

A Revolution in the Vineyard of the Lord: The Glorious Revolution in Massachusetts

Benjamin Lewis Price

It would require a long Summers-Day to Relate the Miseries which were come, and coming in upon poore *New-England*, by reason of the *Arbitrary Government* then imposed on them; a *Government* wherein, as old *Wendover* says of the Time when *Strangers* were domineering over *Subjects* in *England*, *Judicia committentur Injustis, Leges Exlegibus, Pax Discordantibus, Justicia Injuriis*; and Foxes were made the Administrators of Justice to the Poultreys . . . —Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, ca. 1700.¹

There are a sort of men, who call those that are for *English* Liberties, and that rejoice in the Government of Their present Majesties King *William* and Queen *Mary*, by the name of *Republicans*, and represent all such as Enemies of Monarchy and the Church. It is not our single Opinion only, but we can speak it on behalf of the generality of Their Majesties Subjects in New England, that they believe (without any diminution to the Glory of our former Princes) the *English* Nation was never so happy in a *King*, or in a *Queen*, as at this day. And the God of Heaven, who has set them on the Throne of these Kingdoms, grant them long and prosperously to Reign. — E.R. & S.S. *The Revolution in New England Justified, and the People there Vindicated* . . .²

On 4 April 1689, a vessel from Nevis arrived in Boston. Its captain hurried off to report news from England to Governor Andros, news that he and his associates apparently hoped to keep from the people of the Dominion of New England for as long as possible. A passenger on board the ship, one John Winslow, a Boston merchant, provided the town with the information instead, and was arrested for his trouble.³ He brought copies of the Prince of Orange's *Declaration of Reasons*, and it was soon printed and circulated throughout Massachusetts. Although the manifesto was not specifically addressed to the colonies, but to England, it resonated among the people of Massachusetts who thought that the Prince's message applied equally to their own province.⁴ William's declaration that "magistrates who had been unjustly turned out" should resume their old offices provided them with the stimulus that they needed to revolt.⁵ To that end, the "principal Gentlemen of *Boston* met with Mr. Mather" (among them the Governor and several of the magistrates of 1686) and produced their own document modeled on Prince William's, the *Boston Declaration of Grievances*, in which they listed their reasons for ousting the Andros regime.⁶

All of the North American colonies received the news of the Revolution by the end of April. Colonists were quick to interpret the message of William's declaration and to respond to the news of

1 Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana: Books I and II*, Kenneth B. Murdock, ed., (Cambridge, Massachusetts, Belknap Press, 1977), 289. The Latin phrase states, "Judgements were entrusted to the unjust, laws to outlaws, peace to quarrelers, and justice to wrongdoers."

2 E.R. & S.S [Edward Rawson and Samuel Sewall], *The Revolution in New England Justified, and the People there Vindicated from the Aspersions Cast upon them by Mr. Joseph Palmer, in his Pretended Answer to the Declaration, Published by the Inhabitants of Boston, and the Country Adjacent* . . . (Boston, 1691), iv.

3 Thomas Hutchinson, *The History of the Colony and Province of Massachusetts Bay*, 2 vols. Lawrence Shaw, ed., (Boston: Harvard University Press, 1936), 1:317. See also E.R. & S.S., *The Revolution in New England Justified* . . . , 4-6.

4 Winslow's news corroborated rumors that had spread throughout the colony for a few weeks. See Theodore Burnham Lewis, "Massachusetts and the Glorious Revolution, 1660-1692" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin, 1967), 300. See also John Gorham Palfrey, *History of New England*, 3 vols. (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1882), 3:574.

5 Lewis, 300.

6 "Samuel Mather's Account of the Preliminary to Revolt, April 1690," in Michael G Hall et al., ed., *The Glorious Revolution in America, Documents on the Colonial Crisis of 1689* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1964), 39.

the invasion and accession of the new rulers within the context of their own circumstances. Maryland and New York, like Massachusetts, erupted with revolutions of their own. Plymouth and Rhode Island waited, allowing their big sister, Massachusetts, to take the lead. Virginia, apart from a short and easily quashed disturbance in Stafford County, responded by celebrating the accession of the new rulers with festivities similar to those that the colony had staged a few months earlier to commemorate the birth of James Stuart, the Prince of Wales. In each case colonists' responses to the news of the events in England depended upon the peculiar circumstances of each colony. In general, where the policies of Charles II and James II had had negative consequences for the colony, and where the governing regime was despised by at least a sizeable segment of the colonists, conflict followed. Where the government was stable, the Governor trusted, and the hands of the last two Stuart monarchs had touched only lightly, the transition of power across the sea caused little disturbance. Despite the fact that reaction in each province was dictated by local circumstances, by the end of the Glorious Revolution American colonists everywhere had reached a broad ideological consensus on what the Revolution meant. They agreed with William's conceptions of Protestant kingship and the Stuart conspiracy, as promoted by the Prince's propaganda and in the *Declaration of Right*. The legacy of this development had a profound effect upon colonial political thought.⁷

Massachusetts' controversy before the Glorious Revolution rested less with James II than with the King's choice of governor, Sir Edmund Andros, who arrived at Boston on 19 December, 1686, scandalously dressed in a scarlet coat and periwig. According to Thomas Hutchinson, the new Governor's reputation preceded him; "he was known to be of an arbitrary disposition," and those who read his letters written as Governor of New York "discovered much of the dictator" in him.⁸ Andros quickly surrounded himself with a set of "his creatures to say yes to everything he proposed."⁹ What he proposed shocked the people of Massachusetts. Andros levied taxes without representation. He attempted to reform the land tenures of the Massachusetts colony and to require quitrents on the new titles. He remodeled the colony's judicial system in a way that, while reasonably consistent with English Common Law, was at odds with the traditional usage of the Congregationalist Commonwealth. He employed English regular officers to command local militiamen who were not accustomed to the hard treatment English troops received as a matter of course from their commanders. Worst of all, Andros was a cavalier and an Anglican whose demeanor and religion were repugnant to most of the Saints of Massachusetts. In short, the Governor of the Dominion of New England and his regime embodied all of the qualities of government, religion and manners that the Puritan Fathers had forsaken when they left Old England to plant God's Vineyard in the New World some two generations before his arrival.¹⁰

7 See Lewis, 370-371, 382-386; Hall, 212-214.

8 Hutchinson, 1:300.

9 *Ibid.*, 1:301.

10 Useful secondary narrative sources for a study of the Revolution in Massachusetts include Viola Florence Barnes, *The Dominion of New England: A Study in British Colonial Policy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923), Lewis, "Massachusetts in the Glorious Revolution" (see citation above), and David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (New York: Harper & Row, 1972). Barnes is generally more sympathetic toward Andros. She states that the Dominion was created in order to defend the colonies in the north, and to "offer greater opportunities for the development of a constructive commercial program" that would benefit both the colonies and the mother country (30). Additionally, she argues that Massachusetts was included in the Dominion in order to "break the power of the theocracy there, and free that region from Puritan domination" (42), a prospect that the author appears to have relished. For Barnes, the Glorious Revolution in New England was prompted by "the fanaticism of the Puritan theocrats, who were more Hebrew than English in their thought and government" (250-252). T.H. Breen counters that the revolution in Massachusetts "had little or nothing to do with religion" and that colonists based their critique of Andros' government "in terms of life, liberty, and property." See (T.H. Breen, *The Character of a Good Ruler: A Study in Puritan Ideas in New England, 1630-1730* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1970), 152). In fact, both historians err in carrying their arguments too far in one direction. While Barnes makes far too much of the theocratic nature of the revolt against Andros, Breen underestimates the significance of the Anglican presence, and anxiety over Popery in the colony.

Lewis's narrative of the Andros government and the development of the revolt itself provides an excellent blow-by-blow description of the events from the Restoration to 1692. Lewis argues that the Revolution in Massachusetts was brought about and succeeded because of the cooperation of contending factions (Puritan conservatives and economically mobile moderates) who ceased their twenty-year-old political

Massachusetts had already lost its charter in 1684 when Charles II established it as a royal colony in 1684. The Dominion of New England created by James II dissolved its assembly and amalgamated Massachusetts into a super colony, the Dominion of New England. The Dominion extended from Maine to New Jersey. The composition of its governing council, haphazardly comprised of members from all of those provinces as well as some Englishmen, among them Roman Catholic friends of James II, could only have been construed by the freeholders of Massachusetts to contain “such Men as were Strangers to and Haters of the People.”¹¹ Taxes were imposed by the Royal Governor in Council. When several towns complained that the imposition of taxation without representation violated the liberties of English freeholders and refused to pay, their leaders were arrested. An official at their trial informed them that the rights of Englishmen did not follow them “to the Ends of the Earth,” and that they had “no more Privileges left, but this, that you are not bought and sold for Slaves.”¹²

