THE COMMON ORIGIN OF THE MIDDLE COLONIES

BY HAMPTON L. CARSON

I DO NOT know to what cause I may attribute the fact that you have invited a Philadelphia lawyer to come and talk to this learned body. I recall that many years ago I picked up on a bookstall a brochure which was published in London in 1690, just eight years after William Penn had reached the shores of the Delaware, written by one Gabriel Thomas, entitled: "An Account of Ye Flourishing Province of Pennsylvania." After giving special attention to the brewers, the bakers, the bricklayers, the masons, the jewelers and the carpenters, he said: "Of doctors and of lawyers I shall say nothing, because the place is very peaceable and healthy. Long may we be preserved from the pestiferous drugs of the one and the abominable loquacity of the other."

I do not intend to revenge myself, Mr. President, on this audience for that very discriminating remark. But I must take occasion to express the pleasure that I have in meeting you and my appreciation of the honor that you, some three years ago, conferred upon me by making me one of yourselves. Nor can I overlook an incident of some two years ago, when visting Worcester for the purpose of signing the roll—which I found it was not the custom to do, much to my regret, for I would have liked to have seen the autographs on your distinguished roll. We always have those autographs inscribed in the handwriting of the gentlemen accepting membership in the American Philosophical Society; and we celebrate next week the two hundredth anni-

versary of the founding of that society by Benjamin Franklin, it being the direct outgrowth of the famous "Junto." We have had, since 1727, less than two thousand members, but to look at the manuscript autographs of those, both in America and abroad, who obtained membership in a society with a strictly limited membership like your own, is certainly one of the best means of enjoying the past and realizing that you are being brought closely into contact with the famous of former days.

On visiting Worcester I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Brigham and, after a few moments' conversation, he called my attention to the fact that there was lying in his drawer the first volume of an exceedingly interesting and scarce Pennsylvania German newspaper which had very recently come into his possession. His accurate memory had enabled him to identify this paper as having been the property of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania some fifty years ago, at which time it was the earliest of a series of volumes constituting the only known file. He had obtained it for a price, yet with characteristic chivalry and with a spirit which we in Pennsylvania most highly appreciate he said, "This paper shall be restored to your files at exactly what it cost me." That is a rare instance, in my somewhat extended experience of the interchange of courtesies, of the repression of a strong inclination on the part of some librarians to acquire without inquiry treasures which come in their way, irrespective of marks of original ownership. I cannot miss this opportunity of saying to this body that the Historical Society of Pennsylvania is particularly indebted to this Society through the act of its librarian. I do not know that we ever can attempt to reciprocate, for as yet I have had no report of the possession by ourselves of any document which once belonged to you.

I have no notes, I have made none, and I shall simply talk in a plain way on a subject which I have turned over in my mind for quite a number of years—the

thought growing that at some time I might make it the subject of a published work, under some such title as "The Common Origin of the Middle Colonies."

We are all more or less, as we become students of history, attracted not only to the history of our own individual states, but to that of our adjoining sisters, and in that way my attention was drawn to the fact, well known to historians, but very little realized or emphasized by any of them, that the Middle Colonies—New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware—were so closely connected in point of time in respect to their births as to make it a noticeable phenomenon that their charters were practically—with an interval of a very few years, of the same date, and that together they constitute as a compact body (with the single exception of Georgia, whose charter was granted in 1732) the very youngest of the old Thirteen.

The question arose as to how it was that the continuity of territorial expansion in America, through the gift of charters from the Crown for the New England and Southern Colonies, which fell from the liberal hands of Charles I and Charles II in showers, should have been definitely interrupted. I soon realized that the Middle Colonies were allied geographically and were also closely connected in point of time, but that their births were postponed by the interesting fact of the occupation by the Dutch for nearly sixty years of the territory lying between the mouth of the Connecticut River and the mouth of Delaware Bay.

Had the Dutch been able to maintain their possession of that central part of the Atlantic Coast, there would never have been thirteen original stars in the flag of the United States. Maryland and Connecticut could have stretched their hands towards each other, but they never could have clasped above a chasm filled by the subjects of an alien sovereignty. Therefore, the questions followed: How came the Dutch there, how were they dispossessed, what was the cause of their dispossession, and what were the consequences

of the capture of New Amsterdam, now the city of New York, by an English fleet in 1664?

