody to cultivate the fields. As late as 1775, the author of American Husbandry calculated that in setting up a tobacco plantation, five times as much ought to be spent on purchasing 20 black fieldhands as on the “house, offices, and tobacco-house.”

Only after the Chesapeake region had emerged from its prolonged era of mortality and gender imbalance and a mixed economy of tobacco, grain, and cattle had replaced the tobacco monoculture did the rebuilding of the region begin. Excavated house sites indicate that this occurred in the period after 1720. New research reveals that the phases of home building and the social and economic history of a society were closely interwoven.

Reflecting on the Past What do houses today reveal about the resources, economic livelihood, priorities, and values of contemporary Americans? Do class and regional differences in house design continue?
the white ex-indentured servants who hoped for cheap frontier land.

Land hunger and dissatisfaction with declining tobacco prices, rising taxes, and lack of opportunity erupted into violence in the summer of 1675. A group of frontiersmen used an incident with a local tribe as an excuse to attack the Susquehannock, whose rich land they coveted. Governor Berkeley denounced the attack, but few supported his position. As he explained, he faced “a people where six parts of seven at least are poor, indebted, discontented, and armed.” The badly outnumbered Susquehannock prepared for war as rumors swept the colony that they were offering large sums to gain western native allies or that New England tribes would support them.

Thirsting for revenge, the Susquehannock attacked during the winter of 1675–1676 and killed 36 Virginians. That spring, the hot-blooded Nathaniel Bacon became the frontiersmen’s leader. Joined by
hundreds of runaway servants and some slaves, he attacked friendly and hostile Native Americans alike. Governor Berkeley refused to sanction these attacks and declared Bacon a rebel, sending 300 militiamen to drag him to Jamestown for trial. Bacon recruited more followers, including many substantial planters. Frontier skirmishes with Native Americans had turned into civil war. During the summer of 1676, Bacon’s and Berkeley’s troops maneuvered, while Bacon’s men continued their forays against local tribes. Then Bacon boldly captured and razed Jamestown, forcing Berkeley to flee across Chesapeake Bay.

Virginians at all levels had chafed under Berkeley’s rule. High taxes, an increase in the governor’s powers at the expense of local officials, and the monopoly that Berkeley and his friends held on the Native American trade were especially unpopular. This opposition surfaced in the summer of 1676 as Berkeley’s and Bacon’s troops pursued each other through the wilderness. Berkeley tried to rally public support by holding new assembly elections and extending the vote to all freemen, whether they owned property or not. But the new assembly turned on the governor, passing laws to make government more responsive to the common people and to end rapacious office-holding. It also legalized enslaving Native Americans.

Time was on the governor’s side, however. Having crushed the Native Americans, Bacon’s followers began drifting home to tend their crops. Meanwhile, 1,100 royal troops were dispatched from England. By the time they arrived in January 1677, Nathaniel Bacon had died of swamp fever and most of his followers had melted away. Berkeley hanged 23 rebel leaders without benefit of trial.

Royal investigators afterward reported that Bacon’s followers “seem[ed] to wish and aim at an utter extirpation of the Indians.” This hatred of Native Americans, along with hopes of land ownership and independence, became a permanent feature of Virginia life. Even a royal governor could not restrain such men. A generation later, in 1711, the legislature spurned the governor’s plea for quieting the Native American frontier with educational missions and regulated trade, instead voting military appropriations of £20,000 “for extirpating all Indians without distinction of Friends or Enemys.” The remnants of the once populous Powhatan Confederacy lost their last struggle for the world they had known. Now they moved farther west or submitted to a life on the margins of white society as tenant farmers, day laborers, or domestic servants.

After Bacon’s Rebellion, an emerging planter aristocracy annulled most of the reform laws of 1676. By making new land available, the war relieved much of the social tension among white Virginians. Equally important, Virginians with capital to invest were turning from the impoverished rural villages of England and Ireland to the villages of West Africa to supply their labor needs. This halted the influx of poor white servants who, once free, had formed a discontented mass at the bottom of Chesapeake society. A racial consensus, uniting whites of different ranks in the common pursuit of a prosperous, slave-based economy, began to take shape.

Bacon’s Rebellion caused rumblings outside Virginia. Many of his followers fled to North Carolina, joining disgruntled farmers there, who were distressed by recent Native American uprisings, export duties on tobacco, and quitrents controlled by a mercenary elite. Led by George Durant and John Culpeper, they drove the governor from office and briefly seized power.

In Maryland, Protestant settlers chafed under high taxes, quitrents, and officeholders regarded as venal, Catholic, or both. Declining tobacco prices and a fear of Indian attacks increased their touchiness. A month after Bacon razed Jamestown, insurgent small planters tried to seize the Maryland government. Two leaders were hanged for the attempt. In 1681, Josias Fendall and John Coode, “two rank Baconists” according to Lord Baltimore, led another abortive uprising.

In all three southern colonies, the volatility of late-seventeenth-century life owed much to the region’s peculiar social development. Where family formation was retarded by imbalanced gender ratios and fearsome mortality, and where geographic mobility was high, little social cohesion or attachment to community could grow. Missing in the southern colonies were the stabilizing power of mature local institutions, a vision of a larger purpose, and the presence of experienced and responsive political leaders.

**The Southern Transition to Slave Labor**

English colonists on the mainland of North America at first regarded Native Americans as the obvious source of labor. But European diseases ravaged native societies, and the native people, more at home in the environment than the white colonizers, were difficult to subjugate. Indentured white labor proved the best way to meet the demand for labor during most of the seventeenth century.
The enslavement of Africans and their forced migration to many parts of the world has no precedent in human history.

**Reflecting on the Past**
To what degree did climate and other environmental factors determine the development of slave-based societies in the Americas? What differences marked the Atlantic slave trade from the slave trade across the Sahara and through the Red Sea and Indian Ocean?

Most slaves came from coastal West Africa.

The illustration above, from an eighteenth-century pamphlet, demonstrates British regulations for stowing the human cargo aboard slave ships. The Brooks, a 320-ton slave-trading ship, was built to accommodate 451 people. However, because it was expected that many slaves would die en route, ship captains sometimes attempted to increase their profits by crowding even more slaves into the hold than regulations allowed (The Library of Congress).

The transport of Africans to Portuguese Brazil dwarfed that of all other colonies.

For every African brought to North America, more than nine were sold as slaves in the West Indies and more than eight in Brazil.

The Atlantic Slave Trade

### Slave Importations, 1526–1810

- **British N. America**: 427,000
- **British/French West Indies**: 4,040,000
- **Spanish America**: 746,000
- **Portuguese America**: 3,647,000

Source: Data from Philip D. Curtin, *The Atlantic Slave Trade*.

Most slaves came from coastal West Africa.
However, beginning in 1619, a few Africans entered the Chesapeake colonies to labor in the tobacco fields alongside white servants. But as late as 1671, when some 30,000 slaves toiled in English Barbados, fewer than 3,000 served in Virginia. They were still outnumbered there at least three to one by white indentured servants. Only in the last quarter of the seventeenth century did the southern labor force begin to shift to a black slave majority. Three reasons explain this shift. First, the rising commercial power of England, at the expense of the Spanish and Dutch, swelled English participation in the African slave trade. This allowed southern planters, beginning in the 1680s, to purchase slaves more readily and cheaply than before. Second, the supply of white servants from England began drying up. Third, Bacon's Rebellion, involving rebellious former servants seeking land, led white planters to seek a more pliable labor force. Consequently, by the 1730s, the number of white indentured servants dwindled to insignificance. Black hands, not white, tilled and harvested Chesapeake tobacco and Carolina rice, and slave labor became the priority in starting a plantation.

In enslaving Africans, English colonists in North America merely copied their European rivals in the New World and emulated their countrymen on Barbados, Jamaica, and the Leeward Islands. There, from the 1630s on, the English had used brutal repression to mold Africans into a sugar- and tobacco-producing slave labor force. Human bondage would later become the subject of intense moral debate, but in the seventeenth century, all but a few whites accepted it without question.

The System of Bondage

The first Africans brought to the American colonies were probably sold as bound servants, who served their term and then, like Anthony and Mary Johnson, gained their freedom. Once free, they could buy land, hire out their labor, and move as they pleased. Their children, like those of white indentured servants, were born free. But gradually, Chesapeake planters drew tighter lines around the activities of black servants. By the 1640s, Virginia forbade blacks, free or bound, to carry firearms. In the 1660s, marriages between white women and black servants were banned as "shameful matches" and the "disgrace of our Nation." By the end of the century, when incoming Africans increased from a trickle to a torrent, even the few free blacks found themselves pushed to the margins of society. Slavery, which had existed for centuries in many societies as the lowest social status, was now becoming a caste reserved for those with black skin. Step by step, white society turned the black servant from a low-status human being into a chattel, or commodity.

In this dehumanization of Africans, which the English largely copied from their colonial rivals, the key step was instituting hereditary lifetime service. Once servitude ended only by death, other privileges quickly vanished. When a mother's slave condition legally passed on to her newborn black infant (which was not the case in slavery in Africa), slavery became self-perpetuating, passing automatically from one generation to the next.

Slavery became not only a system of forced labor but also a pattern of human relationships legitimated by law. By the early eighteenth century, most provincial legislatures limited black rights. Borrowed largely from England's Caribbean colonies, "Black codes" forced Africans into an ever narrower world. Slaves could not testify in court, engage in commercial activity, hold property, participate in the political process, congregate in public, travel without permission, or legally marry or be parents. Nearly stripped of human status, they became defined as...
property, and gradually all legal restraints on the masters’ treatment of them disappeared.

Eliminating slave rights did not eliminate slave resistance. With every African in chains a potential rebel, the rapid increase in the slave population brought anxious demands for strict control and justifications for brutality. “The planters,” wrote one Englishman in Jamaica, “do not want to be told that their Negroes are human creatures. If they believe them to be of human kind, they cannot regard them as no better than dogs or horses.” Thus occurred one of the great paradoxes of modern history. Many Old World immigrants imagined the Americas as a liberating and regenerating arena. Yet the opportunity to exploit its resources led to a historic process by which masses of Africans were wrenched from their homelands and forced into a system of slavery that could be maintained only by increasing intimidation and brutality.
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While some English settlers in the reign of James I (1603–1625) scrambled for wealth on the Chesapeake, others in England looked to the wilds of North America as a place to build a tabernacle to God. The society they fashioned aimed at unity of purpose and utter dedication to reforming the corrupt world. American Puritanism would powerfully affect the nation’s history by nurturing a belief in America’s special mission in the world. But the “New England way” also represented an attempt to banish diversity on a continent where the arrival of streams of immigrants from around the globe was destined to become the primary phenomenon.

Puritanism in England

England had been officially Protestant since 1558. Many English in the late sixteenth century, however, thought the Church of England was still riddled with Catholic vestiges. Some demanded the end of every taint of “the Bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities.” Because they wished to purify the Church of England, they were dubbed Puritans.