The right of Englishmen to be taxed only by their own consent was considered to be among those ancient rights guaranteed by the Magna Carta and substantiated by long tradition. As early as 1610, the House of Commons in England carried a bill that no impositions might be set by the Crown without its consent. In the Short Parliament of 1614, Commons unanimously voted to deny the King’s right to levy taxes without first consulting Parliament and refused to grant him any subsidies until the matter was settled.¹³ That no one ought to be compelled to pay “any tax, tallage, aid, or other like charge not *set by common consent* in Parliament” was one of the sticking points that brought about the English Civil War.¹⁴ By the 1680s, the doctrine was generally accepted by English jurors as settled law. The right was even extended to the colonies. In 1685, at the request of the Lords of Trade, the Attorney General for England ruled that it was illegal to govern New England without an assembly.¹⁵ Hence, when Massachusetts was deprived of its assembly and Andros levied taxes upon the colonists with no more support than the consent of a council partly comprised of members whose homes were far away in New York, or even England, the Bay Colonists reasoned that they had been deprived of a basic liberty. According to Edward Rawson and Samuel Sewall, Andros and his council “made what Laws they pleased *without any consent of the People, either by themselves or by representatives*, which is indeed to *destroy the Fundamentals* of the *English*, and to *Erect a French Government*.”¹⁶

feud to concert their efforts to regain control of the colony from a government that worked against their various interests. Lovejoy’s view that the Glorious Revolution in America represented a response to a renewed effort by the Crown to make the colonies profitable, implies that the Revolution should have taken place in much the same way and with much the same complaints in all of the colonies, which was not the case. Frustrated (and often incarcerated) English officials, like Edward Randolph, would certainly have agreed with Lovejoy (and, for that matter, Barnes), when they argued that the chief reason for the Revolution in America was the vigor of the trade laws. (Randolph to the Lords of Trade, May 29, 1689, *Edward Randolph, Including His Letters and Official Papers From the New England, Middle, and Southern Colonies in America* . . . , Robert N. Toppan, ed., *Publications of the Prince Society*, XXVII, (New York: Burt Franklin, 1967), 279-280. Henceforth referred to as *Randolph Papers*.) Few, if any, supporters of the revolt in Massachusetts argued thus, as they would in the 1760s. Additional secondary material is included in Hall and Leder’s *The Glorious Revolution in America*, as well as some very useful primary documents.

11 “The Boston Declaration of Grievances, April 18, 1698,” Hall, 42. The original title of this document is *The Declaration of the Gentlemen, Merchants and Inhabitants of Boston, and the Country Adjacent*. (see *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690*, Charles M. Andrews, ed., (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1915), 175). I have used the title that Hall and Leder assign to it here and in all references that follow.

12 Cited in Breen, 145. See also Lovejoy, 182-186; the “Boston Declaration of Grievances,” Hall, 43; William Stoughten, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmund Andros and His Accomplices, Who Acted by an Illegal and Arbitrary Commission from the Late King James* . . . (Boston, 1691), 9-10; and E.R. & S.S., *The Revolution in New England Justified* . . . , 8.

13 Maitland, 259. In 1610 the House of Lords rejected the Commons’ claim. In 1614 James I dissolved Parliament in response. For a discussion of the “consent to taxation” doctrine in English constitutional history and its transatlantic scope, see John Phillip Reid, *Constitutional History of the American Revolution: The Authority to Tax* (Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), 139-146, 275-277.

14 “The Petition of Right,” Stephenson and Marcham, *Sources of English Constitutional History*, 1:450. See also Maitland 307-308.

15 Barnes, 90.

16 E.R. & S.S., *The Revolution in New England Justified* . . . , 6. See also Stoughten, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmund Andros*, 6-7.

In the spring of 1687, Andros began to levy a series of taxes on Massachusetts, including land taxes, excises on various goods, and import duties.¹⁷ In July the government sent out warrants to the sheriffs ordering that the taxes be collected. The Boston Selectmen questioned the legality of the policy, and the town of Taunton sent an angry complaint to John Usher, the Dominion tax collector. The people of Essex County, led by the Reverend John Wise of Chebacco, revolted against the new impositions.¹⁸ In a town meeting, Wise quickly persuaded the people of Ipswich that, “raising money without an Assembly did abridge them their liberty as Englishmen.” They agreed not to pay any taxes until “it be appoynted by a gen^l. Assembly Concurring with the Govern^r. and Councill.”¹⁹ Andros responded to the Ipswich mutiny by arresting twenty-eight citizens for tax evasion and sedition.²⁰ Taxation without representation, and the Dominion government’s swift and ruthless response to resistance, gave the people of the colony more evidence that the Dominion regime was arbitrary and unconstitutional and its policies little more than “a Treasonable Invasion of the Rights which the whole *English Nation* lays claim unto.”²¹

New Englanders became convinced that their property as well as their liberty was at stake when the new government attempted to reform Massachusetts land patents to make property titles originate with the King and thus conform to the traditional practice of land tenure in England. Andros informed the freeholders that their titles became void when the charter was vacated, and that, in any case, old land titles had not been made under the seal of the colony, “a notable defect, which possession and improvement could not heal.”²² Landowners were required to petition for new titles and pay taxes and fees to have their ownership confirmed. Colonists were angered both at the prospect of paying for their own property and at the intimation that the legitimacy of titles issued by their own past government should be questioned by Andros and his bevy of “Strangers.” Additionally, the colonists were convinced that the Governor’s “favorites looked with an envious eye upon some of the best estates,” eagerly waiting for them to fall into arrears so that they could employ the colonial courts to snatch them up.²³

The laws and judicial system of Massachusetts before Andros’ arrival represented a synthesis of the laws of God, as interpreted by the Calvinist Congregationalist traditions of Massachusetts, and the laws and liberties that the colonists understood to be their birthright as Englishmen. “It was,” according to Edmund Morgan, “a blueprint of the whole Puritan experiment, an attempt to spell out the dimensions of the New England way.”²⁴ Before Andros, Massachusetts freemen were, with very few exceptions, Congregational Church members, and chose juries from among their number. Jurors were thus church members, as well as neighbors and peers. Most defendants were tried in the locality where the crime was committed by judges and juries who were local residents and parishioners. Although the Word of God might decide what acts were criminal and how those acts should be punished, the Common Law protections of a local trial by a freeholder jury and the limitations of

17 Barnes, 84-86. Barnes notes that the writ issued to raise the taxes was irregular as it was not issued in the king’s name, and argues that this fact rather than the constitutional irregularity of levying taxes without representation provided the stimulus to resist the taxes. It is more probable that the omission of the King’s name gave grounds for complaint against the import tariffs, which, like tonnage and poundage and other duties raised in England, were customary royal revenues usually raised for the life of the monarch and thus considered as a different legal category from domestic impositions. See Maitland, 182-183, 307, 435; Reid, *The Authority to Tax*, 162-163.

18 Barnes, 86-87; Lewis, 227-237.

19 *Massachusetts Archives*, 127:101, cited in Lewis, 230.

20 Barnes, 87-88.

21 “An Account of the Late Revolution in New England by A.B,” Hall, 48.

22 Hutchinson, 1:305. For a discussion of the origins and constitutional legitimacy of quitrents in Massachusetts, see Barnes, 174-211.

23 Hutchinson, 1:305-306. See also the *Diary of Samuel Sewall, 1674-1729*. 3 vols. *Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Vol. V, Fifth Series. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: University Press, 1878), 1:220-221; 1:231-232, passim; “Grievances Against the Governor, 1687-89,” Hall, 33-34; Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmund Androsse*, 8-9; E.R. & S.S., *The Revolution in New England Justified* . . . , 12-13.

24 Edmund Morgan. *The Puritan Dilemma: The Story of John Winthrop* (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1958), 170.

habeas corpus generally protected the liberty of the accused against arbitrary acts of the colonial government in Boston. Andros considered the Massachusetts system of justice untidy and inefficient. Armed with a commission from London that directed him to remodel the legal system, the new Governor set to work shortly after his arrival to centralize and reform it. Under the new system, defendants were often brought to Boston to be examined and were even tried there, not before their peers in their own towns and counties, but before the officials of the Dominion government whom they considered their oppressors.²⁵ The judges levied fines that were frequently, by colonial standards, arbitrary and extortionate. Many colonists became convinced that if the Governor's "Officers wanted money, it was but Seizing and Imprisoning the best Men in the Country for no fault in the World, and the greedy Officers would thereby have Grist for their Mill."²⁶

Nor might defendants expect the legal protections to which they were accustomed in their own communities, because Andros changed the composition of juries in local courts as well. Under the new scheme, sheriffs appointed by the Governor instead of the freemen of the county or township chose local juries. The Governor changed the jury qualifications so that sheriffs were free to choose any colonists who had a freehold valued at thirty pounds. They need not be freemen, as the term had been employed by Bay Colonists in the past, since Congregational Church membership was no longer a criterion for selection. The freemen of Massachusetts viewed these "packt and pickt Juries" as yet another example of "the most detestable Enormities" that their oppressors practiced against their liberties.²⁷

Another complaint that Puritans had against the Governor was his requirement that oaths be taken on the Bible, a practice that had been banned in Massachusetts because it was considered idolatrous. Before the new government began to demand that the Bible be used, oaths were sworn by lifting the right hand and swearing in the name of God. Massachusetts men claimed that their practice was not in conflict with the law and traditions of England, and was practiced elsewhere under the English Crown, where the law "not only indulges, but even commands and enjoins the Rite of lifting the Hand in Swearing."²⁸ Several native born judges, among them the pious and respected William Stoughten, refused to institute the practice in their courts and were lectured like schoolboys for their obstinance by the frustrated Governor.²⁹ It appears that at least one of Andros' magistrates, Edward Randolph, realized the importance of following local custom in this matter. In January 1688 he allowed one Mr. Hale, who "pleaded he might not lay his hand on the Bible; must Swear by his Creator, not Creature," to take the oath in the traditional fashion.³⁰ Nevertheless, others were fined or imprisoned for "refusing to take the Oath as by Law is required."³¹ Those who refused to swear in the new fashion were excluded from juries and other offices that required the oath. According to Boston leaders, this "one very comprehensive Abuse" angered and frustrated "Multitudes of pious and sober Men through the Land."³²

The mode of worship of Andros and his favorites also vexed the people of Massachusetts. Within minutes after the new Governor was sworn in, he informed the Congregationalist ministers

25 "The Boston Declaration of Grievances," Hall, 44. Far from being an ancient right of Britons enshrined in the Magna Carta, as was claimed by some of those accused in Massachusetts, the statutory protection of *habeas corpus* was quite new, having only been passed into statute in 1679 (31 Car. II, c. 2). See Maitland, 314-315. The act itself is vague as to whether it might actually apply to subjects residing in the colonies. For the Act, see Stephenson and Marcham, 2:557-558. Lewis, however, indicates that although the English statute may not have applied to the colonies, "it had been the practice in Massachusetts to grant bail for offenses which were unbailable under English law" (Lewis, 235); thus, *habeas corpus* writs, or their equivalent, had a legal tradition in that colony. Maitland observes that *habeas corpus* writs were part of the English legal tradition before the reign of Elizabeth. (Maitland, 313).