In looking at the books, particularly those relating to the history of the settlements on the Delaware—very little attention being given by New York historians to the matter, and none at all by the historians of other parts of the country—Pennsylvania history seemed to open with a date in a mariner's journal, that on the 28th of August, 1609, Henry Hudson, an Englishman in the employ of the Dutch East India Company, entered Delaware Bay. After vain attempts to ascend the river—owing to the existence of shoals and channels entirely unknown, which he had no proper means of exploring—he withdrew and sailing north entered on the 4th of September the lower bay of what is now the great harbor of New York. From that point, after exploring New York bay at large, the entrance to the East River being obstructed by the dangerous rapids of Hell Gate, he ascended the Hudson River almost to present Albany and, returning, was detained by the English, who forbade his going back to Holland. His report only by indirect means reached the hands of his employers, the Dutch East India Company.

Now that event, standing alone, is inexpressive. The real question is: How did an Englishman in the employ of the Dutch East India Company find himself on that date in the latitude of the mouth of Delaware Bay, why was he there, under what authority was he there, and what were the consequences of his act?

The main objection to the works of historians up to within thirty years ago—and this feature has not been altogether eliminated as yet—is that they were more interested in casualties than in causes. They did not view history as anything more than a mere congeries of accidents. They did not extend their vision into the past so as to find a definite and satisfactory explanation of the phenomena of the present. The consequence

was, they pursued the habit of annalists, stating events perhaps accurately, but shifting scenes so often that attention was distracted by such a multitude of details that there was lost a broad aspect of the question and lost entirely a philosophical apprehension of those great currents of events which, sweeping through the centuries, have brought about the present, as the child of the past.

Therefore, I indulged in a little further examination as to how Hudson happened to be there, under what authority he came and what were the consequences of his coming. And I found—I cannot say altogether to my surprise, but somewhat to my personal delectation, because discovery for one's self is always a more or less gratifying sensation—that historians had either neglected or had failed to apprehend the true explanation of those several events.

It was not long before I found that Mr. John Romeyn Brodhead, the great historian of New York, and whose book perhaps even today is in the lead as an authentic chronicle of events, had mistaken entirely the character of Hudson's act and had drawn, as I think, from that circumstance some entirely unwarranted conclusions. His cardinal error was in accepting Hudson's accidental *finding* of New York Bay and Manhattan Island as an authorized *discovery* on which to base Dutch sovereignty. He erred again in explaining the downfall of New Amsterdam in 1664, in the reign of Charles II, as the fruit of royal perfidy and avarice, and as being an unworthy effort to enrich Charles's brother (then the Duke of York, afterwards King James II) by snatching Dutch territory. It has seemed to me that these charges are inadequate as an explanation of a great historical fact. To attribute the downfall of New Netherland simply to the avarice of the English King and to the grasping qualities of the King's brother, is not convincing; because the most excited imagination could not have found in the then trade of New Amsterdam sufficient to tempt

avarice in comparison with the rich gold coasts of Guinea and the silver fleets of Spain bringing across the sea the rich ores of Peru, which were the real objects of English adventure. It is an attempt to place upon the King's shoulders a burden which it is unjust to impose.

I hold no brief for Charles II. He was not a far-seeing man. He was very much disposed to pleasures of the Court. He had inherited certain of the qualities of his grandfather, Henry of Navarre. His fondness for the pleasures of life diverted his attention from the broad views of statesmanship. Professor Leacock of McGill University has lately studied carefully the career of Charles II and has to a great extent exonerated him from all charges of that kind and made it clear that he was a misunderstood man—somewhat gallant, somewhat of a courtier, far from admirable in his private life, but not at all a man who was capable of either perfidy or avarice. We must probe more deeply to place these matters in their true light and learn how to explain the acts of the great Minister of State, the Earl of Clarendon, the father-in-law of the Duke of York and the grandfather of two English Queens—Queen Anne and Queen Mary, the wife of William III of Orange. It was Clarendon's policy as a statesman which led to the capture of the Dutch American possessions which now constitute the territory out of which the English Middle Colonies were carved. And it was the threatening interposition of the Dutch on that part of the American coast which clove the English colonies in twain, that led to the sending of an English fleet under Col. Richard Nicolls to take New Netherlands.