Religious reformers as well as men and women hoping to find in religion an antidote to the unsettling changes sweeping over English society were attracted to the Puritan movement. The growth of turbulent cities, the increase of wandering poor, rising prices, and accelerating commercial activity made them fear for the future and long for restraining old institutions such as the church, guilds, and local government.

While the concept of the individual operating as freely as possible, maximizing both opportunities and personal potential, is at the core of our modern system of beliefs, many in Elizabethan England dreaded the crumbling of traditional restraints. They wanted to preserve the ideal of community and the belief that people were bound together by reciprocal rights and responsibilities. Symptoms of the “degeneracy of the times” included the defiling of the Sabbath by Maypole dancing, card playing, fiddling, bowling, and all the rest of the roistering and erotic behavior reflected in Shakespeare’s dramatic portrayals of “Merrie England.” Puritans vowed to reverse the march of disorder by imposing a new discipline.

One part of their plan was a social ethic stressing work as a primary way of serving God. This emphasis on work made the religious quest of every member of society equally worthy. The labor of a mason was just as valuable in God’s sight as that of a merchant, and so was his soul. The “work ethic” would banish idleness and impart discipline throughout the community. Second, Puritans organized themselves into religious congregations in which each member hoped for personal salvation but also supported all others in their quest. Third, Puritans assumed responsibility for coercing and controlling “unconverted” people around them.

In 1603, when King James VI of Scotland became James I of England, he claimed to be responsible only to God. This assertion led to his collision with the rising power of the Puritans, who occupied the pulpits in hundreds of churches, gained control of several colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, and obtained many seats in Parliament where they challenged the king’s power. In response, James harassed them, removed dozens of Puritan ministers from their pulpits, and threatened many others. “I will harry them out of the land,” he vowed, “or else do worse.”

When Charles I succeeded to the throne in 1625, the situation for Puritans became worse. Determined to strengthen the monarchy and stifle dissent, the king summoned a new Parliament in 1628 and one year later adjourned this venerable body (which was the Puritans’ main instrument of reform) when it would not accede to royal demands. The king then appointed William Laud, the bishop of London, to high office and turned him loose on the Puritans, whom Laud called “wasps” and the “most dangerous enemies of the state.”

By 1629, as the king began ruling without Parliament, many Puritans were turning their eyes to northern Ireland, Holland, the Caribbean, and, especially, North America. They were convinced
that God intended them to carry their religious and social reforms beyond the reach of persecuting authorities. A declining economy added to their discouragement about England. Many Puritans decided that they should transport a fragment of English society to some distant shore and complete the Protestant Reformation.

**Puritan Predecessors in New England**

Puritans were not the first European colonizers to reach northeastern North America. Since the early 1500s, fishermen from several European nations had dried their Newfoundland catches on the coast of Cape Cod and Maine, frequently encountering Algonquin-speaking natives. A short-lived attempt at settlement in Maine had been made in 1607. Seven years later, the aging Chesapeake war dog John Smith, hired to hunt whales off the North American coast, coined the term “New England.”

No permanent settlement took root, however, until the Pilgrims—actually outnumbered by non-Pilgrims—arrived in Plymouth in 1620. Unlike the Puritans who followed, these humble Protestant farmers did not expect to convert a sinful world. Rather, they wanted to be left alone to realize their radical vision of a pure and primitive life. Instead of reforming the Church of England, they were Separatists who left it, first fleeing from England to Amsterdam in 1608, then to Leyden, Holland, and, finally, in 1620, to North America.

Arriving at Cape Cod in November 1620, the Pilgrims were weakened by a stormy nine-week voyage and were ill-prepared for the harsh winter ahead. Misled by John Smith’s glowing report of a warm, fertile country, they discovered instead a severe climate and a rockbound coast. By the following spring, half the Mayflower passengers were dead, including 13 of the 18 married women.

The survivors, led by the staunch William Bradford, settled at Plymouth. Squabbles soon erupted with local Native Americans, whom Bradford considered “savage and brutish men.” In 1622, they found themselves nearly overwhelmed by the arrival of 60 non-Pilgrims, sent out by the London Company, which had helped the Pilgrims finance their colony. For two generations, the Pilgrims tilled the soil, fished, and tried to keep intact their religious vision. But with the much larger Puritan migration that began in 1630, the Pilgrim villages nestled around Cape Cod Bay became a backwater of the thriving, populous Massachusetts Bay Colony, which absorbed them in 1691.

**Errand into the Wilderness**

In 11 ships, about 1,000 Puritans set out from England in 1630 for the Promised Land—the vanguard of a movement that by 1642 brought about 18,000 colonizers to New England. Led by John Winthrop, a talented, Cambridge-educated member of the English gentry, they operated under a charter from the king to the Puritan-controlled Massachusetts Bay Company. The Puritans set about building their utopia convinced they were carrying out a divine task. “God hath sifted a nation,” wrote one Puritan, “that he might send choice grain into this wilderness.”

Their intention was to establish communities of pure Christians who collectively swore a covenant with God. Dreaming of homogeneous communities where the good of the group outweighed individual interests, Winthrop counseled that “We must delight in each other, make others’ conditions our own, rejoice together, mourn together, labor and suffer together.”

Puritans willingly gave up freedoms that other English settlers sought. An ideology of rebellion in England, Puritanism in North America became an ideology of control, suffused with a powerful sense of mission that still remains part of American thinking. As Winthrop reminded the first settlers, “we shall be as a city upon a hill [and] the eyes of all people are upon us.”

As in Plymouth and Virginia, the first winter tested the strongest souls. More than 200 of the first
700 settlers perished, and 100 others, disillusioned and sickened by the forbidding climate, soon returned to England. But Puritans kept coming, settling along the rivers that emptied into Massachusetts Bay. A few years later, they pushed south into what became Connecticut and Rhode Island, as well as northward along the rocky coast.

Motivated by their militant work ethic and sense of mission, and led by men experienced in local government, law, and exhortation, the Puritans thrived. The early leaders of Virginia were soldiers of fortune or roughneck adventurers with predatory instincts, men who had no families or had left them at home; ordinary Chesapeake settlers were mostly young men with little stake in English society who sold their labor to cross the Atlantic. But the early leaders in Massachusetts were university-trained ministers, experienced members of the lesser gentry, and men with a compulsion to fulfill God’s prophecy for New England. Most ordinary settlers came as free men and women in families. Artisans and farmers from the middle ranks of English society, they established tight-knit communities in which, from the outset, the brutal exploitation of labor rampant in the Chesapeake had no place.

Relying mostly on free labor, the Puritans built an economy based on agriculture, fishing, timbering, and trading for beaver furs with local Native Americans. Even before leaving England, the directors of the Massachusetts Bay Company transformed their commercial charter into a rudimentary government. In North America, they laid the foundations of self-government. Free male church members annually elected a governor and deputies from each town, who formed one house of a colonial legislature, the General Court. The other house was composed of the governor’s assistants, later to be called councillors. Consent of both houses was required to pass laws.

The Puritans established the first printing press in the English colonies and founded Harvard College, which opened its doors in 1636 to train clergymen. The Puritan leaders also launched a brave attempt in 1642 to create a tax-supported school system, open to all wanting an education.

In spite of these accomplishments, the Puritan colony suffered many of the tensions besetting people bent on human perfection. Nor did Puritans prove any better at reaching an accommodation with the Native Americans than their less pious countrymen on the Chesapeake. Surrounded by seemingly boundless land, Puritans found it difficult to stifle acquisitive instincts and to keep families confined in compact communities. “An over-eager desire after the world,” wrote an early leader, “has so seized on the spirits of many as if the Lord had no farther work for his people to do, but every bird to feather his own nest.” Those remaining at the nerve center in Boston agitated for broader political rights and even briefly ousted Winthrop as governor in 1635, when the colony’s clergy backed the stiff-necked Thomas Dudley. After a few years, Governor Winthrop wondered whether the Puritans had not gone “from the snare to the pit.”

Winthrop’s troubles multiplied in 1633 when Salem’s Puritan minister, Roger Williams, began to voice disturbing opinions. The contentious and visionary young man argued that the Massachusetts Puritans were not truly pure because they would not completely separate from the polluted Church of England (which most Puritans still hoped to reform). Williams also denounced mandatory worship and argued that government officials should confine themselves to civil affairs and not interfere with religious matters. “Coerced religion,” he warned, “on good days produces hypocrites, on bad days rivers of blood.” Today honored as the earliest spokesman for the separation of church and state, Williams in 1633 seemed to strike at the heart of the Bible commonwealth, whose leaders regarded civil
and religious affairs as inseparable. Williams also charged the Puritans with illegally intruding on Native American land.

For two years, Puritan leaders could not quiet the determined young Williams. Convinced that he would split the colony into competing religious groups and undermine authority, the magistrates vowed to deport him to England. Warned by Winthrop, Williams fled southward through winter snow with a small band of followers to found Providence in what would become Rhode Island.

Even as they were driving Williams out, the Puritan authorities confronted another threat: a devout and magnetic woman of extraordinary talent and intellect who arrived in 1634 with her husband and seven children. Quickly gaining respect among Boston’s women as a midwife, healer, and spiritual counselor, Anne Hutchinson soon began to discuss religion and suggested that the “holy spirit” was absent in the preaching of some ministers. Before long Hutchinson was leading a movement labeled antinomianism, which stressed the mystical nature of God’s free gift of grace while discounting the efforts the individual could make to gain salvation.

By 1636, Boston was dividing into two camps—those who followed the male clergy and those drawn to the theological views of a gifted though untrained woman without official standing. Her followers included most of the community’s malcontents—merchants and artisans who chafed under the price controls the magistrates imposed in 1635 to stop inflation, young people resisting the rigid rule of their elders, and women disgruntled by male authority. Hutchinson doubly offended the male leaders of the colony because she boldly stepped outside the subordinate position expected of women. “The weaker sex” set her up as a “priest” and “thronged” after her, wrote one male leader. Another described a “clamour” in Boston that “New England men . . . usurp over their wives and keep them in servile subjection.”

Determined to remove this thorn from their sides, the clergy and magistrates put Hutchinson on trial in 1637. After long interrogations, they convicted her of sedition and contempt in a civil trial and banished her from the colony “as a woman not fit for our society.” Six months later, the Boston church excommunicated her for preaching erroneous theological opinions. She had “highly transgressed and offended and troubled the church,” pronounced the presiding clergyman, and “therefore in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, I do cast you out and deliver you up to Satan and account you from this time forth to be a heathen and a leper.” In the last month of her eighth pregnancy, Hutchinson, with a band of supporters, followed Roger Williams’s route to Rhode Island in 1638.

Ideas proved harder to banish. The magistrates could never enforce uniformity of belief nor curb the appetite for land. Growth, geographic expansion, and commerce with the outside world all eroded the ideal of integrated, self-contained communities vibrant with piety. Leaders faced the nearly impossible task of containing land-hungry immigrants in an expansive region. By 1636, groups of Puritans had swarmed not only to Rhode Island but also to Hartford and New Haven, where Thomas Hooker and John Davenport led new Puritan settlements in what became Connecticut.