26 E.R. & S.S., *The Revolution in New England Justified . . .*, 35. See also "The Boston Declaration of Grievances," Hall, 44; A.B., *An Account of the Late Revolution*, Hall, 48; Stoughten, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmund Andros*, 10.

27 "Boston Declaration of Grievances," Hall., 43-44.

28 *Ibid.*, 44.

29 Lovejoy, 189.

30 Sewall, *Diary*, 1:201.

31 *Ibid.*, 1:208.

32 "The Boston Declaration of Grievances," Hall, 44.

present that he required that they make a church available for Anglican services.³³ Andros was likely aware, either through the King himself or from his communication with the Lords of Trade, that James was in the process of instituting religious tolerance in both England and the colonies. In calling for a place of worship for Anglicans, it is reasonable to assume that Andros was, in fact, complying with the King's wishes by giving Anglicans in Boston the opportunity to exercise their consciences by worshiping in their own way. This interpretation was certainly promoted by those who supported the Governor in the pamphlet war that followed the revolution of April of 1689.³⁴ On the other hand, he may have decided, possibly under the influence of Edward Randolph, that it was to his political advantage to champion the cause of the growing number of moderate and prosperous Anglicans against the established Congregationalist majority.³⁵ At any rate, this impolitic request by the new Governor, made so recently after his arrival and installation, was met with stiff resistance from the Congregationalist ministers and leaders of Boston. Cotton Mather and Simon Willard informed Andros two days later that none of the Boston congregations was willing to host Anglican services in their buildings.³⁶ The Governor let the issue lie until 23 March, when he sent Edward Randolph to demand the keys to the Third (South) Church so that the Anglicans might hold their Easter services there.³⁷ A delegation of the members of that church met with Andros and asserted that the building belonged to them and produced a deed as proof. They declared that they would not "consent to part with it to such use."³⁸ Andros prevailed, however, and the church hosted Anglican services thereafter to the dismay of the regular Congregational parishioners, who were, according to member Samuel Sewall, often forced to wait for the Anglican service to finish before they had their own Sunday meeting.³⁹ The very existence and use of the vestments, Prayer Book, and paraphernalia of the Church of England, those "filthy stinking thing[s]," were repugnant to the Boston Congregationalists who "came from England to avoid such things."⁴⁰ In their cavalier use of religion to antagonize the citizens of Boston, as in their threat to land titles and judicial meddling, Andros and his servants helped convince New Englanders that they were governed by a tyrant who threatened their liberty, religion and property. The religious controversy only added weight to the people's complaints against the Governor and his entourage.

Curiously, there is little evidence that the people of Massachusetts had any grievances against the King. They must certainly have known that James II was a practicing Roman Catholic, which in itself should have prejudiced them against him. But there is little evidence from sources written *before* the news of the Revolution in England to indicate that they suspected the King's own complicity in the oppression of the colony. All of the blame was assigned to Andros and his creatures. In fact, many Bay colonists were heartened by "[t]he sight of his Majesty's Declarations for Liberty of Conscience," which was published in Boston in the summer of 1687.⁴¹ In his

33 Sewall, *Diary*, 1:162; Edward Randolph to the Committee for Trade and Foreign Plantations, March 25, 1687, in *Randolph Papers*, 4:152. See also Hamilton Andrews Hill, *History of the Old South Church (Third Church), Boston, 1669-1884*, 2 vols. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1890), 1:265.

34 "Andros' Report of His Administration, 1690," in *Narratives of the Insurrections, 1675-1690*, Charles M. Andrews, ed., (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1915), 230; C.D. *New England's Faction Discovered*, in Andrews, 258.

35 According to Edward Randolph (who probably overcounted), "Wee have at present 400 persons who are daily frequenters of our church [presumably meaning Anglican Communicants], and as many more would come over to us, but some being tradesmen, others of mechanick professions, are threatened by the congregational men to be arrested by their creditors, or to be turned out of their work, if they offer to come to our church." Randolph to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Boston, October 27, 1686, *Randolph Papers*, 4:131. See also Lewis, 214; Henry Wilder Foote, *Annals of King's Chapel From the Puritan Age of New England to the Present Day*, 2 vols., (Boston: Little, Brown, & Co., 1882), 1:88-94.

36 Sewall, 1:162-163.

37 Randolph to the Committee, Boston, March 25, 1687, *Randolph Papers*, 4:152; Sewall, 1:171.

38 Sewall, 1:171.

39 *Ibid.*, 1:172, 177, 217-18, *passim*.

40 *Ibid.*, 1:218.

41 Samuel Sewall to John Storke, August 8, 1687. *Letter Book of Samuel Sewall. Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, Vol. I, Sixth Series. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: University Press, 1886), 52.

declaration dated 4 April 1687, James announced that, “though heartily wishing all the people of his dominions were members of the Catholic Church,” he desired that his subjects should be granted free exercise of their own religion. He suspended the tests and oaths that had been required to guarantee that government officials and military officers be Anglican Church members, and he granted pardons and indemnities to all who were subject to prosecution or imprisonment for violations of the ecclesiastical laws.⁴²

Increase Mather celebrated the declaration in his sermon of 25 August. Preaching from the fifth verse of Jude, he “Praised God for the Liberty good People enjoy in England. Said ‘tis marvellous in our Eyes.”⁴³ Colonial writers later wrote, in agreement with William’s propagandists, that the declaration was only a ruse used by the King to dupe English Dissenters into supporting his government, and only of benefit to Catholics. Most Massachusetts colonists, like their dissenting brethren in England, however, received the news of the royal dispensation with heartfelt gratitude in the summer of 1687.⁴⁴ Increase Mather wrote an address of thanks to the King in the name of his congregation. Cotton Mather noted that “Protestant Dissenters had abundance of reason to be thankful for” the King’s favor, even though “it assumed an illegal power of dispensing with laws.” He argued that the King should not be faulted since the test laws were “contrary to the laws of God, and the rights and claims of human nature.”⁴⁵ The ministers of Boston, acting on the younger Mather’s motion, wrote addresses of thanks to the King for his declaration and designated a day of thanksgiving to celebrate the event. Andros appears not to have shared their elation over the King’s declaration, for he “with many menaces, forbade their proceedings, and particularly threatened that he would set guards of soldiers on their church doors, if they attempted what they pretended to.”⁴⁶

Increase Mather went to England in the Spring of 1688, ostensibly to present the addresses of thanks from the various Boston churches to the King, but also to present a case to the King and Lords of Trade against Andros and to attempt to get the Massachusetts colony charter restored. There he read at least five addresses to the King in June of 1688. James responded that he hoped that he might “by a Parliament . . . obtain a *Magna Charta* for *Liberty of Conscience*.”⁴⁷ The King also asked Mather whether the people of the colony were happy with Andros, and the Boston minister took the opportunity to rehearse some of the complaints of his fellow colonists. The Governor, he replied, ignored the King’s Declaration of Indulgence. Andros and his council took pains to discourage the Massachusetts churches from thanking his Majesty for his declaration, and when the congregations of Boston had set aside a day to thank God for their King and his wisdom, Sir Edmund threatened to use troops to prevent them from doing so. He also complained that Andros’ judges imprisoned and fined those who scrupled to swear on the Book.⁴⁸

Increase Mather gauged the monarch well. He neither claimed the rights of Englishmen for his fellow colonists, nor complained of unlawful taxation, loss of representation, or threats to the property of his Majesty’s subjects in the Dominion. He focused instead on complaints of religious persecution.

42 *Ibid.*, fn. 1, 52-53.

43 Sewall, *Diary*, 1:186. “I will therefore put you in remembrance, though you once knew this, how that the Lord, having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterward destroyed them that believed not.” Jude 5.

44 Hutchinson, 1:304. For the immediate response of Dissenters in England and Massachusetts, see Sewall, *Letter Book*, fn. 1, 54-55.

45 Sewall, *Letter Book*, fn. 1, 56. At least one Puritan minister, Thomas Danforth of Cambridge, was less than sanguine about James’ proclamation. He explained to Mather in a letter of 8 November, 1687, “For my own part, I do more dread the consequences thereof [universal tolerance] than the execution of those penal laws the only wall against Popery . . . , We may, without a breach of charity, conclude that Popish Counsels are laid deep: time will show more.” Sewall, *Letter Book*, fn. 1, 57.