But that is the finale. The real question is: How did that statesmanship develop itself, and what was the cause of its sudden and timely exertion?

Now go back to Henry Hudson, an Englishman in the employ of the Dutch East India Company; how did that happen?

Hudson's active life covered a period of but five years. He perished, as we know, at the hands of a mutinous crew, who cut him loose and put him adrift amid the icebergs of Hudson's Bay, which is now his monument as well as his tomb. But he was one of those daring adventurers who, in the employ originally of the English Muscovy Company, had attempted the dangers of the northern ice in order to find a safe route to China, Japan, the Spice Islands and India.

In order to appreciate the quest of the northern nations—I mean England and Holland in particular, the maritime nations—for a northeast passage to China (the northwest passage was not at that time thought of at all) we must dig into the facts. The disasters which overcame the Muscovy Company were such that the company for a time suspended business. Hudson, who had been one of their captains—in fact he had on a former voyage reached the highest degree of northern latitude of any navigator of his age, as far north as eighty degrees—found himself without a job, to speak in the vernacular. He went to Amsterdam and he there found employment with the Dutch East India Company.

I emphasize the Dutch East India Company because the Dutch West India Company was not in existence at that time. It was not chartered until some twelve years later. The Dutch had become, after their successful revolt against Philip II of Spain, the great carrying nation of the world. The interruption to the overland commerce between the Far East and Europe was attributable to the downfall of Constantinople and its capture by the Turks. After the discovery of America, the Pope by decree divided the New World between two Catholic nations, Spain and Portugal, drawing an imaginary meridian line slightly west of the Azores, all that was west of the Azores to belong to Spain and all that was east to belong to Portugal. Knowledge of Geography in those days was exceedingly limited and it was not known to what extent the

great shoulder of Brazil jutted out into the Atlantic Ocean, so as to bring the Brazilian Coast within the Portuguese claim, and that accounts for the presence of the Portuguese in that Country. The Portuguese having the eastern part of South America while the Spaniards had the west, threw Spain upon Peru, Chile and Mexico, while Portugal exploited the Spice Islands of the Far East, the west coast of Africa and the coast of Guinea, the Gold Coast which was very tempting and afterwards became the subject of the slave trade to furnish labor for the mines in Peru and the sugar plantations elsewhere. The consequence was that when Spain absorbed Portugal the inborn hostility of the Dutch to anything that was Spanish became so intense that it transferred itself from the battlefield and the scenes of the dungeon, and the rack, in their struggle for religious liberty to a struggle for commercial supremacy. The Dutch were on the heels of the Portuguese ships and went in and established their colonies in the East Indies.

Now in order to rid that commerce of the dangers of being captured by Spanish pirates or Portuguese pirates, as well as to escape the long delays of ten thousand miles of navigation around Africa and across the Indian Ocean, the Dutch East India Company, with its eye on trade, sought the northeast passage to China, to Japan and to the Malaysian Archipelago. They were sending their captains out in order to discover that passage. Their geographers and navigators had figured out very carefully the amount of saving in distance and the captains themselves were able to testify to the fact that Dutch commerce would be safe from capture on the part of Spanish and Portuguese privateers if such a passage could be found. Hence it was that Henry Hudson, looking for a job and trained by years of previous experience in encountering the ice, found no difficulty in obtaining employment for a voyage with the East India Company.

I went so far as to secure a copy of the contract

which Henry Hudson made with the East India Company, in looking for the extent of his authority in order to see exactly what it was that he represented. He did not represent the States General of Holland. His contract was simply one of private employment as captain of the *Half Moon,* a little vessel of only sixty tons burden. He recruited eighteen men, but unfortunately, as most of the crew were accustomed to tropical waters, they could not stand the rigors of the ice, and when he got in the neighborhood of Spitzbergen they mutinied. His instructions were positive and they were twice repeated in the contract: "If you cannot find a northeast passage to China you must return to Amsterdam for further instructions."