New Englanders and Indians

Though the charter of the Massachusetts Bay Company spoke of converting “the natives to the knowledge and obedience of the only true God and Saviour of mankind and the Christian faith,” the instructions that Governor John Winthrop carried from England reveal other Puritan thoughts about
the native inhabitants. According to Winthrop’s orders, all men were to receive training in the use of firearms, a reversal of the sixteenth-century English policy of disarming the citizenry in order to quell public disorders. New England magistrates prohibited Native Americans from entering Puritan towns and threatened to deport any colonist selling arms to a native or instructing one in their use.

Only sporadic conflict with local tribes occurred at first because disease had left much of New England vacant. In 1616, visiting English fishermen had triggered a ferocious outbreak of respiratory viruses and smallpox that wiped out three-quarters of some 125,000 Native Americans. Five years later, an Englishman exploring the area described walking through a forest where human skeletons covered the ground. The Puritans believed that God had intervened on their side, especially when smallpox returned in 1633, killing thousands more natives and allowing new settlers to find land. Many surviving natives welcomed the Puritans because they now had surplus land and through trade hoped to gain English protection against tribal enemies to the north.

The settlers’ pressure for new land, however, soon reached into areas untouched by disease. Land hunger mingled with the Puritan sense of mission made an explosive mix. To a people brimming with messianic zeal, the Native Americans represented a challenge to the building of a religious commonwealth that would “shine as a beacon” back to decadent England. Puritans believed that God would blame them for not civilized and Christianizing the natives and would punish them with his wrath, so
they tried to make the “savages” of New England strictly accountable to their ordinances. They succeeded with the smaller, disease-ravaged tribes of eastern Massachusetts, but control over the stronger Pequot led to a bloody war in 1637. The Puritan victory assured English domination over all the tribes of southern New England except the powerful Wampanoag and Narragansett of Rhode Island and removed the last obstacle to expansion into the Connecticut River valley. Missionary work, led by John Eliot, began among the remnant tribes in the 1640s. After a decade of effort, about 1,000 Native Americans had been settled in four “praying villages,” learning to live according to the white settlers’ ways.

The Web of Village Life
Unlike the dispersed Chesapeake tobacco planters, the Puritans established small, tightly settled villages that were vital centers of life. Most were “open field” agricultural communities where farmers trudged out from the village each morning to cultivate narrow strips radiating out from the town. They grazed their cattle on common meadowland and cut firewood on common woodland. In other towns, Puritans employed the “closed field” system of self-contained farms that they had known at home. Both systems re-created common English patterns of agriculture with families living close together in towns built around a common, with a meetinghouse and tavern. These small, communal villages kept families in close touch so that each could be alert not only to its own transgressions, but also to those of its neighbors. “In a multitude of counsellors is safety,” Puritan ministers were fond of advising, and the little villages of 50 to 100 families perfectly served the need for moral surveillance, or “holy watching.” To achieve godliness and communal unity, Puritans also prohibited single men and women from living by themselves, beyond patriarchal authority and group observation. Left to themselves, men and women would stray from the path, for, as Thomas Hooker put it, “every natural man and woman is born full of sin, as full as a toad of poison.” Virginia planters counted the absence of restraint as a blessing. New Englanders feared it as the Devil.

At the center of every Puritan village stood the meetinghouse. These plain wooden structures, sometimes called “Lord’s barns,” gathered in every soul in the village twice a week. No man stood higher in the community than the minister, the spiritual leader in these small, family-based, community-oriented settlements, which viewed life as a Christian pilgrimage.

In Commemoration of Lydia Minot
Funeral testimonials like this one were cheaply printed as broadsides and were passed out to mourners. When Lydia Minot died in 1667 while giving birth to her sixth child, she was memorialized with anagrams and acrostics—popular literary exercises in the seventeenth century. What do the hourglass, coffin, and shovel, at the middle of the broadside, symbolize? (Courtesy of the Massachusetts Historical Society)

The unique Puritan mixture of strict authority and incipient democracy, of hierarchy and equality, can be seen in the way the Massachusetts town distributed land and devised local government. After receiving a grant, townspeople met to parcel out land. They awarded individual grants according to the size of a man’s household, his wealth, and his usefulness to the church and town. Such a system perpetuated existing differences in wealth and status. Yet some towns wrote language into their covenants that to the modern ear has an almost socialist ring. “From each according to his ability to each as need shall require,” read one. But it was not socialism that the Puritans had in mind; rather, they believed that the community’s welfare transcended individual ambitions or accomplishments and that
How Others See Us

John Josselyn, A Description of New Englanders

John Josselyn of Kent, England, on his second trip across the Atlantic, described New Englanders in the 1660s in this way.

The great masters [magistrates] as also some of their merchants, are damnable rich, generally all of [them] inexplicably covetous and proud. They receive your gifts but as an homage or tribute due to their transcendency [high social position], which is a fault their clergy are also guilty of, whose living is upon the bounty of their hearers .... But ... there are many sincere and religious people amongst them, descirled by their charity and humility ... by their hearty submission to their sovereign, the king of England, by their diligent and honest labor in their callings .... There are none that beg in the country, but there be witches too many—bottle-bellied witches amongst the Quakers and others that produce many strange apparitions (if you will believe reports of it): of a shallop [small ship] at sea manned with women; of a ship and a great red horse standing by the main mast; a ship being in a small cove to the eastward vanished of a sudden; of a witch that appeared aboard a ship twenty leagues to sea; of a mariner who took up the carpenter’s broad axe and cleft her head with it; the witch dying of the wound at home.

Does Josselyn believe in witches?

What do the many reports of apparitions tell you about the Salem witchcraft trials 30 years after this account was written?

Source: John Josselyn, Two Voyages to New England (London, 1674), excerpted in James Axtell, America Perceived: A View from Abroad in the 17th Century (West Haven, Conn.: Pendulum Press, 1974), 102–103. Spelling and punctuation have been modernized.

Population of the New England Colonies, 1620–1750

The fact that white population growth was far more rapid in New England than in the Chesapeake region reflected higher birthrates, a healthier environment, and a reliance on free labor.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census
Puritans’ “New Israel.” Whereas the germs carried by English colonizers devastated neighboring Native American societies, the effect on the newcomers of entering a new environment was the opposite. The low density of settlement prevented infectious diseases from spreading, and the isolation of the New England villages from the avenues of Atlantic commerce, along which diseases as well as cargo flowed, minimized biological hazards. The result was a spectacular natural increase in the population and a life span unknown in Europe. At a time when the population of western Europe was barely growing—deaths almost equaled births—the population of New England, discounting new immigrants, doubled every 27 years. The difference was not a higher birthrate. New England women typically bore about seven children during the course of a marriage, but this barely exceeded the European norm. The crucial factor was that chances for survival after birth were far greater than in England because of the healthier climate and better diet. In most of Europe, only half the babies born lived long enough to produce children themselves. Life expectancy for the population at large was less than 40 years. In New England, nearly 90 percent of the infants born in the seventeenth century survived to marriageable age, and life expectancy exceeded 60 years—longer than for the American population as a whole at any time until the early twentieth century. About 25,000 people immigrated to New England in the seventeenth century, but by 1700, they had produced a population of 100,000. By contrast, some 75,000 immigrants to the Chesapeake colonies had yielded a population of only about 70,000 by the end of the century.

Women played a vital role in this family-centered society. The Puritan woman was not only a wife, mother, and housekeeper; she also kept the vegetable garden; salted and smoked meats; preserved vegetables and dairy products; and spun yarn, wove cloth, and made clothes.

The presence of women and a stable family life strongly affected New England’s regional architecture. As communities formed, the Puritans converted early economic gains into more substantial housing rather than investing in bound labor as Chesapeake colonists did, a practice that retarded family formation and rendered the economy unstable. In New England, well-constructed one-room houses with sleeping lofts quickly replaced the early “wigwams, huts, and hovels.” Families then added parlors and lean-to kitchens as soon as they could. Within a half century, New England immigrants accomplished a general rebuilding of their living structures, whereas Chesapeake residents lagged far behind.

A final binding element in Puritan communities was the stress on literacy and education, eventually to become a hallmark of American society. Placing religion at the center of their lives, Puritans emphasized the ability to read catechisms,
psalmbooks, and especially the Bible. In literacy and education, Puritans saw guarantees for preserving their central values.

Though eager to be left alone, Puritans could not escape events in England. In 1642, King Charles I pushed England into revolution by violating the country’s customary constitution and continuing earlier attacks against Puritans. By 1649, the ensuing civil war climaxed with the trial and beheading of the king. Thereafter, during the so-called Commonwealth period (1649–1660), Puritans in England could complete the reform of religion and society at home. Meanwhile, migration to New England abruptly ceased.

The 20,000 English immigrants who had come to New England by 1649 were scattered from Maine to Long Island. Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts and Roger Williams of Rhode Island deplored this dispersion and condemned the “depraved appetite” for new and better land. Yet in a terrain so rock-strewn that its pastures were said to produce Yankee sheep with sharpened noses, it was natural that farmers should seek better plow land.

In 1643, to combat the problems of dispersion, Puritan leaders established the Confederation of New England, intended to coordinate government among the various Puritan settlements (Rhode Island was pointedly excluded) and to provide more effective defense against the French, the Dutch, and the Native Americans. This first American attempt at federalism functioned fitfully for a generation and then dissolved.

Although the Puritans fashioned stable communities, developed the economy, and constructed effective government, their leaders, as early as the 1640s, complained that the founding vision of Massachusetts Bay was faltering. Material concerns seemed to transcend religious commitment; the individual prevailed over the community. In 1638, the General Court declared a day of humiliation and prayer to atone for the colony’s “excess idleness and contempt of authority.” A generation later, the synod of 1679—a convention of Puritan churches—cried out that the “church, the commonwealth and the family are being destroyed by self-assertion.” If social diversity increased and the religious zeal of the founding generation waned, that was only to be expected. One second-generation Bay colonist put the matter bluntly. His minister had noticed his absence in church and found him later that day at the docks, unloading a boatload of cod. “Why were you not in church this morning?” asked the clergyman. Back came the reply: “My father came here for religion, but I came for fish.”

### King Philip’s War in New England

For religious leaders concerned about declining piety, continued difficulties with native tribes of southern New England signaled new evidence of God’s displeasure. Following the Pequot War of 1637, the Wampanoag and Narragansett tried to keep their distance from the Puritans who coveted their territories. As New Englanders quarreled among themselves over provincial boundaries, they gradually reduced the natives’ land base.