46 *Ibid.*

47 *Ibid.*, 58. Mather and the other Congregationalist leaders undoubtedly felt that the King’s declaration of tolerance put them in a dilemma. While they hoped that they could use it to claim that they had been wronged by Andros and his Anglican supporters who had violated their civil rights because of their religion, they must have worried about the difficulties that they would certainly encounter if, upon the restoration of their old charter, they had to abide by the letter of the proclamation and tolerate Anglicans, Quakers, and even Roman Catholics. Mather and his supporters were willing to cross that bridge when they came to it if they could get their old charter restored and free themselves from Andros’ government.

48 Lovejoy, 223.

Here he knew the ground was firm. Neither James nor his court might be predisposed to worry about the rights of colonists who resided so far from London, but James appeared to be keenly, and, despite later Whig allegations to the contrary, genuinely concerned about religious toleration within his realms.

James, like his brother and predecessor Charles II, exhibited a tolerance for religious diversity that was uncharacteristic of the era. Charles' tolerance of heterodox faiths (including, with reservations, Catholicism) placed him at odds with the conservative Anglican gentry who had supported the Stuart Restoration in 1660. Charles evidently felt that religious tolerance, if confirmed by law and adhered to by English government and society, would help to insure stability within his realm.⁴⁹ Although James feared Presbyterians primarily because he associated them with republicanism, he exhibited tolerance for religious sects in general and was more solicitous toward his fellow Roman Catholics than his brother had been. According to historian John Miller, "James claimed very consistently that he was against persecution for conscience's sake."⁵⁰ The King felt that once universal toleration was effected in his realm, most Englishmen would voluntarily choose to convert to Roman Catholicism; thus, he did not feel the need to force his own beliefs on others. If, however, Britons did not convert, he may have believed that his realm was still better off if its subjects were left unhindered to worship as their consciences dictated.⁵¹

Mather might have understood James better than the Anglican Whigs who were already plotting that ruler's end. In fact, Mather found that those who were the most supportive of his aims and most influential at the court in London were often individuals whom he was least inclined to trust. As might be expected, dissenting ministers supported him, and during his stay in England he showed his appreciation by preaching in their churches. But Calvinist Dissenters could offer him little support at the center of government. Mather obtained more telling support from the Quaker leader William Penn, who disliked Andros, Randolph and other members of the Dominion government, and who had the King's ear. Several of the Catholics at court were civil to him and may have solicited the King on his behalf. While he did not trust any of them, he gave Penn some praise and appears to have accepted the support of most Catholics who were inclined to give it to him. His acceptance of Catholic support had limits, however, for he avoided the aid of the infamous Father Petre, James' confessor and Privy Councillor.⁵² While Mather was soliciting the King and the great ones at court, however, events were unfolding that made his efforts moot.

William's accession and James' flight required Mather to begin his work in London anew. Slipping into rhetoric that more clearly reflected the ideology of the recent Revolution, Mather argued before the new ruler that the colonies, oppressed under the previous reign, ought to share in the liberation that William had brought to England and have their ancient privileges restored to them. Mather and his ally Sir William Phips asserted that the revocation of the colonial charters that comprised the Dominion was illegal and unconstitutional, and that they should be restored. William

49 See Paul Seaward, *The Cavalier Parliament and the Restoration of the Old Regime, 1661-1667* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 162, *passim*.

50 John Miller, *James II: A Study in Kingship* (London: Methuen, 1989), 126. Miller argues that James was more concerned with advancing the cause of Catholicism than with strengthening the monarchy and that James was less concerned with restoring a Catholic hierarchy in England than with the practice of religion (admittedly, for preference, the Catholic religion) according to the dictates of individual consciences. This contrasts with the Whig view, as promulgated by Orangist and Hanover propaganda and transmitted by Macaulay and his predecessors, that James intended to set up an arbitrary and Catholic nation in England. It also goes a long way to explain the problems in J.P. Kenyon's account of James. Kenyon argues that James wanted to make Catholicism the religion of the English state, but his cynical and inept attempts at it alienated English lay Catholics as well as the Pope. (Kenyon, *Stuart England*, 246-250) Miller agrees that James' statecraft was often inept, that the monarch was "so obsessed with his own rightness that he showed virtually no interest in the views of others," and that his policies often ran hard against the Anglican ruling elite and the traditional prejudices of the average Englishman "who equated 'Popery' with 'arbitrary government.'" (Miller, viii, 128) Employing exhaustive research of James' personal papers, Miller argues convincingly that James' religious tolerance was heartfelt and sincere, even if impolitic, and that he had no plans to convert England into a Roman Catholic state by force. For a more recent study of James II as "Catholic zealot and political reformer," see Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain, 1603-1714* (London: The Penguin Press, 1996), 265-269.

51 Miller, 126-127, *passim*.

52 Increase Mather, "Autobiography," cited in Lovejoy, 224.

turned the question over to the Lords of Trade for review. They concluded that the revocations and the creation of the Dominion were legal because the colonies in question, especially Massachusetts, had repeatedly violated both their charters and the trust that resided between the Crown and its subjects. So Mather and Phips were unable to achieve their primary objective expeditiously. They did, however, succeed in convincing William delay the communication of confirmation instructions to Andros. The Dominion Governor was thus deprived of any authoritative support from the new regime in London. With neither instructions from the Crown nor any confirmation of his authority in the New England, Andros' political position became precarious.⁵³ While Mather continued to lobby and publish tracts in London that aimed at swaying the government to his point of view, the scene of action shifted to the colonies themselves, and especially to Massachusetts.

When William's declaration arrived in Boston and was printed, disseminated and studied, leaders began to reinterpret the Andros regime in the light of the Prince's rationale for his invasion of England. New Englanders' understanding of the treatment that they had received under the Dominion government acquired a new dimension. Now it was not simply the work of a few renegade petty tyrants bent on filling their pockets at the expense of colonists, and in contravention to the trust that the King had placed in them. The Dominion administration had become a part of the greater and more sinister conspiracy of James II and his Popish advisors to deprive Englishmen everywhere of their liberty, property, and Protestant religion. Then, according to Samuel Mather, "a Strange Disposition entred in the Body of the People to assert their *Liberties* against the Arbitrary Rulers that were fleecing them."⁵⁴ When the Boston leadership framed their *Declaration of Grievances* against the Dominion, they prefaced it with an historical interpretation that pitted Protestantism against Papism as a rationale for the actions of both the Andros government and their own revolutionary response to it. Their complaints were no longer couched simply in the libertarian issues of property rights and representative government. Now, this constitutional oppression made sense to them within the wider context of the great struggle between English Protestantism and European Catholicism. As the Boston leaders observed in their own declaration:

We have seen more than a decad of Years rolled away since the English World had the Discovery of an horrid Popish Plot; wherein the bloody Devotoes of Rome had in their Design and Prospect no less than the Extinction of the Protestant Religion: which mighty Work they called the utter subduing of a Pestilent Heresy; wherein (they said) there never were such Hopes of Success since the Death of Queen Mary, as in our Days. And we were of all Men the most insensible, if we should apprehend a Countrey so remarkable for the true Profession and pure Exercise of the Protestant Religion as New-England is, wholly unconcerned in the Infamous Plot.⁵⁵

In fact, the assertion that Andros was involved in a plot to Romanize New England was something of a problem for the Governor's critics in the Bay Colony because there existed not the slightest indication that either he or any of his assistants in Massachusetts were Papists. Most of them were Anglican, and while the Congregationalists were not happy to see Anglicans worshiping in their midst, and worse, holding sway over them, they were sufficiently cognizant of both history and theology and lived in close enough proximity to the French to know the difference. Andros did not fit the pattern of the stereotypical Roman Catholic conspirator. He was not accompanied by Jesuits, he made no concerted effort to convert the Puritans, he closed no churches, and he imposed no liturgy. Bible swearing aside (which to Andros was probably a judicial rather than a religious matter), no one was imprisoned for their faith, and the government forced neither the Prayer Book nor the Roman Mass, down the throats of the Saints of Massachusetts. Even the annalists of the period tacitly admitted as much by omission. If Andros had employed his authority and his troops to that end, surely such staunch Puritan souls as Samuel Sewall, William Stoughton, and the Mathers would have mentioned it.⁵⁶

53 Lovejoy, 227-228.

54 "Samuel Mather's Account of the Preliminary to Revolt, April 1689," Hall, 39.

55 "The Boston Declaration of Grievances," Hall, 42.

56 Sewall does mention that some of the people of Boston *voluntarily* joined in the Anglican services at the South Church. References are scattered about in his *Dairy* (see 1:171). Edward Lilley was probably an Anglican convert. He apparently requested an Anglican funeral. For a short synopsis of the scandal (ultimately

If the Revolution in Massachusetts was to be analogous to England's, however, a Popish Plot was a crucial ingredient in the mix. It was not sufficient merely to give lip service to the Popish Plot of 1679; some explicit evidence was required to show that the Andros regime conspired with James to subvert the liberties and religion of the colonists. Where there was Popery, there was slavery, and *vice versa*. The two were so closely linked in English thought and so explicit to William's rationale for his invasion that Massachusetts leaders needed an analogous link in order to convince England that their rebellion against the authority of the Dominion government was legitimate. To that end they concentrated on the one series of events that offered the best evidence, albeit conjectural, that Andros had had a role in the greater conspiracy hatched by James and his Popish advisors to enslave and forcibly convert Englishmen to the Roman faith. That link was the Governor's Indian policy.