When he found himself unable to penetrate to the northeast he absolutely disregarded his sailing instructions, and, wishing to obtain if possible some wreath of laurel for himself, he took the risk and, yielding to a mutinous crew, he disobediently turned his prow to the west. He got caught in the Labrador current, was carried down the coast. When he found himself in the latitude of Chesapeake Bay he suddenly recalled that his friend Captain John Smith, who had successfully conducted a colony to Jamestown some three years before, had told him that somewhere north of the King's River—as the James River at that time was called, and still perpetuates the name of James I as the English King—there was a great entrance leading towards the northwest and possibly he might find a passage in that way. It was with that thought in his mind that he entered Delaware Bay. Unable to penetrate in that direction, he withdrew and sailing north entered New York Bay. Going up the Hudson until the river shallowed on him to such an extent that he could proceed no further than one hundred and fifty miles, he found that he had failed in that respect. He hardly dared to return home and proposed wintering somewhere in the Labrador region, but his crew mutinied again; and the crew being composed of

English and Dutch, the Englishmen prevailed on him to enter the harbor of Plymouth and surrender his papers. There he was detained by the English governor, who, having found that he had entered the employ of the Dutch East India Company and made some sort of a finding, did not want the benefit to accrue to another nation. But his papers reached the Dutch East India Company. It paid no attention whatever to that finding. The Company was interested only in the spices of the East; it cared nothing for beaver skins of the West. Besides, Hudson had violated his instructions.

Now I emphasize this because I want to puncture the argument which Mr. Brodhead and others who have followed him have urged, that it was a Dutch discovery. It was not a Dutch discovery, nor did the States-General of Holland make a claim based on the finding. I know that Doctor O'Callaghan in his History of New York has asserted that such a claim was made on October 25, 1634, but I submit that he has misread the Document on which he based his assertion. I use the word "finding" because I want to point the distinction between discovery and mere finding, subsequently followed by actual occupation—totally different concepts in international law as sources of title. Hudson's report was neglected absolutely by the East India Company. Why? They were not interested in the West; they were interested in the East. They thought of spices and of nutmegs and of cocoanut groves. They knew nothing about beaver skins and furs of the otter and deer skins and wolf skins. And therefore, as their capatin had violated his instructions, they simply allowed the whole matter to drop.

This is important, because it shows that when it was reported to the employers of Hudson they never made any claim on behalf either of their own company or on behalf of the States-General of Holland of a new finding of an unknown and hitherto unexplored coun-

try. It is true that one or two of the directors in the Dutch East India Company examined the otter skins and the beaver skins which had been brought in large masses, so far as samples were concerned, and they found that in the beaver skin was probably a more prolific source of wealth than if they sent into Russia and purchased the skins of beavers in that country. They therefore applied to the States-General for a charter.

Now this is important, because the charter was refused. What was granted was a mere trading license limited to three years. The States-General, had they been so minded, had the opportunity to say, "a ship under the auspices of a Dutch Company found something on the coast of America hitherto unknown, and we claim sovereignty by virtue of that fact." They utterly neglected to do so. They repeatedly neglected it.

Now here is where Mr. Brodhead, in my judgment, has gone astray. I put it candidly to historians, so that if I am wrong I ask for criticism; if I am right I ask for a rewriting of that chapter of history. The Dutch could never lay any claim to *discovery qua discovery* as against the English claim. The Dutch claim rested on actual occupation.

The English claim was based, as is well known, on the voyage of John Cabot under the auspices of the royal commission of Henry VII. It is true, from a modern geographical and nautical study of history, that John Cabot never landed on the American coast south of Cape Breton. But, nevertheless, his sailing subsequently along that coast, even though he never again landed, and perhaps never saw it except at distant points, became the basis of an English claim all the way from Labrador and Newfoundland to Florida. And that English claim was constantly asserted, except that it fell into neglect and was not acted on during the reigns of Henry VIII and Bloody Mary, but when Elizabeth came to the throne she granted charters to Gilbert and to Raleigh and other

explorers. Although their efforts at colonization were not successful, their efforts were entirely sincere—to go there and take possession of that unknown land which Cabot by virtue of his voyage had reported to the English Crown. And as we look at the pages of those old historians or chroniclers, whichever you see fit to call them, Haklyut and Purchas, we find that what Cabot had done was as well known to the men of that day as the adventures of Peary and Shackleton are to the men of this generation, every bit.