By the 1670s, when New England’s population had grown to about 50,000, the Native American leader was Metacomet (called King Philip by the English), the son of Massasoit, the Wampanoag chief who had allied with the first Plymouth settlers in 1620. Metacomet had watched his older brother preside over the deteriorating position of his people after their father’s death in 1661. Becoming chief in his turn, Metacomet faced one humiliating challenge after another, climaxing in 1671, when leaders of the Plymouth colony forced him to surrender a large stock of guns and accept his people’s subjection to English law.

Metacomet began organizing a resistance movement fed by the rising anger of the young Wampanoag males, who refused to imitate their fathers, who had acquiesced to the colonizers’ encroachments and abridgment of their sovereignty. For the young tribesmen, revitalization of their ancient culture through war became as important a goal as defeating the enemy. Rather than submit further, they attempted a pan-Indian offensive against an ever-stronger intruder.

In 1675, Puritans executed three Wampanoag for murdering John Sassamon, a Christianized Native American educated at Harvard who had allegedly warned Plymouth colony of an impending native attack. The execution sparked insurrection. That summer the Wampanoag unleashed daring hit-and-run attacks on villages in the Plymouth colony. By autumn, many New England tribes, including the powerful Narragansett, had joined Metacomet. Towns all along the frontier reeled under Native American attacks. By November, native warriors had devastated the entire upper Connecticut River valley, and by March 1676, they were less than 20 miles from Boston and Providence. As assumptions about English military superiority faded, New England officials passed America’s first draft laws. Widespread draft evasion and friction among the colonies hampered a counteroffensive.

Metacomet’s offensive faltered in the spring of 1676, sapped by food shortages, disease, and the refusal of the powerful Mohawk to join the New England tribes. Then Metacomet fell in a battle near the Wampanoag village where the war had begun.
The head of this “hell-hound, fiend, serpent, caitiff and dog,” as one colonial leader branded him, was displayed in Plymouth for 25 years.

At war’s end, several thousand colonists and perhaps twice as many Native Americans lay dead. Of some 90 Puritan towns, 52 had been attacked and 13 completely destroyed. Some 1,200 homes lay in ruins and 8,000 cattle were dead. The estimated cost of the war exceeded the value of all personal property in New England. Not for 40 years would the frontier advance beyond the line it had reached in 1675. Native American towns were devastated even more completely, including several inhabited by “praying Indians” who had converted to Christianity and allied with the whites. An entire generation of young men had been nearly annihilated. Many of the survivors, including Metacomet’s wife and son, were sold into slavery in the West Indies.

### Slavery in New England

The Wampanoag captives sold as slaves in the West Indies continued New England’s involvement in the dirty business of slavery. New England’s crops were not labor-intensive, so coerced labor never became the foundation of New England’s workforce. Slavery did take root in the cities, though, where slaves worked as artisans and domestic servants. Northern colonial economies also became enmeshed in the Atlantic commercial network, which depended on slavery and the slave trade. New England’s merchants eagerly pursued profits in the slave trade as early as the 1640s. By 1676, New England slavers were packing their holds with slaves from Madagascar, off the coast of East Africa, and transporting them 6,000 miles to the western side of the Atlantic. By 1750, half the merchant fleet of Newport, Rhode Island, reaped profits from carrying human cargo. In New York and
Philadelphia, building and outfitting slave vessels proved profitable.

New England’s involvement in the international slave trade deepened with the growth of its seaports as centers for distilling rum—the “hot, hellish and terrible liquor” made from West Indian sugar. Rum became one of the principal commodities traded for slaves on the African coast. As the number of slaves in the Caribbean multiplied—from about 50,000 in 1650 to 500,000 in 1750—New England’s large fishing fleet found important markets for its cod. Wheat from the middle colonies and barrel staves and hoops from North Carolina also serviced the slave-based West Indies economy. In short, every North American colony participated in the slave business.
The New Englanders were not the only European settlers in the northern region, for both France and Holland created colonies there. While English settlers founded Jamestown, the French were settling Canada, where they had failed in the 1540s.

**France’s America**

Henry IV, the first strong French king in half a century, sent Samuel de Champlain to explore deep into the territory even before the English had obtained a foothold on the Chesapeake. Champlain established a small settlement in Port Royal, Acadia (later Nova Scotia), in 1604 and another at Québec in 1608. French trading with Native Americans for furs had already begun in Newfoundland, and Champlain’s settlers hoped to keep making these easy profits. But the holders of the fur monopoly in France did not encourage immigration to the colony, fearing that settlement would reduce the forests from which the furs were harvested. New France therefore remained so lightly populated that English marauders easily seized and held Québec from 1629 to 1632.

In 1609–1610, Champlain allied with the Algonquian Indians of the St. Lawrence region in attacking their Iroquois enemies to the south, earning their enmity. This drove the Iroquois to trade furs for European goods with the Dutch on the Hudson River; when the Iroquois exhausted the furs of their own territory, they turned north and west, determined to seize the forest-rich resources from the Huron, French allies in the Great Lakes region.

When the Iroquois descended on them in the 1640s, the Huron were already decimated by a decade of epidemics that spread among them as Jesuit priests entered their villages. In the “beaver wars” of the 1640s and 1650s, the Iroquois used Dutch guns to attack Huron parties carrying beaver pelts to the French. By midcentury, Iroquois attacks had scattered the Huron, all but ending the French fur trade and reducing the Jesuit influence to a few villages of Christianized Huron.

The bitterness bred in these years colored future colonial warfare, driving the Iroquois to ally with the English against the French. By the mid-seventeenth century, the English remained unhindered by the beleaguered French colonists, who numbered only about 400.

**England Challenges the Dutch**

By 1650, the Chesapeake and New England regions each contained about 50,000 settlers. Between them lay the mid-Atlantic area controlled by the Dutch.
who planted a small colony named New Netherland at the mouth of the Hudson River in 1624. In the next four decades they extended their control to the Connecticut and Delaware river valleys. South of the Chesapeake lay a vast territory where only the Spanish, from their mission frontier in Florida, challenged the power of Native American tribes.

Although for generations they had been the Protestant bulwarks in a mostly Catholic Europe, England and Holland became bitter commercial rivals in the mid-seventeenth century. By the time the Puritans arrived in New England, the Dutch had become the mightiest carriers of seaborne commerce in western Europe. By one contemporary estimate, Holland owned 16,000 of Europe’s 20,000 merchant ships. The Dutch had also muscled in on Spanish and Portuguese transatlantic commerce, trading illegally with Iberian colonists who gladly violated their government’s commercial policies to obtain cloth and slaves more cheaply. By 1650, the Dutch had temporarily overwhelmed the Portuguese in Brazil, and soon their vast trading empire reached the East Indies, Ceylon, India, and Formosa (now Taiwan). The best shipbuilders, mariners, and businessmen in western Europe, they validated the dictum of Sir Walter Raleigh that “whosoever commands the sea commands the trade; whosoever commands the trade of the world commands the riches of the world, and consequently the world itself.”

In North America, the Dutch West India Company’s New Netherland colony was small, profitable, and multicultural. Agents fanned out from Fort Orange (Albany) and New Amsterdam (New York City) into the Hudson, Connecticut, and Delaware river valleys, establishing a lucrative fur trade with local tribes by hooking into the sophisticated trading network of the Iroquois Confederacy, which stretched to the Great Lakes. The Iroquois welcomed the Dutch presence, who were few in number, did not have voracious appetites for land, and willingly exchanged desirable goods for the pelts of animals plentiful in the vast Iroquois territory. At Albany, the center of the Dutch–Iroquois trade, relations remained peaceful and profitable for several generations.

Although the Dutch never settled more than 10,000 people in their mid-Atlantic colonies, their commercial and naval powers were impressive. The Virginians learned this in 1667 when brazen Dutch raiders captured 20 tobacco ships on the James River and confiscated virtually the entire tobacco crop for that year.

By 1650, England was ready to challenge Dutch maritime supremacy. War broke out three times
between 1652 and 1675, as the two Protestant nations competed to control the emerging worldwide capitalist economy. In the second and third wars, New Netherland became an easy target for the English. They captured it in 1664 and then, after it fell to the Dutch in 1673, recaptured it almost immediately. By 1675, the Dutch had been permanently dislodged from the North American mainland. But they remained mighty commercial competitors of the English around the world.

New Netherland—where from the beginning Dutch, French Huguenots, Walloons from present-day Belgium, Swedes, Portuguese, Finns, English, refugee Portuguese Jews from Brazil, and Africans had commingled in a babel of languages and religions—now became New York, so named because Charles II gave it (along with the former Dutch colonies on the Delaware River) to his brother the duke of York, later King James II. Under English rule, the Dutch colonists remained ethnically distinct for several generations, clinging to their language, their Dutch Reformed Calvinist churches, and their architecture. In time, however, English immigrants overwhelmed the Dutch, and gradual intermarriage among the Dutch, the French Huguenots (Protestants), and the English diluted ethnic loyalties. New York retained its polyglot, religiously tolerant character, and its people never allowed religious concerns or utopian plans to interfere with the pragmatic conduct of business.

**Proprietary Carolina: A Restoration Reward**

In 1663, three years after he was restored to his father’s throne, England’s Charles II granted a vast territory named Carolina to a group who supported him during his exile. Its boundaries extended from Virginia southward to central Florida and westward to the Pacific. Within this potential empire, eight London-based proprietors, including several involved in Barbados sugar plantations, gained governmental powers and semifeudal rights to the land. The system of governance planned for Carolina had both feudal and modern features. To lure settlers, the proprietors promised religious freedom and offered land free for the asking. However, this generous land offer included a scheme for a semimedieval government in which they, their deputies, and a few noblemen would monopolize political power. Reacting to a generation of revolutionary turbulence in England, they designed Carolina as a model of social and political stability in which a hereditary aristocracy would check boisterous small landholders.

Carolina realities bore faint resemblance to these hopes. The rugged sugar and tobacco planters who streamed in from Barbados and Virginia, where depressed economic conditions made a new beginning seem attractive, claimed their 150 acres of free land, as well as additional acreage for each family member or servant they brought. They ignored proprietary regulations about settling in compact rectangular patterns and reserving two-fifths of every county for an appointed nobility. In government, they also did as they pleased. Meeting in assembly for the first time in 1670, they refused to accept the proprietors’ Fundamental Constitutions of 1667 and ignored orders from the proprietors’ governor. Most of the settlers already knew how to run a slave society from having lived in Barbados, and they shaped local government from that experience.

**The Indian Debacle**

Carolina was the most elaborately planned colony in English history yet the least successful in achieving the harmony the proprietors had intended. Mindful of the violence that had plagued other settlements, they projected a well-regulated Native American trade, run exclusively by their appointed agents. By drawing the major tribes of the Southeast—the Cherokee, Creek, and Choctaw—into trade they might reap vast wealth, which the Spanish in Florida had failed to tap. But the aggressive settlers from the West Indies and the Chesapeake flouted all this.