The New Englanders' relations with the Indians and the French in the period after King Philip's War were reasonably peaceful. Local tribes were loath to suffer the fate of the Wampanoags and so left the Englishmen alone. Indians allied to the French in upper Maine made occasional forays against settlers in the North Country, but even these were rare. In part, peaceful relations between England and France contributed to the state of peace on the frontier. A fair amount of the credit, however, should also go to the Baron de Castine, a French trader whose harem of Indian wives made him an in-law to most of tribes of the area and who controlled a small trading empire for himself in Canada and northern Maine. The Baron encouraged peace with the English among the Indians primarily because it was good for business, and the English settlers left Castine alone for the same reason. Besides, they feared the consequences of molesting so powerful a player in the affairs of the region.⁵⁷

In May of 1688 Andros sailed up the Penobscot River to Castine's trading post. The Baron and his retinue took refuge in the forest while Andros' soldiers confiscated the trader's goods. Castine responded to this insult by encouraging his Indian allies to attack English settlers.⁵⁸ In the summer, Andros began a campaign to placate Indian tribes within the Dominion. He angered the Iroquois by ordering them to cease hostilities against the French and their Indian allies and to return their hostages. He gave gifts to local sachems in New England and New York. While the Governor was attempting to promote a policy of peace and conciliation, however, local officers and settlers, frightened by rumors of war with France, initiated hostilities against local Indians. At the same time, Indians on the northern frontier, incited by Castine and supplied by both the Baron and the Canadian French, prepared for war. Minor skirmishes took place in Maine, Massachusetts and New York. Settlers began to arm, supply and drill their militia companies and to fortify their communities in preparation for war. The Dominion Council raised an army to go to Maine without consulting the Governor. All of these preparations convinced the Indians that war was imminent. Andros found himself powerless to control the situation and complained that the colonists were sabotaging his attempts to promote peace.

In November of 1688 Andros returned from Albany to Boston. He was eager to forestall any actions on the part of the colonists that the Indians might construe as a threat. Along the way the Governor ordered watches and patrols to stand down and return to their homes. When he arrived at Boston, he found the jail filled with Indian prisoners and ordered their release. He then issued a proclamation that promised amnesty to Indians who had not actually killed any colonists if they would lay down their arms and release their captives.⁵⁹ New Englanders, whose attitude was simply that the best Indian policy was one of eradication, viewed the Governor's policy toward the Indians as incompetent meddling at best and, at worst, a treasonous secret alliance with the French. Rumors

blamed on Andros) that took place when his executors decided on a Puritan service but the Anglican Rev. Mr. Ratcliffe appeared to perform the funeral rites, see Hamilton Andrew Hill, *History of the Old South Church Boston, 1669-1884*, 2 vols., (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1890), 1:279-280.

⁵⁷ Barnes, 223; Lewis, 270.

⁵⁸ Lewis, 269-270. Most of the Narrative which follows is from Lewis, 269-300. For an account of the Dominion's Indian problems that is more forgiving of Andros, placing most of the blame for the conflict on the Puritans whose "faith in God's protection was substituted for the building of expensive forts and training skilled soldiers," see Barnes, 213-230. Lewis offers a fairly balanced view of the conflict. He argues that Andros' handling of the Indians was less than adroit, and that the colonists' preference in Indian policy ran to extermination rather than negotiation. Lewis, 273, *passim*.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 273-274.

began to circulate between Albany and Boston that Andros had allied himself with the French and that he had conspired with various tribes to wipe out the Bay colonists.⁶⁰

By the end of November the Maine Frontier was in chaos. Militia units that the Council had sent earlier in the fall had returned home, and the French and Castine were arming and supplying Indians to attack English settlements. Andros was forced to respond to the attacks. He began to make preparations for a winter campaign in the Maine wilderness. He ordered his regular units to Maine, leaving only the Frigate *Rose* and a small guard in Boston, and issued orders to raise 500 militiamen to accompany his regulars. The Governor chose Fitz-John Winthrop, the colony's ranking militia officer, to command the expedition. Winthrop declined, claiming that he was too ill to go on such a rigorous expedition. In the same letter he also explained that the government had not yet confirmed the titles to his properties in the colony.⁶¹ So Andros decided to lead the expedition himself.

While Andros and his army tramped through the Maine snows in a vain attempt to locate Indians to fight, Boston simmered. The local leadership was loath to do anything that might complicate Increase Mather's diplomatic negotiations in London, but they were becoming increasingly anxious about his lack of success.⁶² Mather's reports home indicated that James II would soon grant New England "a certain Magna Charta for a speedy Redress of many Things," but after months of negotiations no real results were forthcoming.⁶³ By mid-December, news from Europe began to enter the colony that hinted at a Dutch invasion of England. On 10 January, Andros issued a proclamation ordering the militia to be vigilant and ready to repel Dutch invaders. The Puritan leaders in Boston bided their time until events in England might become clearer.⁶⁴

Throughout January and February rumors of William's landing and advance filtered into the colony. By March, Cotton Mather received a copy of a pamphlet that his father had published in London. The tract, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New-England, By Reason of an Arbitrary Government Erected there Under Sir Edmund Andros*, listed the colonists' complaints and contained the details of the elder Mather's negotiations with James II along with two appendices. The first appendix was an address of the Bishop of London and the Anglican clergy of the city showing support for William's invasion "for the Deliverance, & Preservation of the Protestant Religion."⁶⁵ The second was a similar address of the dissenting ministers of London to the Prince, delivered to William at the Court of St. James. The significance of the tract was three-fold. First, it rehearsed the grievances of the Bay colonists in language that was tailored to the new regime's interests. It also reminded the colonists that in spite of the best efforts of the respected elder Mather, James had done no more than listen to their complaints. Finally, the appendices offered more substance to the rumors that William was present in London, and that, whatever the fate of James, the Prince of Orange held court at the capital. Richard Pierce, the official printer of the Dominion, agreed to publish the tract at some personal risk. At the same time, he printed a second edition of Increase Mather's anti-Anglican pamphlet, *A Testimony Against Several Profane and Superstitious Customs, Now Practised by Some in New England*.⁶⁶ The authorities responded to this attack by jailing a few minor troublemakers in the

60 *Ibid.*, 274. See also "Boston Declaration of Grievances," Hall, 45; "An Account of the Late Revolutions in New England, by A.B.," Hall, 49; "The Charges Against Sir Edmund Andros, Governor," Hall, 57; Hutchinson, 1:314.

61 Lewis, 276. Richard Dunn remarks that, "Fitz frequently fell sick on such occasions." See Richard S. Dunn, *Puritans and Yankees: The Winthrop Dynasty of New England, 1630-1717* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1971), 251-252.

62 Moody to Increase Mather, 4 October, 1688. *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, ser. 4, 8:365-368.

63 Rumors circulated in the fall of 1688 that Mather had already been successful in his negotiations. Samuel Sewall wrote on 20 September, "Eldridge comes in, who sais the Amsterdam Gazett reported that Mr. Mather's Petition is granted . . .," *Sewall Diary*, 1:226; see also Samuel Sewall to Increase Mather, 8 October, 1688, in note 1, 1:229. These rumors undoubtedly raised false hopes among people of Massachusetts that were dimmed as time passed with no change in the government of the colony, and as further reports from London indicated the fruitlessness of the elder Mather's mission.

64 Lewis, 278. See also Sewall, *Diary*, 30 December, 1688, 1:214, 1 January, 1688⁸/₉, 1:242; and Hutchinson, 1:317.

65 *Andros Tracts II*, cited in Lewis, 294. See also Lovejoy, 228.

city, among them possibly Pierce; but without orders from the Governor, and in as much confusion about affairs in London as anyone else, they hesitated to do more.⁶⁷

Andros remained in the North. He had received news of the coup in London but did not yet know his own status. Whitehall had issued instructions on 12 January to all colonial governors ordering them to proclaim the new rulers and continuing all Protestant officials in their offices.⁶⁸ Andros had received no official instructions, however, because Mather and Phips had been able to prevent the new administration from sending him any. In March, the militiamen in Maine received the news that James had escaped to France and been welcomed by their enemy, King Louis XIV. This, combined with the fact that Andros had yet to confirm William and Mary, revived the rumors of the previous fall that the Governor was in league with the French. Now, however, the rumor was embellished by the addition of the late King as an active participant in the conspiracy. A local Indian, one John James, appeared at Sudbury and announced that Andros had hired Indians to massacre the English.⁶⁹ Shortly thereafter the Governor sent an officer to Canada to arrange a truce, and militiamen speculated that the meeting was a further proof of Andros' complicity with James and the French.⁷⁰ On 10 April, amid a storm of rumor and innuendo, angry militiamen shouldered their weapons, ignored their officers' commands, and returned to their homes. They brought with them all of the gossip that had circulated in Maine as well as stories of the brutal treatment that they had received from the British regular officers under whom they had served during the futile winter campaign. They were joined by other militia companies that fell in with them during their march to Boston, and they, together with some of the townspeople, began to accumulate in the streets, angry, armed, and ready to rebel against the Andros government.

At this point the Boston leaders decided to take control of the situation. "Then," wrote Samuel Mather forty years later, "to prevent the Shedding of *Blood* by an ungoverned Multitude, some of the Gentlemen present would appear in the Head of what Action should be done; and a Declaration was prepared accordingly."⁷¹ The authors of *The Declaration of the Gentlemen, Merchants and Inhabitants of Boston and the Country Adjacent* were comprised of William Bradstreet, the former Governor of the colony, "with several magistrates chosen in 1686, and some of the principal merchants and other principal inhabitants" of the town of Boston.⁷² In keeping with the Prince of Orange's declaration which was published the previous month in Boston, these "illegally turned out" magistrates printed their own declaration as part of their preparations to resume control of the colony from the mob in Boston. At the same time they wanted to justify their actions in a way that was analogous to William's stated reasons for his seizure of the English government.