With those outstanding claims and with the charters of James I of 1606, and again in 1609, 1612 and 1619, which divided "Virginia" between the Plymouth Company, which occupied New England territory, and the London or Virginia Company which occupied Jamestown, we must guard against the narrow interpretation that is now put on the word "Virginia," now a definite geographical section of country, but in those days "Virginia" meant all territory in America, named after the Virgin Queen, Queen Elizabeth. The English claim was a very comprehensive claim indeed, and it was a claim to sovereignty.

Now, here we have a royal enterprise, sanctioned by the crown (Henry VII). We have a commission which invested Cabot with distinct authority not only to discover lands in the name of the Crown, but to take possession in the name of the Crown, as contrasted with a simple private contract between an English captain of a Dutch Company's ship, unacted upon, unaccepted, with the opportunity rejected on the part of the States-General of Holland to claim sovereignty.

Now all the Dutch "charters," as they are mistermed by Mr. Brodhead, are not charters; they are trading licenses, and I have taken the pains to examine them as carefully as if I was sitting as master in an equity case and analyzing the terms of documents that were offered in evidence. The only actual charter granted by the States-General was that to the Dutch West India Company in 1620, and it failed to mention

New Netherland. Even had it done so, it was later than the English charters. Mr. Brodhead did an astonishing piece of work in the early fifties. He was at The Hague. He had a thousand pages of Dutch documents or Holland documents, as they are termed, translated. He brought them to this country. They were published by the State of New York in eleven superb folio volumes and together with the Albany records constitute the basis of the colonial history of New York. But he was much too close to his achievement. He was too much flushed with the natural enthusiasm and excitement and exaltation of having found documents which shed light on history; and he failed to notice that these trading licenses, strictly limited to a period of three years, and subsequent in point of time to Hudson's voyage, were without the slightest authority to take possession of, or to claim any territorial sovereignty over the part of the coast which Hudson had visited. The consequence is that when Mr. Brodhead wrote about a Dutch claim of *discovery* importing sovereignty, he erred. We must discriminate, intelligently, philosophically and calmly between the character of those documents, and the English claim based on royal charters following technical discovery, accompanied by a declaration of sovereignty, pursued by an effort to make good by occupation; while the Dutch claims were based on trading licenses, without a claim of sovereignty.

There were three Dutch captains who came to America following Hudson between 1610 and 1619, and they explored the little inlets from Long Island Sound running into the mainland. They must have been bewildered by their multiplicity and sometimes by their imposing appearance, as when they came into the mouth of the Thames at New London or of the Connecticut or "Fresh River" as it was called. One of these captains was Adriaen Block, whose name is preserved in Block Island. Following through the years, there were Adriaen Block and Captain Cornelius

Mey, whose name is perpetuated by Cape May, at the end of New Jersey, with a slight difference in the spelling. We have the perpetuation of another Dutch name in Fisher's Island, off to the west of the entrance to Watch Hill in Rhode Island, an English corruption of the name Visscher. Dutch names were plentifully scattered upon certain points. These Dutch captains, basing their claims on their licenses, claimed to be discoverers, and they attached to some of their petitions for charters two maps which were found by Mr. Brodhead when he visited The Hague. The ambitious extent of those maps ought to have warned a cautious mind against yielding to the breadth of the claims. Those Dutch captains, three in number, who had applied for charters and who got only limited trading licenses, were ambitious enough to attach to their petitions maps which claimed five degrees of latitude; and yet they had only been along Long Island Sound, along latitude forty-one. Mr. Brodhead fell into a trap in surmising that as there were maps attached to the petitions, those maps were conclusive proof of the extent of the alleged discoveries. The captains did not pretend to have explored so extensively. The maps ran all the way from the northern line of Maryland clear up to Nova Scotia. If true, the Dutch would have claimed all of New England, and swept Pilgrims and Puritans straight out, as interlopers. The Dutch have often quarreled with you about the question of Cape Cod. They asserted they had found that place, but they forgot that Gosnold had named it before they had their own ships in those waters. The consequence is that what the Dutch actually had resulted from occupation. If we read the history of the States-General we find that the reason why the States-General neglected to back these claims was, in the first place, that they did not believe the maps. The maps have recently been proved—very conclusively, I think—to have been fabrications pure and simple, based on English, French and Spanish maps. The map maker went to work

and consolidated Spanish, English and French maps; French maps were added in order to make the territory more extensive, and to give a beautifully consolidated result, but one not based on any evidence of accomplishment. But the maps did not mislead the States-General. They refused the charters. They did not claim sovereignty.