To the consternation of the London proprietors, capturing Native Americans for sale in New England and the West Indies became the cornerstone of commerce in Carolina in the early years, plunging the colony into a series of wars. Planters and merchants selected a small tribe, armed it, and rewarded it handsomely for bringing in enemy captives. But even strong tribes found that after they had used English guns to enslave their weaker neighbors, they themselves were scheduled for elimination. The colonists claimed that “thinning the barbarous Indian natives” was needed to make room for white settlement, and the “thinning” was so thorough that by the early eighteenth century the two main tribes of the coastal plain, the Westo and the Savannah, were nearly extinct.

**Early Carolina Society**

Carolina’s fertile land and warm climate convinced many that it was a “country so delicious, pleasant, and fruitful that were it cultivated doubtless it
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would prove a second Paradize.” In came Barbadians, Swiss, Scots, Irish, French Huguenots, English, and migrants from northern colonies. But far from creating paradise, they clashed abrasively in an atmosphere of fierce competition, ecological exploitation, brutal race relations, and stunted social institutions. Decimating the coastal Native Americans made it easier to expand the initial settlements around Charleston.

After much experimentation, planters found a profitable staple crop that would flourish in this forbidding environment: rice. Its cultivation required backbreaking labor to drain swamps, build dams and levees, and hoe, weed, cut, thresh, and husk the crop. Many early settlers had owned African slaves in Barbados, so their reliance on slave labor came naturally. On widely dispersed plantations, black labor came to predominate. In 1680, four-fifths of South Carolina’s population was white. But by 1720, when the colony had grown to 18,000, black slaves outnumbered whites two to one.

As in Virginia and Maryland, the low-lying areas of coastal Carolina were so disease-ridden that population grew slowly in the early years. “In the spring a paradise, in the summer a hell, and in the autumn a hospital,” remarked one traveler. Malaria and yellow fever, especially dangerous to pregnant women, were the main killers that retarded population growth, and the scarcity of women further limited natural increase. Like the West Indies, the rice-growing region of Carolina was at first more a place to accumulate a fortune than to rear a family.
In healthier northern Carolina, a different kind of society emerged amid pine barrens along a sandy coast. Settled largely by small tobacco farmers from Virginia seeking free land, the Albemarle region developed a mixed economy of livestock grazing, tobacco and food production, and the extraction of naval stores—lumber, turpentine, resin, pitch, and tar.

In 1701, North and South Carolina became separate colonies, but their distinctiveness had already emerged. Slavery took root only slowly in North Carolina, which was still 85 percent white in 1720. A land of struggling white settlers, its healthier climate and settlement by families rather than by single men with servants and slaves gave it a greater potential for sustained growth. But in North as well as South Carolina, scattered settlements, ethnic and religious diversity, and a lack of shared assumptions about social and religious goals inhibited the growth of a strong colony-wide identity.

**THE QUAKERS’ PEACEABLE KINGDOM**

Of all the utopian dreams imposed on the North American landscape in the seventeenth century, the most remarkable was the Quakers’. During the English civil war, the Society of Friends, as the Quakers called themselves, had sprung up as one of the many radical sects searching for a juster society and a purer religion. Their visionary ideas and defiance of civil authority cost them dearly in fines, brutal punishment, and imprisonment. After Charles II and Parliament stifled radical dissent in the 1660s, they, too, sent many converts across the Atlantic. More than any other colony, the society they founded in Pennsylvania foreshadowed the religious and ethnic pluralism of the future United States.

**The Early Friends**

Like Puritans, the Quakers regarded the Church of England as corrupt. But Quakers went much further, rejecting all Church officials and institutions and holding that every believer could find grace through the “inward light,” a redemptive spark in every human soul. Rejecting original sin and eternal predestination, Quakers offered a radical alternative to Calvinism.

Other Protestants, regarding them as dangerous fanatics, persecuted Quakers in England after their movement, led by George Fox and Margaret Fell, gathered momentum in the 1650s. The Quaker doctrine of the “light within” took precedence even over Scripture and elevated all laypeople to the position of the clergy. Practicing civil disobedience, the Quakers also threatened social hierarchy and order. They refused to observe the customary marks of deference, such as doffing one’s hat to a superior, believing that God made no social distinctions. They used the familiar thee and thou instead of the formal and deferential you, they resisted taxes supporting the Church of England, and they refused to sign witnesses’ oaths on the Bible, regarding this as profane. Most shocking, they renounced the use of force in human affairs and therefore refused to perform militia service.

Quakers also affronted traditional views when they insisted on the spiritual equality of the sexes and the right of women to participate in church matters on an equal, if usually separate, footing with men. Quaker leaders urged women to preach and to establish separate women’s meetings. Among Quakers who fanned out from England to preach the doctrine of the inward light, 26 of the first 59 to cross the Atlantic were women. All but four of them were unmarried or without their husbands and therefore living, traveling, and ministering outside male authority.
Intensely committed to converting the world, Quakers ranged westward to North America and the Caribbean in the 1650s and 1660s. Nearly everywhere, they faced jeers, prison, mutilation, deportation, and death. Puritan Massachusetts warned them “to keep away from us and such as will come to be gone as fast as they can, the sooner the better.” Hungering to serve in what they called “the Lamb’s War” (the crusade of the meek), the Quakers vowed to test the Puritans’ resolve and kept coming. To enforce religious conformity, the Bay Colony magistrates in 1659 hanged two Quaker men on the Boston Common and threatened to do the same to Mary Dyer, an old woman who had followed Anne Hutchinson a quarter century before. Led from the colony, Dyer returned the next year, undaunted, to meet her death at the end of a rope in 1661.

Early Quaker Designs
By the 1670s, the English Quakers were looking for a place in the New World to carry out their millennial dreams and escape severe repression. They found a leader in William Penn. His decision to identify with this radical and persecuted sect was surprising, for he was the son of Sir William Penn, the admiral who had captured Jamaica from Spain in 1654. In 1666, the 23-year-old Penn adopted the Quaker creed and thereafter devoted himself to the Friends’ cause.

In 1674, Penn joined other Friends in establishing a North American colony, West Jersey. They had bought the land from one of the proprietors of New Jersey, itself a new English colony recently carved out of the former New Netherland. For West Jersey, Penn helped fashion a constitution extraordinarily liberal for its time that allowed virtually all free males to vote for legislators and local officials. Settlers were guaranteed freedom of religion and trial by jury. As Penn and the other trustees of the colony explained, “We lay a foundation for [later] ages to understand their liberty as men and Christians, that they may not be brought in bondage, but by their own consent; for we put the power in the people.”

The last phrase, summing up the document, would have shocked anyone of property and power in England or North America at the time. Most regarded “the people” as ignorant, dangerous, and certain to bring society to a state of anarchy if allowed to rule themselves. Nowhere in the English world had ordinary citizens, especially those who did not own land, enjoyed such extensive privileges. Nowhere had a popularly elected legislature received such broad authority.
West Jersey sputtered at first. Only 1,500 immigrants arrived in the first five years, and for several decades the colony was caught up in tangled claims to the land and government. The center of Quaker hopes lay across the Delaware River, where in 1681, Charles II granted William Penn a territory almost as large as England, paying off a large royal debt to Penn’s father. Charles II also benefited by getting the pesky Quakers out of England. Thus Penn and the Quakers came into possession of the last unassigned segment of the eastern coast of North America, and one of the most fertile.

**Pacifism in a Militant World: Quakers and Native Americans**

On the day Penn received his royal charter for Pennsylvania, he wrote a friend, “My God that has given it to me will, I believe, bless and make it the seed of a nation.” The nation that Penn envisioned was unique among colonizing schemes. Penn intended to make his colony an asylum for the persecuted and a refuge from arbitrary state power. Puritans had strived for social homogeneity and religious uniformity, excluding all not of like mind. In the Chesapeake and Carolina colonies, aggressive, unidealistic men had sought to exploit their lands and bondspeople. But Penn dreamed of inviting to his forested colony people of all religions and national backgrounds, offering them peaceful coexistence. His state would neither claim authority over citizens’ consciences nor demand military service of them.

The Quakers began streaming into Pennsylvania in 1682, quickly absorbing earlier Dutch, Finnish, and Swedish settlers. They participated in the government by electing representatives who initiated laws. They were primarily farmers, and like colonists elsewhere, they avidly acquired land, which Penn sold at reasonable rates. Unlike other colonizers, the Quakers practiced pacifism, holding the ethic of love and nonresistance embodied in the Sermon on the Mount as literally binding on them.

Even before arriving, Penn laid the foundation for peaceful relations with the Delaware tribe inhabiting his colony. “The king of the Country where I live, hath given me a great Province,” he wrote to the Delaware chiefs, “but I desire to enjoy it with your Love and Consent, that we may always live together as Neighbors and friends.” In this single statement Penn dissociated himself from the entire history of European colonization in the New World and from the widely held negative view of Native Americans. Recognizing the natives as the rightful owners of the land included in his grant, Penn pledged not to sell

**Concluding a Treaty with the Indians**

Edward Hicks painted Penn’s Treaty with the Indians in the nineteenth century. It is a romanticized version of the Treaty of Shackamaxon by which the Lenape chiefs ceded the site of Philadelphia to Penn. The treaty was actually made in 1682, but Hicks was correct in implying that the Lenape held Penn in high regard for his fair treatment of them. What evidence of Quaker pacifism do you find in this painting? (Edward Hicks, Penn’s Treaty with the Indians, Gift of Edgar William and Bernice Chrysler Garbisch, © 2000 Board of Trustees, National Gallery of Art, Washington)
one acre until he had first purchased it from local chiefs. He also promised to regulate strictly the Native American trade and to ban alcohol sales.

The Quaker accomplishment is sometimes disparaged with the claim that there was little competition for land in eastern Pennsylvania between the natives and the newcomers. However, a comparison between Pennsylvania and South Carolina, both established after the restoration of Charles II to the English throne in 1660, shows the power of pacifism. A quarter century after initial settlement, Pennsylvania had a population of about 20,000 whites. Penn’s peaceful policy had so impressed Native American tribes that native refugees began migrating into Pennsylvania from all sides. During the same 25 years, South Carolina had grown to only about 4,000 whites, many of them involved in wholesale violence employed to enslave thousands of Native Americans and lay waste to the Spanish mission frontier in Florida.

As long as the Quaker philosophy of pacifism and friendly relations with the local Native Americans held sway, interracial relations in the Delaware River valley contrasted sharply with those in other parts of North America. But ironically, the Quaker policy of toleration, liberal government, and exemption from military service attracted thousands of immigrants to the colony (especially in the eighteenth century) whose land hunger and disdain for Native Americans undermined Quaker trust and friendship. Driven from their homelands by hunger and war, Germans and Scots–Irish flooded in, swelling the population to 31,000 by 1720. Neither shared Quaker idealism about racial harmony. They pressed inland and, sometimes encouraged by the land agents of Penn’s heirs, encroached on the lands of the local tribes. By the mid-eighteenth century, white immigrants were spilling blood with the natives who also sought sanctuary in Pennsylvania.