The preamble of the declaration consisted of a rehearsal of the history of Romanism in Protestant England from the reign of Mary Tudor through the Popish Plot of 1679. The first actual grievance that the Bay elders listed was the loss of the Massachusetts Bay Charter under Charles II. They stated that their charter was vacated because of the "slandrous Accusations" of one man (presumably Edward Randolph) in order to "get us within reach of the Desolation desired for us." From the context of the document, the tacit implication is that the charter had been revoked with the intent of introducing Papism (implied in the preamble) and arbitrary government into the colony, just as James had tried to introduce Popery and tyranny into England. The declaration went on to itemize the colony's grievances against Andros' government, much as William's declaration had itemized complaints against James. The Governor exercised his powers in an arbitrary manner by raising taxes, levying troops, and creating laws as he pleased with only the consent of his Council (hence without a representative assembly). Andros was accompanied by an army "now brought from Europe to support what was imposed upon us." Andros loaded "Preferments principally upon such men as

66 Lewis, 295. Evidently, at about the same time other attacks against the Church of England were published in the Bay Colony. Edward Randolph complained in May that "M^r. Mathers book ag^t. Y^c Common Prayer" was in circulation at the time of the Revolution in Boston (Randolph to the Bishop of London, *Randolph Papers*, 4:305-306).

67 Lewis, 295.

68 Lovejoy, 228; Lewis, 295-296.

69 Lewis, 298-299.

70 *Ibid.*, 299.

71 Samuel Mather, *The Life of the Very Reverend and Learned Cotton Mather . . .* (Boston, 1729), 42.

72 Hutchinson, 1:321.

were Strangers to and Haters of the People,” especially “a Crew of abject Persons fetched from New York,” who extorted and oppressed the people of Massachusetts “without any rules but those of their own insatiable Avarice and Beggery.” The people were treated like slaves “with multiplied Contradictions to Magna Charta, the Rights to which we laid claim to.” Deprived of their Assembly, judged by unqualified juries and corrupt judges and often punished without benefit of jury or habeas corpus, “it was now plainly affirmed . . . that the People in New England were all Slaves.” The Bay leaders complained of Andros’ land schemes and taxes that they claimed were promoted to enrich the strangers placed over them and “to impoverish a land already Peeled, meeted out and Trodden down.” The authors of the declaration stated that, while the good people of the colony “bore all these, and many more such Things, without making any Attempt for any Relief,” Increase Mather undertook to represent them before King James. The King “more than once or twice” promised relief but did nothing more. The leaders then moved to the issue of the Indian wars. They alleged that “in the Army, as well as in the Council, Papists are in Commission” and that these men were instrumental in bringing about the failure of the Maine expedition, and had even conspired to give New England over “to a Forreign power.” For all these reasons, the Boston leaders wrote, “we do therefore seize upon the Persons of these few men which have been (next to our Sins) the Grand Authors of our Miseries” in order to secure them for whatever justice the government in England saw fit to visit upon them.⁷³

Historians, pondering the vagueness of the Declaration, have theorized that those who wrote it were unsure as to events in London. Hall and Leder write that “it seems certain that on April 18 Boston did not know definitely that William had been successful and was already installed on the throne of England . . . otherwise the Declaration would have been specific on that point.”⁷⁴ Although the Boston leaders might not have been clear as to the details of William’s accession, they were certainly aware that a change of government had been effected in England and that the new government was hostile to the old. Increase Mather’s tract with its appendices had reached Boston and been published in the previous month. Edward Randolph believed that Cotton Mather received frequent updates on the situation in England, and, if this was the case, the Boston leadership at least knew that James II no longer sat upon the throne and William held power in London.⁷⁵ Additionally, John Winslow’s arrival on 4 April with copies of the Prince’s *Declaration of Reasons* confirmed the evidence of William’s presence in England. It is more likely that the terms of the document were vague because its authors were at pains to publish it quickly before matters got out of hand in Boston and caused a bloody, and possibly politically embarrassing, confrontation. It was also vague because the Boston leadership wanted their accusations against the Andros regime to parallel those leveled by William against James II.

The two necessary ingredients of the Prince of Orange’s *Declaration of Reasons* were arbitrary government and Popery, and while Andros and his creatures displayed ample evidence of the former, the Boston leaders had no concrete evidence that the Governor or any of his principal assistants in Massachusetts were Roman Catholic and certainly none that they had conspired to introduce Popery to New England. In fact, they had established, not Romanism, but Anglicanism in Massachusetts, a fact that the authors failed to mention in their declaration. So, with no real evidence of a Popish Plot hatched in Massachusetts and understanding the necessary connection between Popery and slavery, the authors of the declaration rehearsed past English history (the reign of “Bloody Mary” and the Popish Plot in England of 1679), and employed the gossip that had filtered from Maine to hint that Andros was in league with his master James, the French and their Indian allies, and left it at that.⁷⁶ To the modern reader these allegations seem vague indeed, but to the people of Boston who were

73 “The Boston Declaration of Grievances,” in Hall, 42-44.

74 Hall, 39. See also Lewis, 308-309, and Hutchinson, 1:323. Barnes argues that the document was “inconsistent” because it contained “two different points of view,” those of the moderates whose complaints were primarily legal and secular, and those of the “theocrats,” who presumably inserted the religious material (242-243). I agree with Lovejoy, who argues that the declaration was a “carefully written and eloquent document” that juxtaposed vague threats of a Papist conspiracy with real complaints of arbitrary government and was meant primarily to influence the people assembled in Boston. See Lovejoy, 241.

75 Randolph to the Governor of Barbados, May 16, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:265.

76 “Boston Declaration of Grievances,” Hall, 45-46. The Declaration states, “The whole War hath been so managed, that we cannot but suspect in it a Branch of the Plot to bring us low . . . we secure them [Andros and his officers] lest, ere we are aware, we find . . . ourselves to be by them given away to a Forreign Power” Hall, 45-46.

nurtured on *Foxes' Martyrs* and recently reacquainted with the traditional Puritan arguments that there was little substantial difference between Anglicanism and Popery, and who were aware of James II's Catholicism, the allegations in the declaration had substance.⁷⁷ The declaration was sufficient for the accomplishment of its first purpose, to enable the "principal Gentlemen in *Boston*" to take control of the unruly mob, and for its second, as it acted as a warrant, of sorts, for the arrest of Andros and his officers in Boston on 18 April. As to how the government in London would respond to the revolution in Boston, they were willing to put their faith in God's providence, the new regime at Whitehall, and in the diplomatic abilities of their agents, friends and supporters in England.

The arrest of Andros and his most objectionable supporters amounted to little more than a day's work, but the Glorious Revolution in Massachusetts was not yet over. After Andros and other members of his administration were incarcerated and an interim government created, the battleground moved from the streets of Boston to the Court of St. James. There, various factions in the Bay Colony and members of the purged government competed with each other to influence the new King and the Lords of Trade, who would ultimately decide the fate of the Dominion leaders and the political future of the colony. What followed was a war of letters, addresses and pamphlets that lasted until 1691. The Lords of Trade were not enthusiastic about revolutions in the colonies, and the ex-Governor and some of his co-defendants had influential friends in England. In order to garner both public and private support for their cause, Andros, Randolph, Reverend Ratcliffe, and their allies wrote letters and pamphlets that cast the Dominion administration in a favorable light and criticized the colonists. Randolph began his own letter writing campaign shortly after his incarceration in "y^e Common Goal [sic] in Boston" and continued to solicit support from men of influence in this fashion into the next year.⁷⁸ Andros himself wrote an account of his tenure in which he stressed his faithfulness to his royal commission.⁷⁹ Others wrote pamphlets in which they praised the Governor and his administration, and characterized the leaders of the Revolution in Massachusetts as religious bigots, smugglers, pirates, and traitors. Andros and his co-defendants were acquitted of maladministration by the Lords of Trade in October, 1690.

The "Anglican faction" that supported the Andros regime argued that the rebel leaders of Boston consisted primarily of "Preachers and their Adherents," who "highly intraged the Minds of the People against the Governor."⁸⁰ To them, the Revolution in Boston was partially aimed at the Church

77 Richard Dunn assumes that "the more credulous Puritans" among Boston's leaders honestly believed that "Andros was betraying the militia to the Popish French" (Dunn, 252).

Other publications were circulated in Boston in April that carried anti-Catholic and anti-Anglican sentiment. In addition to Mather's *A Testimony Against Several Profane Practices*, published in February, the most important of these was Increase Mather's *A Brief Discourse Concerning the Unlawfulness of the Common-Prayer Worship*. See Randolph to Dr. William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, May 28, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:270, and Foote, 96. Apparently the Congregationalist ministers also did their part to promote anti-Anglicanism as well. Randolph notes that "Mr. Mathers booke ag^t. y^e Common Prayer" and "y^e Ministers has perswaded the people that wee were Idolaters & therefore not fitt to be intrusted longer wth y^e Gom^t." (Randolph to the Bishop of London, October 25, 1698, *Randolph Papers*, 4:305).