Then came the West India Company. By that time the trade with the West Indies was becoming of importance.

The "West Indies" was a comprehensive term for America, North and South, comprehending the fur trade in New York waters as well as the trade in Brazilian waters—as well as what we know as The West Indies themselves. They wanted to divide the trade of the globe, and the charter of the East India Company expiring, the States-General said in effect: "Very well, we will charter two companies, we will re-charter the East India Company and we will charter a new West India Company." They were prompted by a very remarkable man named William Usselinx, who had been an active worker in the way of exploitation and colonization and matters of that kind. But the Dutch nation was not a colonizing nation as the English were. The English, wherever they planted a colony, sought to develop citizenship, if I may use the term, in its broadest and most general sense. English posts were not mere trading posts, they were not simply forts guarded by guns. English settlements did not intend merely to make trading terms with the Indians for the furs from the forest and the far distant streams. Wherever English civilization went, there went English political systems. And this it is that made your ancestors so successful—expanding from Massachusetts, carrying your men into Connecticut, where they came into physical contact with the Dutch, though not into bloody opposition, on the banks of the Connecticut Rvier. The fertility of the Connecticut Valley had been explained to Governor

Winthrop of Massachusetts by some Indian Chiefs and he was invited to send men there. He was in ill health at the time and unable to take up any expeditions. But men of Plymouth and men who were restive under the intolerance of the Puritan régime sought a still larger religious liberty—which they did not even find in Rhode Island under Roger Williams. They came into Connecticut and established themselves on the banks of the Connecticut River, and of course that brought them into actual physical friction with the Dutch. The Dutch complained, "You are in our territory." "No," said the English, "you are in ours." As a matter of fact, the Dutch actually were in occupation, and they remained in occupation for sixty-four years. They extended themselves to the banks of the Delaware. I am afraid I am drifting into too much detail, but I want to give you the general outline of the subject. They conquered the Swedes. The Swedes, under Gustavus Adolphus's encouragement and that of the great Chancellor Oxenstierna had established a colony on the banks of the Delaware. The Swedes formed a very important basic element of our Pennsylvania citizenship. But the Dutch conquered the Swedes, and held all Delaware territory until the time of Cromwell. I allude to Cromwell because I want to show how unfair it is to attempt to load the whole responsibility of an English taking of New Netherland on the shoulders of Charles II. Cromwell passed the Navigation Act which was afterwards copied by Charles II. in his celebrated Navigation Act. If you trace the history of that Act it was not alone the plain result of insult offered to Oliver St. John, secretary to the English Ambassador at The Hague, who out of revenge aided in striking a blow at Dutch commerce by helping to pass a strongly protective English statute; but the real reason why Cromwell, who was then at war with Holland, intervened and ordered an expedition from England in aid of the efforts being made by the Connecticut settlers to over-

come the resistance of the Dutch along the line of the Connecticut Valley was this. The language, as I recall it, of the Cromwellian Act, in order to promote English shipping, forbade English planters—whether in Virginia as tobacco growers, whether in the Carolinas as exporters of rice and sugar, or whether in the region around the Hudson as exporters of furs—to export save in English-owned ships or in British-built ships. But the Dutch, having a mercantile marine which was about twenty times as large as the English, could underbid on ocean freights. And the consequence was that what is a phenomenon of today, was presented in those days in reverse. We talk about a "rum fleet" hanging off the coast in order to get into this country contraband goods in violation of the Volstead Act and the Eighteenth Amendment. In those days a Dutch fleet was off the coast ready to receive from the American planter tobacco, furs, rice and sugar smuggled out from our shores, to the fleet awaiting them in the ocean, and ready to take them for a less rate of freight across the Atlantic. To put a stop to that practice Cromwell authorized the Leverett expedition and some seven hundred men were mustered in New England. Massachusetts was a little reluctant about backing Connecticut (Rhode Island did not participate) or New Haven, the term Connecticut at that time meaning New Haven. There was the Hartford colony, also, which the Dutch called Good Hope. Cromwell said, "As long as New Amsterdam is a haven of Dutch smugglers aiding our own colonists in smuggling goods from their country in violation of the Navigation Act which we have seen fit to pass to protect English commerce and English ships, we will crush them out." A general peace between England and Holland, however, happened to be declared, and therefore the Dutch escaped for the time being from English capture.