**Building the Peaceable Kingdom**

Although Pennsylvania came closer to matching its founder’s goals than any other European colony, Penn’s dreams never completely materialized.
Unable to persuade people to settle in compact villages, which he believed necessary for his “holy experiment,” they instead created open country networks without any particular centers or boundaries. Still, because Quaker farmers prized family life and immigrated almost entirely in kinship groups, a sense of common endeavor persisted. This helped them maintain their distinctive identity. So did other practices such as allowing marriage only within their society, carefully providing land for their offspring, and guarding against too great a population increase (which would cause too rapid a division of farms) by limiting the size of their families.

Settled by religiously dedicated farming families, Pennsylvania boomed. Its countryside became a rich grainland. By 1700, the port capital of Philadelphia overtook New York City in population, and a half century later, it was the largest city in the colonies, bustling with artisans, mariners, merchants, and professionals.

The Limits of Perfectionism

Despite commercial success and peace with Native Americans, not all was harmonious in early Pennsylvania. Politics were often turbulent, in part because of Pennsylvania’s weak leadership. Penn was a much-loved proprietor, but he returned to England in 1684, revisiting his colony briefly in 1700. Penn’s absence created a leadership vacuum.

A more important cause of disunity resided in the Quaker attitude toward authority. In England, balking at authority was almost a daily part of Quaker life. But in Pennsylvania, the absence of persecution eliminated a crucial binding element from Quaker society. The factionalism that developed among them demonstrated that people never unify as well as when under attack. Rather than looking inward and banding together, they looked outward to an environment filled with opportunity. Their squabbling filled Penn with dismay. Why, he asked, were his settlers so “governmentish, so brutish, so susceptible to scurvy quarrels that break out to the disgrace of the Province?”

Meanwhile, Quaker industriousness and frugality helped produce great material success. After a generation, social radicalism and religious evangelicalism began to fade. As in other colonies, settlers discovered the door to prosperity wide open, and in they surged. Pennsylvania, it is said, was the first community since the Roman Empire to allow people of different national origins and religious persuasions to live together under the same government on terms of near equality. English, Highland Scots, French, Germans, Irish, Welsh, Swedes, Finns, and Swiss all settled in Pennsylvania. This ethnic mosaic was further complicated by a medley of religious groups, including Mennonites, Lutherans, Dutch Reformed, Quakers, Baptists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Catholics, Jews, and a sprinkling of mystics. Their relations may not always have been friendly, but few attempts were made to discriminate against dissenting groups. Pennsylvanians thereby laid the foundations for the pluralism that was to become the hallmark of American society.
THE QUAKERS’ PEACEABLE KINGDOM

Of all the utopian dreams imposed on the North American landscape in the seventeenth century the most remarkable was the Quakers’. During the English civil war, the Society of Friends, as the Quakers called themselves, had sprung up as one of the many radical sects searching for a juster society and a purer religion. Their visionary ideas and defiance of civil authority cost them dearly in fines, brutal punishment, and imprisonment. After Charles II and Parliament stifled radical dissent in the 1660s, they, too, sent many converts across the Atlantic. More than any other colony, the society they founded in Pennsylvania foreshadowed the religious and ethnic pluralism of the future United States.

The Early Friends

Like Puritans, the Quakers regarded the Church of England as corrupt. But Quakers went much further, rejecting all Church officials and institutions and holding that every believer could find grace through the “inward light,” a redemptive spark in every human soul. Rejecting original sin and eternal predestination, Quakers offered a radical alternative to Calvinism.

Other Protestants, regarding them as dangerous fanatics, persecuted Quakers in England after their movement, led by George Fox and Margaret Fell, gathered momentum in the 1650s. The Quaker doctrine of the “light within” took precedence even over Scripture and elevated all laypeople to the position of the clergy. Practicing civil disobedience, the Quakers also threatened social hierarchy and order. They refused to observe the customary marks of deference, such as doffing one’s hat to a superior, believing that God made no social distinctions. They used the familiar thee and thou instead of the formal and deferential you, they resisted taxes supporting the Church of England, and they refused to sign witnesses’ oaths on the Bible, regarding this as profane. Most shocking, they renounced the use of force in human affairs and therefore refused to perform militia service.

Quakers also affronted traditional views when they insisted on the spiritual equality of the sexes and the right of women to participate in church matters on an equal, if usually separate, footing with men. Quaker leaders urged women to preach and to establish separate women’s meetings. Among Quakers who fanned out from England to preach the doctrine of the inward light, 26 of the first 59 to cross the Atlantic were women. All but four of them were unmarried or without their husbands and therefore living, traveling, and ministering outside male authority.
Intensely committed to converting the world, Quakers ranged westward to North America and the Caribbean in the 1650s and 1660s. Nearly everywhere, they faced jeers, prison, mutilation, deportation, and death. Puritan Massachusetts warned them “to keep away from us and such as will come to be gone as fast as they can, the sooner the better.” Hungering to serve in what they called “the Lamb’s War” (the crusade of the meek), the Quakers vowed to test the Puritans’ resolve and kept coming. To enforce religious conformity, the Bay Colony magistrates in 1659 hanged two Quaker men on the Boston Common and threatened to do the same to Mary Dyer, an old woman who had followed Anne Hutchinson a quarter century before. Led from the colony, Dyer returned the next year, undaunted, to meet her death at the end of a rope in 1661.

Early Quaker Designs

By the 1670s, the English Quakers were looking for a place in the New World to carry out their millennial dreams and escape severe repression. They found a leader in William Penn. His decision to identify with this radical and persecuted sect was surprising, for he was the son of Sir William Penn, the admiral who had captured Jamaica from Spain in 1654. In 1666, the 23-year-old Penn adopted the Quaker creed and thereafter devoted himself to the Friends’ cause.

In 1674, Penn joined other Friends in establishing a North American colony, West Jersey. They had bought the land from one of the proprietors of New Jersey, itself a new English colony recently carved out of the former New Netherland. For West Jersey, Penn helped fashion a constitution extraordinarily liberal for its time that allowed virtually all free males to vote for legislators and local officials. Settlers were guaranteed freedom of religion and trial by jury. As Penn and the other trustees of the colony explained, “We lay a foundation for [later] ages to understand their liberty as men and Christians, that they may not be brought in bondage, but by their own consent; for we put the power in the people.”

The last phrase, summing up the document, would have shocked anyone of property and power in England or North America at the time. Most regarded “the people” as ignorant, dangerous, and certain to bring society to a state of anarchy if allowed to rule themselves. Nowhere in the English world had ordinary citizens, especially those who did not own land, enjoyed such extensive privileges. Nowhere had a popularly elected legislature received such broad authority.
West Jersey sputtered at first. Only 1,500 immigrants arrived in the first five years, and for several decades the colony was caught up in tangled claims to the land and government. The center of Quaker hopes lay across the Delaware River, where in 1681, Charles II granted William Penn a territory almost as large as England, paying off a large royal debt to Penn’s father. Charles II also benefited by getting the pesky Quakers out of England. Thus Penn and the Quakers came into possession of the last unassigned segment of the eastern coast of North America, and one of the most fertile.

Pacifism in a Militant World: Quakers and Native Americans

On the day Penn received his royal charter for Pennsylvania, he wrote a friend, “My God that has given it to me will, I believe, bless and make it the seed of a nation.” The nation that Penn envisioned was unique among colonizing schemes. Penn intended to make his colony an asylum for the persecuted and a refuge from arbitrary state power. Puritans had strived for social homogeneity and religious uniformity, excluding all not of like mind. In the Chesapeake and Carolina colonies, aggressive, unidealistic men had sought to exploit their lands and bondspeople. But Penn dreamed of inviting to his forested colony people of all religions and national backgrounds, offering them peaceful coexistence. His state would neither claim authority over citizens’ consciences nor demand military service of them.

The Quakers began streaming into Pennsylvania in 1682, quickly absorbing earlier Dutch, Finnish, and Swedish settlers. They participated in the government by electing representatives who initiated laws. They were primarily farmers, and like colonists elsewhere, they avidly acquired land, which Penn sold at reasonable rates. Unlike other colonizers, the Quakers practiced pacifism, holding the ethic of love and nonresistance embodied in the Sermon on the Mount as literally binding on them.

Even before arriving, Penn laid the foundation for peaceful relations with the Delaware tribe inhabiting his colony. “The king of the Country where I live, hath given me a great Province,” he wrote to the Delaware chiefs, “but I desire to enjoy it with your Love and Consent, that we may always live together as Neighbors and friends.” In this single statement Penn dissociated himself from the entire history of European colonization in the New World and from the widely held negative view of Native Americans. Recognizing the natives as the rightful owners of the land included in his grant, Penn pledged not to sell
one acre until he had first purchased it from local chiefs. He also promised to regulate strictly the Native American trade and to ban alcohol sales.

The Quaker accomplishment is sometimes disparaged with the claim that there was little competition for land in eastern Pennsylvania between the natives and the newcomers. However, a comparison between Pennsylvania and South Carolina, both established after the restoration of Charles II to the English throne in 1660, shows the power of pacifism. A quarter century after initial settlement, Pennsylvania had a population of about 20,000 whites. Penn’s peaceful policy had so impressed Native American tribes that native refugees began migrating into Pennsylvania from all sides. During the same 25 years, South Carolina had grown to only about 4,000 whites, many of them involved in wholesale violence employed to enslave thousands of Native Americans and lay waste to the Spanish mission frontier in Florida.

As long as the Quaker philosophy of pacifism and friendly relations with the local Native Americans held sway, interracial relations in the Delaware River valley contrasted sharply with those in other parts of North America. But ironically, the Quaker policy of toleration, liberal government, and exemption from military service attracted thousands of immigrants to the colony (especially in the eighteenth century) whose land hunger and disdain for Native Americans undermined Quaker trust and friendship. Driven from their homelands by hunger and war, Germans and Scots–Irish flooded in, swelling the population to 31,000 by 1720. Neither shared Quaker idealism about racial harmony. They pressed inland and, sometimes encouraged by the land agents of Penn’s heirs, encroached on the lands of the local tribes. By the mid-eighteenth century, white immigrants were spilling blood with the natives who also sought sanctuary in Pennsylvania.

Building the Peacable Kingdom

Although Pennsylvania came closer to matching its founder’s goals than any other European colony, Penn’s dreams never completely materialized.

William Penn, To the Delaware Chiefs

Addressing them as “My Friends in 1681,” William Penn wrote the Delaware (Lenape) chiefs the following letter as Quaker colonists were preparing to leave England for Pennsylvania. Penn signed the letter “I am your friend, William Penn.”