78 See *Randolph Papers*, Randolph to the Governor of Barbados, Boston, May 16, 1689, 4:264; Randolph to Dr. William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, Boston, May 28, 1689, 4:268; Randolph to the Lords of Trade, May 29, 1689, 4:271; Randolph to Blathwayt, from Gaol, July 22, 1689, 4:283; Randolph to my Lord Privie Seale, July 23, 1689, 4:284; Randolph to the Com^{tee}, September 5, 1689, 4:292; Randolph to the Com^{tee}, October 15, 1689, 4:297; Randolph to the Bishop of London, October 25, 1689, 4:305; Randolph to the Bishop of London, October 26, 1689, 4:309; Randolph to Mr. Chaplain, October 28, 1689, 5:20; Randolph to the Committee, January 10, 1689/90, 5:28; "Randolph's Answer to Matters Objected Against Him, April 24, 1690," 5:31.

79 "Andros' Report of his Administration to the Right Hon'ble Lords of the Committee for Trade and Plantations . . .," in Andrews, *Narratives*, 229-236.

80 [Robert Ratcliffe?], *A Particular Account of the Late Revolution at Boston in the Colony and Province of Massachusetts*, in Andrews, *Narratives*, 196, 199. See also C.D., *New England's Faction Discovered; or A Brief and True Account of their Persecution of the Church of England; the Beginning and Progress of the War with the Indians; and other Late Proceedings there, in a Letter from a Gentleman of Quality. Being an Answer to a False and Scandalous Pamphlet Lately Published; Intituled, News from New England, etc.*, in Andrews, *Narratives*, 258; Randolph to the Lords of Trade, May 29, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:280, Randolph to my Lord Privie Seale, July 23, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:285.

of England.⁸¹ It was not a supportive response to the Revolution in England, but a “long contriv’d piece of Wickedness” planned by a small group of influential Puritans in Boston and carefully instilled into the populace. According to the Anglican faction’s interpretation of the events in Boston, William’s landing only gave the theocrats an opportunity to put their conspiracy into action.⁸² Andros’ supporters argued that the New England rebels were not allied with William of Orange but with James II, and illustrated their point by describing Increase Mather’s relationship with the Stuart king and his Catholic advisors. Mather, they claimed, had endeared himself “into the affections of F. Peters [Petre], Mr. Brunt, and Nevil Pain . . . to satisfie his own malice and prejudice (without any ground or reason) conceived against the then Government of New-England.”⁸³ Randolph and others also alleged that before 1685 the Massachusetts colonists had become rich by ignoring the Acts of Trade and by providing safe (and lucrative) havens for pirates.⁸⁴ According to Randolph, “it is not the person of S^t. Edmund but the government itself, they designe to have removed, that they may freely trade . . . without ever touching at or paying the customes of England as the law requires.”⁸⁵ He further alleged that, before Andros governed the colony and enforced the laws of navigation and trade, “this place was the common receptacle of pyratts of all nations . . . who have been received and p^rected by some in the present government.”⁸⁶

The allegations that seem to have troubled the Boston rebels the most were those that centered around religion. Within weeks of the Revolution in Boston, Anglicans began to send complaints of mistreatment and discrimination to the government in London. In May, Edward Randolph complained to the Archbishop of Canterbury that “M^r. Mather has published here a booke called ‘the Idolatry of y^e Common prayer worship’ which renders all of us of that church obnoxious to the common people who account us popish & treat us accordingly.”⁸⁷ Just after the April revolution, Anglicans sent an address to London.⁸⁸ In it they claimed that “such is the malice of our dissenting neighbours that wee are become the object of their scorn, and are forced to take many affronts and indignities by them frequently offered to our persons and religion, which some of their principall Teachers have lately in a printed treaty [treatise] charged to be idolatry and Popery.” The Boston Anglicans alleged that “our Church by their rage and fury having been greatly hurt and damnified” and was “daily threatened to be pulled down and destroyed.” Their minister was “hindered and obstructed in the discharge of his duty.” They were “put under the burden of most excessive rates and

81 *Humble Address of Your Majesty’s most loyal and dutiful Subjects of the Church of England in Boston in Your Majesty’s Territory and Dominion of New England*, Foote, 1:101; Randolph to Dr. William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, Boston, May 28, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:268; Randolph to the Bishop of London, October 25, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:305, 4:307-308; *A Particular Account*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 207; *Faction Discovered*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 258-259.

82 *Particular Account*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 196. See also “Mr. Randolph’s Petⁿ. To be Restored to his Employment, May 22, 1690,” *Randolph Papers*, 5:34.

83 *Faction Discovered*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 253-254. See also Randolph to the Lords of Trade, May 29, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:272; Randolph to the Lords of Trade, May 29, 1689, 4:271. Brunt was well known Catholic advisor to James and, according to Andros, solicitor to Fr. Petre. For Brunt and Payne, see Andrews, *Narratives*, fn. 2-4, 254. Fr. Petre was the King’s personal chaplain and confessor.

84 Randolph to the Governor of Barbados, Boston, May 16, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:267; Randolph to Dr. William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, May 28, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:269; Randolph to the Lords of Trade, May 29, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:273; [Edward Randolph?] *Considerations Humbly Offered to the Parliament*, *Randolph Papers*, 5:11-13; *Mr. Randolph’s Acco^t of Irregular Trade in New England since y^e Revolution*, 1690, *Randolph Papers*, 5:35-37; *Particular Account*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 209, “Letter of Captain George to Pepys, 1689,” Andrews, *Narratives*, 219.

85 Randolph to the Lords of Trade, May 29, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:278-279.

86 *Ibid.*

87 Randolph to Dr. William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, May 28, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:270. See also Randolph to the Bishop of London, October 25, 1689, *Randolph Papers*, 4:305.

88 Although Mather and other rebel pamphlet writers alleged that this address was written to James, and not to William and Mary because only one ruler is mentioned in the title, it is more probable that the Anglicans who wrote it, like the authors of the “Declaration of Grievances,” knew only that William presided over the government at London but were not yet aware that William was to rule in partnership with Mary. See Foote, fn. 2, 1:100.

taxes to support the interest of a disloyal prevailing party amongst us who . . . designe nothing but ruin and destruction to us and the whole countrey.”⁸⁹

Pamphlets followed letters and addresses, each more critical of the new Puritan government than the last. In 1690 a tract by John Palmer was published in London. Palmer noted that the new government was comprised of “*New England Reformers*, . . . [who] now had the opportunity to make themselves Persecutors of the Church of *England*, as they had before been of all others that did not comply with their Independency.”⁹⁰ He claimed that the new government there could be expected to mete out the kinds of punishment—“Fines, Imprisonment, Stripes, Banishment, and Death”—to Anglicans that they had reserved in the past for others who did not conform to the New England Way.⁹¹ The author of *A Particular Account* declared that one of the Puritan ministers “was for cutting the throats of all of the Established Church and then (said he religiously), wee shall never bee troubled with them again.” Other Puritans allegedly replied “that it was no more a sin to kill such as they were, than to cut off a dog’s neck.”⁹² C.D., an unknown Anglican writer, argued that it was not the government of Andros that galled the colonists but the Church of England men in positions of power there. He noted that “at the time of the Revolution most of the Principal Officers in the Government were of the Independent and Presbyterian Party, yet their malice and fury was not shewn to any of them, but only used and exercised against those of the Church of England, whom . . . they seized and barbarously Imprisoned.”⁹³ The new Anglican chapel was defiled when angry Puritans, “stir[red] up to Faction and Rebellion,” broke its glass windows and daubed it “with dung, and other filth, in the rudest and basest manner imaginable.”⁹⁴ The Anglican minister, Rev. Ratcliffe, escaped the colony, his church, and his flock, C.D. alleged, for his own safety.⁹⁵ In short, Dominion supporters argued that the new regime was dominated by religious fanatics, who were far more tyrannical toward the property and religion of Anglicans than the Andros regime had ever been toward the Congregationalists.

Mather and other supporters of the Boston Revolution responded to the charges of their detractors through pamphlets and by collecting all of the allegations and complaints against the Andros regime that they could find. The latter did them little good in London. Their accusations came to nought when the Dominion officers were acquitted by the Lords of Trade. The pamphlets were important, however, both as a means of influencing the Crown’s decision to give the colony a new charter and because it offered the colonists, as well as the government in London, a viable interpretation of the Revolution in Boston. It is ever the case that the winners of revolutions write the history for posterity, so it was with the winners of the Glorious Revolution both in England and in Massachusetts.

One problem that confronted the memorialists of the Revolution in the Bay Colony, however, was that the comparison between Popery and the Church of England, so useful in focusing the resentments of the colonists, represented a political liability in London. It was one thing to accuse Andros and his accomplices of treachery and conspiracy along with James II. It carried little weight in London, but it was safe. It was quite another to condemn the Church of England of being no more than Popery dressed in English fashion. Increase Mather’s statements that the Anglican service consisted of “broken Responds and shreds of Prayer which the Priests and People toss between them like Tennis Balls,” that “a stinted Liturgy is opposite to the Spirit of Prayer,” and that the surplice and cross were “Idols of Rome,” could not help his cause in London.⁹⁶ Such comparisons were not employed there. In fact, Increase Mather and his allies confronted a very different problem in the

89 *Humble Address of Your Majesty’s most loyal and dutiful Subjects of the Church of England in Boston in Your Majesty’s Territory and Dominion of New England*, Foote, 1:101-102.

90 John Palmer, *And Impartial Account of the State of New England, etc.*, cited in Foote, fn. 2, 1:106.

91 *Ibid.*

92 *A Particular Account*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 207.