Now what was the historic background? The most titanic and gigantic wars between England and Holland

on the sea; wars that were some seventy years in the brewing and three of which occupied twenty years of time. Recall the names of the Dutch and English admirals who faced each other. There were Blake, Monk, Penn, the father of William Penn, the founder of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, on the one side, and there were Tromp and DeRuyter and DeWitt on the other. The fame of those admirals has filled the centuries as constituting one of the greatest groups of sea captains of the world in any period of history. It was a struggle for the command of the narrow seas, the English channel and the North Sea, as well as the larger waters of the Ocean which led to the entrance of the English channel.

During that tremendous struggle Cromwell died. Charles II was restored and came to the throne and in the very first year of the restoration—the interregnum being ignored in the numbering of Charles's statutes—a Navigation Act was passed marked "12 Charles II," although it was the first year of his reign, which was almost word for word a repetition of the Cromwellian statute.

Who was the great statesman at the head of English affairs in those days? The Earl of Clarendon, probably as great as any statesman that England ever saw. He sat in the Privy Council. There was no secrecy about his policies. Read the records of the Privy Council, and we find that, instead of secrecy, there were open public meetings at which all the evidence was produced of the violation of the Navigation Acts on the part of the American colonies from Massachusetts to Virginia. Of course at that time Pennsylvania did not exist, because the charter had not been granted, but through all that territory the same phenomena were occurring of smuggling in violation of the Navigation Acts. The Earl of Clarendon saw that right in the middle of English territory the Dutch were in conflict with the prior English claims. England had never abandoned those claims. History shows that the

English repeatedly protested and protested and protested against the Dutch as squatters on English soil. Read Massachusetts history and Connecticut history, and we find that position was uniformly taken. The English settlers never regarded the Dutch as anything except as intruders. But the Dutch under Peter Stuyvesant and others stood stubbornly their ground. They were Dutchmen; they were not afraid. But the States of Holland had never raised a claim to Sovereignty. Hence, it was not a conflict between sovereign powers; it was a conflict between subjects. And in pursuance of a broad-sighted policy to have the English title run all the way continuously from Maine, in contact with Acadia which had been brought under subjection by the action of one of the English admirals when the French were there, all the way down to the Florida line, in pursuance of that policy, I say, the Earl of Clarendon issued the order, "Capture New Amsterdam. That is the heart of the territory." It was a very weak post. Stuyvesant only had about seven hundred men, but four hundred of whom were fit for duty. He had no serviceable guns; his appeals to Holland for help had been ignored and when the English fleet under Nicolls appeared before the ruinous little fort, he had to succumb and without fighting he surrendered.

Then came a turn in the train of affairs. In July 1673, during the third war, the Dutch Admiral Evertsen with a fleet came to Manhattan and re-took New York. A year later, there was a turn in the tide of affairs and England became victorious. By treaty, Surinam was surrendered by the English to the Dutch, and the Dutch surrendered New York.

What followed? A great grant to the Duke of York—not as a result of the avarice of Charles, not as the result of any perfidy towards the Dutch, but as one of the inevitable consequences of great wars between contending nations, and in fulfilment of the policy of a great statesman, in an effort to develop English com-

merce and English navigation, and to unify American colonization. Such was the cause of the downfall of New Netherland, as I see it, and to that event the Middle Colonies trace their common origin.

Fellow Members: I have simply talked out loud to you, and presented what I have had in mind as a general view of the common origin of the Middle Colonies. Soon after the grant was made to the Duke of York, it was followed by a charter for the present State of New York. The territory of Pennsylvania was excepted, but the three lower counties on the Delaware belonged to the Duke. Then there was a separate charter to New Jersey. Later came the Grant to William Penn, and the Purchase by him from the Duke of the Delaware regions. At this point, the histories of the Middle Colonies diverge, and I shall not pursue them. It is to those common circumstances that I have narrated that we of the Middle Colonies owe our origin and our belated births. Happily for ourselves and for you we are not in Dutch territory, but can claim kinship with you as Sisters at the Family Fireside of The Old Thirteen.

Copyright of Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society is the property of American Antiquarian Society and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.