There is one great God and power that has made the world and all things therein, to whom you and I and all people owe their being and well-being, and to whom you and I must one day give an account for all that we do in this world. This great God has written his law in our hearts, by which we are taught and commanded to love and help and do good to one another, and not to do harm and mischief one unto another. Now this great God has been pleased to make me concerned in our parts of the world, and the kind of the country where I live has given unto me a great province therein, but I desire to enjoy it with your friends, else what would the great God say to us, who has made us not to devour and destroy one another, but live soberly and kindly together in the world. ... I am very sensible of the unkindness and injustice that has been too much exercised towards you by the people of these parts of the world, who have sought themselves, and to make great advantages by you, rather than be examples of justice and goodness unto you; which I hear has been matter of trouble to you and caused great grudgings and animosities, sometimes to the shedding of blood, which has made the great God angry. But I am not such a man, as is well known in my own country. I have great love and regard toward you and I desire to win and gain your love and friendship by a kind, just, and peaceable life; and the people I send are of the same mind, and shall in all things behave themselves accordingly. And if in anything any shall offend you or your people, you shall have a full and speedy satisfaction for the same by an equal number of honest men on both sides, that by no means you may have just occasion of being offended against them.

To what extent does Penn’s Quaker pacifism explain this letter?

Was there any precedent for what he mentions at the end of the letter: mediation of European–Native American disputes by an equal number of native and white males?
NEW SPAIN’S NORTHERN FRONTIER

Spain’s outposts in Florida and New Mexico, preceding all English settlements on the eastern seaboard, fell into disarray between 1680 and the early eighteenth century just as the English colonies were sinking deep roots. Trying to secure a vast northern frontier with only small numbers of settlers, the Spanish relied on forced Native American labor. This reliance proved to be their undoing in Florida and New Mexico.

Popé’s Revolt

During the 1670s, when the Franciscans developed a new zeal to root out traditional Native American religious ceremonies, the Pueblo people turned on the Spanish intruders. In years of harsh rule, the Spanish had extracted tribute labor from the Pueblo, who at the same time suffered the ravaging effects of European diseases. Both of these punishing long-term effects contributed to Pueblo alienation, but an assault on their religion pushed the Pueblo to the edge. Launching a campaign to restrict native religious ceremonies in the 1670s, the Spanish friars seized the Pueblo kivas (underground ceremonial religious chambers), forbade native dances, and destroyed priestly masks and prayer sticks.

In August 1680, Popé, a much-persecuted medicine man from San Juan pueblo, responded by leading about two dozen Pueblo villages scattered over several hundred miles to rise up in fury. They burned Spanish ranches and government buildings, systematically destroyed Spanish churches, lay waste to Spanish fields, and killed half of the friars. As the Spanish governor in Santa Fe watched the church go up in flames, he reported his shock at the “scoffing and ridicule which the wretched and miserable Indian rebels made of the sacred things, intoning . . . prayers of the church with jeers.”

Spanish settlers, soldiers, and friars streamed back to El Paso, abandoning their northern frontier in the Southwest for more than a decade. Only in 1694 did a
new Spanish governor, the intrepid Diego de Vargas, regain Santa Fe and gradually subdue most of the Pueblo. Learning from Popé’s rebellion, the Spanish declared a cultural truce, easing their demands for Pueblo labor tribute and tolerating certain Pueblo rituals in return for nominal acceptance of Christianity. Periodic tension and animosity continued, but the Pueblo had to come to terms with the Spanish because of their need for defense against their old enemies—the Navajo, Ute, and Apache.

**Decline of Florida’s Missions**

The Franciscan missions established in Florida along the Atlantic coast and inland to the west in the Florida panhandle had firmed up New Spain’s grip of the southeast corner of North America. Yet few Spanish settlers could be persuaded to settle in Florida. As the governor of Cuba put it frankly in 1673, “It is hard to get anyone to go to St. Augustine because of the horror with which Florida is painted. Only hoodlums and the mischievous go there from Cuba.”

Much devastated by disease, the Florida Indians and their Franciscan spiritual shepherds were as severely pummeled as those in New Mexico in the late seventeenth century. English settlers in neighboring South Carolina were eager to use Native American allies to attack the Spanish Indian villages and sell the captives into slavery. The attacks of Carolinians in the early 1680s destroyed a number of Spanish missions. When England and Spain went to war in

---
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1701—called Queen Anne's War in the colonies—the Carolinians attacked Florida. Burning mission villages to the ground, they slaughtered the Spanish friars and captured some 4,000 women and children to be sold as slaves. The Spanish mission frontier was thoroughly devastated, and only St. Augustine remained as a Spanish stronghold. Unlike in New Mexico, there was no Spanish reconquest. From this time onward, English and French traders, offering more attractive trade goods, would have the main influence over Florida Indians.

AN ERA OF INSTABILITY

A dozen years after King Philip's War in New England and Bacon's Rebellion in Virginia, a series of insurrections and a searing witchcraft incident convulsed colonial society. The Revolution of 1688 triggered the rebellions and was known thereafter to English Protestants as the Glorious Revolution since it ended forever the notion that kings ruled by “divine right.” Marking the last serious Catholic challenge to Protestant supremacy, it also signified a struggle for social and political dominance in the expanding colonies, as did the Salem witchcraft trials in Massachusetts.

Organizing the Empire

From the beginning of colonization, the English assumed that overseas settlements existed to promote the national interest at home. Mercantilist theory held that colonies were meant to serve as outlets for English manufactured goods, provide foodstuffs and raw materials, stimulate trade (and hence promote a larger merchant navy), and fill royal coffers by exporting commodities such as sugar and tobacco on which duties were paid. In return, colonists received English military protection and guaranteed markets.

Beginning with a small step in 1621, when the king's council forbade tobacco growers to export their crop to anywhere but England, the Crown slowly began to regulate its colonies in order to mold them into a unified empire. However, not until 1651, when the colonists traded freely with the commercially aggressive Dutch, did Parliament consider regulating colonial affairs. It passed a navigation act requiring that English or colonial ships, manned by English or colonial sailors, carry all goods entering England, Ireland, and the colonies, no matter where those goods originated. These first steps toward a regulated empire were also the first steps to place England's power behind national economic development.

In 1660, after the monarchy was restored, Parliament passed a more comprehensive navigation act that listed colonial products (tobacco, sugar, indigo, dyewoods, and cotton) that could be shipped only to England or other English colonies. Like its predecessor, the act took dead aim at Holland's domination of Atlantic commerce, while increasing England's revenues by imposing duties on the enumerated articles. Later navigation acts closed loopholes in the 1660 law and added other enumerated articles. This regulation bore lightly on the colonists, for the laws lacked enforcement.

After 1675, international competition and war led England to impose greater imperial control. That year marked the establishment of the Lords of Trade, a committee of the king's privy council empowered to make and enforce decisions regulating the colonies. Their chief aim was to create more uniform governments in North America and the West Indies that would do the Crown's will. Although movement toward imperial centralization often sputtered, the trend was unmistakable, especially to colonists who felt the sting of royal customs agents sent to enforce the navigation acts. England was becoming the shipper of the world, and its state-regulated policy of economic nationalism was essential to commercial greatness.

The Glorious Revolution in North America

When Charles II died in 1685, his brother, the duke of York, became King James II. This set in motion a chain of events that nearly led to civil war. Like Charles, James II professed the Catholic faith. Charles II, however, had disclosed this only on his deathbed, while the new king announced his faith immediately on assuming the throne. Consternation ensued. Protestant England recoiled when James issued the Declaration of Indulgence, which granted liberty of worship to all. Belief that the declaration was primarily a concession to Catholics hardened when the king began creating Catholic peerages to fill the House of Lords, appointed Catholics to high government posts, and demanded that Oxford and Cambridge open their doors to Catholic students. In 1687, the king dismissed a resistant Parliament. When his wife, supposedly too old for childbearing, bore a son in 1688, a Catholic succession loomed.

Convinced that James aimed at absolute power, Protestant leaders in 1688 invited a Dutch prince, William of Orange, to seize the throne with his wife, Mary, who was James's Protestant daughter.
James abdicated rather than fight. It was a bloodless victory for Protestantism, for parliamentary power and the limitation of kingly prerogatives, and for the merchants and gentry of England.

The response of New Englanders to these events stemmed from their previous experience with royal authority and their fear of “papists.” In 1676, New England became a prime target for efforts to reorganize the empire and crack down on smuggling, which had prevailed there for two generations. Charles II annulled the Massachusetts charter in 1684, and two years later James II appointed Sir Edmund Andros, a crusty professional soldier and former governor of New York, to rule over the newly created Dominion of New England. Soon the dominion gathered under one government all the English colonies from Maine to New Jersey. Puritans now had to swallow the bitter fact that they were subjects of London bureaucrats who cared more about shaping a disciplined empire than about New England’s special religious vision.

At first, New Englanders accepted Andros, though coolly. But he soon earned their hatred by invading freedoms they cherished. He imposed taxes without legislative consent, ended trial by jury, abolished the General Court of Massachusetts (which had met annually since 1630), muzzled Boston’s town meetings, and challenged land titles. He also mocked the Puritans by converting a Boston Puritan meeting-house into an Anglican chapel, held services there on Christmas Day—a gesture that to Puritans stank of popery—and insisted on religious toleration.

When news reached Boston in April 1689 that William of Orange had landed in England, Bostonians streamed into the streets. They imprisoned Andros, a suspected papist, and overwhelmed the fort in Boston harbor, which held most of the governor’s small contingent of red-coated royal troops. Andros escaped, disguised in women’s clothing, but was quickly recaptured. Boston’s ministers, along with merchants and former magistrates, led the rebellion, but city folk of the lower orders supplied the foot soldiers. For three years, an interim government ruled Massachusetts while the Bay colonists awaited a new charter and a new royal governor.

Although Bostonians had dramatically rejected royal authority and the “bloody devotees of Rome,” no internal revolution occurred. However, growing social stratification and the emergence of a political elite caused some citizens to argue that men of modest means but common sense might better be trusted with power. “Anarchy” was the word chosen by Samuel Willard, minister of Boston’s Third Church, to tar the popular spirit he saw unloosed in Boston in the aftermath of Andros’s ouster. But such egalitarian rumblings came to little.

In New York, the Glorious Revolution was similarly bloodless at first but far more disruptive. Royal government melted away on news of James’s abdication. Displacing the governor’s “popishly affected dogs and rogues,” German-born militia captain Jacob Leisler established an interim government and ruled with an elected Committee of Safety for 13 months until a governor appointed by King William arrived.

Leisler’s government enjoyed popularity among Dutch small landowners and urban laboring people who had resented the English seizing their colony and crowding them out of the society they had built.

Most of the upper Dutch echelon, however, had adjusted to English rule and many incoming English merchants had married into Dutch families. These New Yorkers detested Leisler as an upstart—a common foot soldier of the Dutch West India Company who arrived in 1660 and had leapedfrogged into the merchant class by marrying a wealthy widow. After the English seized the Dutch colony in 1664, he was often at odds with English leaders.

The Glorious Revolution ignited this smoldering social conflict. Leisler shared Dutch hostility toward New York’s English elite, and his sympathy for the common people, mostly Dutch, earned him the hatred of the city’s oligarchy. Leisler freed imprisoned debtors, planned a town-meeting system of government for New York City, and replaced merchants with artisans in important offices. By the autumn of 1689, Leislerian mobs were attacking the property of some of New York’s wealthiest merchants. Two merchants, refusing to recognize Leisler’s authority, were jailed.

Leisler’s opponents were horrified at the power of the “rabble.” They believed that ordinary people had no right to rebel against authority or to exercise political power. When a new English governor arrived in 1691, the anti-Leislerians embraced him and charged Leisler and seven of his assistants with treason for assuming the government without royal instructions.

In the ensuing trial, an all-English jury convicted Leisler and Jacob Milbourne, his son-in-law and chief lieutenant, of treason and ordered them hanged. Leisler’s popularity among the artisans of the city was evident when his wealthy opponents could find no carpenter in the city who would make a ladder for the scaffold. After his execution, peace gradually returned to New York, but for years provincial and city politics reflected the deep rift between Leislerians and anti-Leislerians.

The Glorious Revolution also focused dissatisfactions in several southern colonies. Because a Catholic
proprietary ruled Maryland, the Protestant majority seized power in July 1689 on word of the Glorious Revolution, using it for their own purposes. They vowed to cleanse Maryland of popery and to reform a corrupt customs service, cut taxes and fees, and extend the rights of the representative assembly. The militant Protestant John Coode, formerly a fiery Anglican minister who had been involved in a brief rebellion in 1681, assumed the reins of government and held them until the arrival of Maryland’s first royal governor in 1692.

In neighboring Virginia, the wounds of Bacon’s Rebellion were still healing when word of the Glorious Revolution arrived. The fact that Virginia lived under a Catholic governor, Lord Howard of Effingham, and a number of Catholic officials, fostered rumors of a Catholic plot. News of the revolution in England led a group of planters, suffering a prolonged drop in tobacco prices, to try to overthrow the governor, but the governor’s council defended itself, partly by removing Catholics from positions of authority.

The Glorious Revolution brought lasting political changes to several colonies. The Dominion of New England collapsed. Connecticut and Rhode Island regained the right to elect their own governors, but Massachusetts (now including Plymouth) and New Hampshire became royal colonies with governors appointed by the king. In Massachusetts, a new royal charter in 1691 eliminated Church membership as a voting requirement. The Maryland proprietorship was abolished (to be restored in 1715 when the Calverts became Protestant), and Catholics were barred from office. Everywhere Protestant Englishmen celebrated their liberties.

The Social Basis of Politics

The colonial insurrections associated with the Glorious Revolution revealed social and political tensions that accompanied the transplanting of English society to the North American wilderness. Colonial societies were hardly beyond the frontier stage, still fluid, unruly, competitive, and lacking the stable political systems and acknowledged leadership class thought necessary for social order.

The emerging colonial elite tried to foster stability by upholding a stratified Old World–style society in which children were subordinate to parents, women to men, servants to masters, and the poor to the rich. Hence, leaders everywhere tried to maintain social gradations and subordination. Puritans did not file into church on Sundays and occupy the pews randomly; seats were “doomed,” or assigned according to customary yardsticks of respectability—age, parentage, social position, wealth, and occupation. Even in fluid Virginia, lower-class people were hauled before courts for horse racing because this was a sport legally reserved for men of social distinction.

These social distinctions proved difficult to maintain. Regardless of previous rank, settlers rubbed elbows so frequently and faced such raw conditions together that those without pedigrees often saw little reason to defer to men of superior rank. “In Virginia,” explained John Smith, “a plain soldier that can use a pickaxe and spade is better than five knights.” Colonists everywhere gave respect not to those who claimed it by birth but to those who earned it by deed. A native elite gradually formed, but it had no basis as in Europe in legally defined and hereditary social rank. Planters and merchants, accumulating large estates, aped the English gentry by cultivating the arts, building fine houses, and acquiring symbols of respectability such as libraries, coaches, and racehorses. Yet their place was rarely secure. New competitors nipped constantly at their heels.

Amid such social flux, the elite never commanded general allegiance to the ideal of a fixed social structure. Ambitious men on the rise such as Nathaniel Bacon and Jacob Leisler, and their discontented followers, rose up against the constituted authorities, which they almost certainly would not have dared to do so in their homelands. When they gained power during the Glorious Revolution, in every case only briefly, the leaders of these uprisings linked themselves with a tradition of English struggle against tyranny and oligarchical power. They vowed to make government more responsive to the ordinary people, who composed most of their societies.

Witchcraft in Salem

The ordinary people in the colonies, for whom Bacon and Leisler tried to speak, could sometimes be misled, as the tragic events of the Salem witch hunts demonstrated. In Massachusetts, the deposing of Governor Andros left the colony in political limbo for three years, and this allowed what might have been a brief outbreak of witchcraft in the little community of Salem to escalate into a bitter and bloody battle. The provincial government, caught in transition, reacted only belatedly.

On a winter’s day in 1692, 9-year-old Betty Parris and her 11-year-old cousin Abigail Williams began to play at magic in the kitchen of a small house in Salem, Massachusetts. They enlisted the aid of Tituba, the slave of Betty’s father, Samuel Parris,
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the minister of the small community. Tituba told voodoo tales from her Caribbean past and baked “witch cakes.” The girls soon became seized with fits and began making wild gestures and speeches. Soon other young girls in the village were behaving strangely. Village elders extracted confessions that they were being tormented by Tituba and two other women, both social outcasts.

What began as young girls’ play turned into a ghastly rending of a farm community capped by the execution of 20 villagers accused of witchcraft. In the seventeenth century, people still took literally the biblical injunction “Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live.” For centuries throughout western Europe, people had believed that witches followed Satan’s bidding and did evil to anyone he designated. Communities had accused and sentenced women to death for witchcraft far more often than men. In Massachusetts, more than 100 people, mostly older women, had been accused of witchcraft before 1692, and more than a dozen had been hanged.

In Salem, the initial accusations against three older women quickly multiplied. Within weeks, dozens had been charged with witchcraft, including several prominent figures. Formal prosecution of the accused witches could not proceed because neither the new royal charter of 1691 nor the royal governor to rule the colony had yet arrived. For three months, while charges spread, local authorities could only jail the accused without trial. When Governor William Phips arrived from England in May 1692, he ordered a special court to try the accused. By then, events had careened out of control.

All through the summer, the court listened to testimony. By September it had condemned about two dozen villagers. The authorities hanged 19 of them on barren “Witches Hill” outside the town and crushed 80-year-old Giles Corey to death under heavy stones. The trials rolled on into 1693, but by then, colonial leaders, including many of the clergy, recognized that a feverish fear of one’s neighbors, rather than witchcraft itself, had possessed the little village of Salem.

Many factors contributed to the hysteria. Among them were generational differences between older Puritan colonists and the sometimes less religiously motivated younger generation, old family animosities, population growth and pressures on the available farmland, and tensions between agricultural Salem Village and the nearby commercial center called Salem Town. An outbreak of

What Witches Can Do

On both sides of the Atlantic, most people took witches seriously. The book Full and Plain Evidence Concerning Witches and Apparitions, published in London in 1681, showed devil-inspired witches flying over a house, entering an attic window, and hovering in one of the rooms. (By permission of the Houghton Library, Harvard University)
food poisoning may also have caused hallucinogenic behavior, and a new Native American war on the Massachusetts–Maine frontier caused near-hysteria. Probably nobody will ever fully understand the exact mingling of causes, but the fact that most of the individuals charged with witchcraft were women underscores the relatively weak position of women in Puritan society. The relentless spread of witchcraft accusations suggests the anxiety of this tumultuous era of war, economic disruption, the political tension, and the erosion of the early generation’s utopian vision.

**Conclusion**

**The Achievement of New Societies**

Nearly 200,000 immigrants who had left their European homelands reached North America in the seventeenth century. Coming from a variety of social backgrounds and spurred by different motives, they represented the rootstock of distinctive societies that would mature in the North American colonies of England, France, Holland, and Spain. For three generations, North America served as a social laboratory for religious and social visionaries, political theorists, fortune seekers, social outcasts, and, most of all, ordinary men and women seeking a better life than they had known in Europe.
By the end of the seventeenth century, 12 English colonies on the eastern edge of North America (and several others in the West Indies) had secured footholds in the hemisphere and erected the basic scaffolding of colonial life. So had Spanish and French colonies lying north, south, and west of the English. The coastal Native American tribes were reeling from disease and a series of wars that secured the English colonists’ land base along 1,000 miles of coastal plain. Though never controlling the powerful tribes of the interior, the colonists had established a profitable trade with them. English settlers had overcome a scarcity of labor by copying the other European colonists in the hemisphere, who had linked the west coast of Africa to the New World through the ghastly trade in human flesh. Finally, the English colonists had engaged in insurrections against what they viewed as arbitrary and tainted governments imposed by England.

The embryo of British America carried into the eighteenth century contained peculiarly mixed features. Disease, stunted family life, and the harsh work regimen imposed by the planters who commanded the labor of the vast majority ended the dreams of most who came to the southern colonies. Yet population inched upward, and the bone and sinew of a workable economy formed. In the northern colonies, to which the fewest immigrants came, life was more secure. Organized around family and community, favored by a healthier climate, and motivated by religion and social vision, the Puritan and Quaker societies thrived.

Still physically isolated from Europe, the colonists developed a large measure of self-reliance. Slowly, they began to identify themselves as the permanent inhabitants of a new land rather than as transplanted English, Dutch, or Scots-Irish. Viewing land and labor as the indispensable elements of a fruitful economy, they learned to exploit without apologies the land of one dark-skinned people and the labor of another. Yet even as they attained a precarious mastery in a triracial society, they were being culturally affected by the very people to whose land and labor they lay claim. Although utopian visions of life in North America still preoccupied some, most colonists had awakened to the reality that life in the New World was a mixture of unpredictable opportunity and sudden turbulence, unprecedented freedom and debilitating wars, racial intermingling and racial separation. It was a New World in much more than a geographic sense, for the people of three cultures who now inhabited it had remade it. And, while doing so, people like Anthony and Mary Johnson (whom we met at the beginning of the chapter) were remaking themselves.

Questions for Review and Reflection

1. What factors most shaped the development of the colonial Chesapeake region in the seventeenth century?
2. Early Massachusetts was organized around shared religious goals, yet it was riven by strife. How do you explain the tensions within this colony?
3. Seventeenth-century North America included a wide variety of colonial endeavors. What were the main regional divisions and distinguishing features of each area?
4. What were the causes and consequences of King Philip's War and Bacon's Rebellion? In what ways were the two conflicts similar or different?
5. What were the effects of the Glorious Revolution on the colonies and the empire?
6. Despite differences between colonial regions, it appears that prejudicial attitudes toward Africans and Native Americans were a common thread running through all colonial societies. Do you agree, and if so do you see any exceptions to this rule?
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