93 *Faction Discovered*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 259.

94 *Ibid.*

95 *Ibid.*

96 Increase Mather, *A Brief Discourse Concerning the Unlawfulness of the Common Prayer Worship . . .*, cited in Foote, 1:96.

capital. They and their co-religionists in Massachusetts were accused of behaving toward Anglicans and other Dissenters like a Papist government.

The accusations of Anglicans against the Boston Puritans were particularly embarrassing. Massachusetts agents first tried to accuse the Boston Anglicans of treasonably applying to James II (or possibly even Louis XIV) for support against the Congregationalists in Massachusetts. In *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New-England, To which King You Please . . .*, an anonymous pamphlet published in London in 1691, the author claimed that the supposed members of the Church of England who had sent an Address to the King, were really men educated in “Debauchery and Depravation.”⁹⁷ Mather and others characterized the Anglican faction in Boston as ardent supporters of James II, “Tools of Tyranny,” who were confused without the Stuart King’s guidance.⁹⁸

Mather, himself, apparently decided that the best means of answering the Anglicans’ allegations were both to dismiss them as inconsequential and to do all that he could to influence the government in Boston to adopt a policy of tolerance henceforth. To the first end he wrote that the accusations of the Boston Anglicans were mostly falsehoods. He admitted that a few windows were broken on the new Anglican chapel. The new church had been built next to a school yard, and who could fault the innocent accidents of the local lads playing at ball? “What?” he asked incredulously, “must not a Boy in New England throw a Stone or a Ball amiss but the *King* shall hear of it? To a *Domitian* (who counted *Fly Catching* not below him) this might have been a proper Address: But for these Impur tinences to be laid before the High and Mighty *William* the Greatest Prince now in *Europe*, . . . there was doubtless a *mistake in the delivery*.”⁹⁹

At about the same time, Mather called for religious tolerance in Massachusetts. He informed his friends at home that the “Archbishop of Canterbury that now is, and many of the present Bishops, are Friends to New-England,” and he warned them that the new King and his Court were considering a charter in which “Liberty is granted to all Men to Worship God after that manner which in their Consciences they shall be perswaded is the most Scriptural way.”¹⁰⁰ He implied that if the colonists wanted a new charter that guaranteed them their property, English liberties and a representative assembly, the price that they would have to pay was tolerance toward other Protestant denominations. Anglicans in Massachusetts had achieved the high ground early on the issue of religion, and their opponents were willing to surrender it to them and move on to constitutional considerations where they thought their arguments the strongest.¹⁰¹

In 1690 Increase Mather and other colonial agents answered Randolph’s accusations that the colony ignored the trade laws and encouraged piracy. “The Government and Inhabitants in generall,” they wrote, “have no advantage by irregular Trade but the Offenders only, whom they

97 [Anon.], *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New-England, To Which King You Please, with Remarks upon it. (A Publican is a Creature that Lives Upon the Common-Wealth)* (London, 1691), 10. At least one pamphleteer reminded London readers that the Revolution in Boston was supported by Anglicans as well as Congregationalists. A.B. wrote, “no, even some of that [Anglican] Communion did appear in their Arms to assist the enterprize.” “An Account of the Late Revolution,” Hall, 51. Some Anglicans did indeed take sides against the Dominion government. Henry Wilder Foote notes that “Mr. John Nelson,” an Anglican, “but a lover of liberty, took command of the impatient militia and led them against the fort just in time to intercept the Governor’s escape.” Foote, 1:85-86.

98 *Ibid.*, 7, 9.

99 Increase Mather, *A Vindication of New-England, From the Vile Aspersions Cast upon that Country By a Late Address of a Faction there, Who Denominate Themselves of the Church of England in Boston*, (Boston, 1690?), 20.

100 Increase Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New-England, their Negotiation at the Court of England . . .*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 288-289. See also [Cotton Mather?], *A Letter of Advice to the Churches of the Non-Conformists in the English Nation . . .*, (London, 1700), *passim*.

101 T.H. Breen argues that the justification for the Massachusetts Revolution represented a turnabout in New England political writing. He writes that in these works we see the transformation of Massachusetts political thought from religious to secular as New Englanders argued that Andros threatened their liberty and property, but not their religion. Breen claims that the accusation of Popery “was a minor theme in the protests against [sic] his [Andros’] administration” (T.H. Breen, *The Character of a Good Ruler*, 153). Perhaps such accusations were omitted in the pamphlet war in London and gradually diminished in Massachusetts primarily because they were less credible to London readers and thus were not productive in the propaganda battle for the new charter.

have been and will always be ready and forward to find out and punish as the Acts direct.”¹⁰² They argued that Randolph as commissioner of customs persecuted shippers with false charges of “irregular Trading” and engaged in further corrupt and illegal acts under Andros.¹⁰³ They questioned Randolph’s veracity and character. After all, they asserted, when the “Council took upon them[selves] to make Laws and levy mony without an Assembly or any Consent of Their Ma^{ty}. Subjects” to the destruction of English rights in Massachusetts, Randolph was one of the collaborators.¹⁰⁴ Pamphlet writers thereafter argued primarily that Andros and his regime had been arbitrary rulers who conspired with the tyrant James II against the people of New England and William. Each pamphlet contained a similar list of the New Englanders’ allegations. Andros and his accomplices had governed without an assembly, had taken their property, including the South Church, without due process, had erected arbitrary courts, and had generally perpetrated “a treasonable invasion of all the Rights belonging to the English Nation” just as James II had to the people of England.¹⁰⁵

In the meantime, while the pamphlet war and negotiations continued in England, the interim government in Massachusetts fared poorly. The Maine frontier was left undefended after the troops had deserted Andros and returned to their homes, and, since England and France were now at war, the French and their Indian allies ravaged Maine with impunity.¹⁰⁶ When the provisional government in Boston tried to levy troops throughout the colony to fight in Maine, they encountered stiff resistance from the smaller towns whose leaders claimed that they had contributed more than their fair share of both blood and treasure under Andros. In a sermon delivered in response to these complaints, Cotton Mather replied that the current war was just and necessary for the defense of the colony.¹⁰⁷ Probably at the suggestion of the colonial agents in London, Massachusetts embarked on an extravagant, and ultimately ruinous, expedition against French Canada, successfully taking Port Royal and then mounting an attack upon Quebec. The war was popular in the colony at first. Merchants, stung in the past by the attacks of French privateers and enthusiastic at the possibility of booty, supported it. The Puritans viewed the war as a crusade against French Popery. The leaders of the Bay Colony, both in Boston and England, hoped that their expedition against the new rulers’ enemies would convince the government in London of their loyalty and enthusiasm and thus hasten the creation a more favorable charter. The Quebec expedition, poorly planned and manned from the start, failed, and Boston once more saw militia companies in its streets. This time, however, the unpaid soldiers turned out to protest against the provisional government.¹⁰⁸ To promote the war, the government in Boston was forced to levy taxes that were thirty-two times higher than those raised in 1660.¹⁰⁹

The failure of King William’s War, the increased taxation, and the resultant public disorder caused a rift between the moderate merchants of the colony and the more conservative Puritan leaders. These two parties, and the Andros supporters in the colony, bombarded their agents and

102 *An Answer to M^r. Randolph’s Acco^t. Touching Irregular Trade Since y^e late Revolution, 1690*, *Randolph Papers*, 5:45.

103 *Ibid.*, 5:46.

104 *Ibid.*

105 *A Vindication of New-England*, 13. A few other pamphlets, each of which feature approximately the same allegations include Nathaniel Byfield, *An Account of the Late Revolution in New England . . .* (London, 1689), Andrews, *Narratives*, 170-182; [Anon.], *The Plain Case Stated* (Boston, 1689); [Anon.], *An Appeal to the Men of New-England* (Boston, 1689); A.B., *An Account of the Late Revolutions in New England* (London, 1689), Hill, 48-53; E.R. & S.S., *The Revolution in New England Justified*; William Stoughton, *A Narrative of The Proceedings of Sir Edmund Androsse and his Complices, Who Acted by an Illegal and Arbitrary Commission from the Late K. James, during his government in New England. By Several Gentlemen who were of his Council* (Boston and London, 1691), Andrews, *Narratives*, 239-249; [Anon.], *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New-England*.

106 Hall, 55; Barnes, 257; Lewis, 337-338.

107 Cotton Mather, *Souldiers Counsell’d and Comforted: A Discourse unto Some Part of the Forces Engaged in the Just War of New-England Against the Northern and Eastern Indians* (Boston: Samuel Green, 1689).

108 Barnes, 259.

109 Hall, 55.

friends in London with requests for a new charter and the restoration of legitimate and ordered government in Massachusetts.¹¹⁰ Their appeals and prayers finally bore fruit when King William granted the colony a new charter on 17 October, 1691.¹¹¹

The charter of 1691 itself became a bone of contention between conservative Puritans like Elisha Cooke and Thomas Oakes, “who trusted God more than Kings,” and would not be satisfied with anything less than the full restoration of the old charter, and the majority of the Bay leadership who were reasonably happy with the new one and “were too intelligent to believe that the clock could be turned back.”¹¹² Most colonists looked forward with optimism to the new charter and the stability they were convinced it would foster.

The new Massachusetts charter had a profound effect on both the colony’s internal politics and its relationship to the mother country. The Massachusetts assembly was restored, but the Governor, who would henceforth be appointed by the king, had the power to veto legislation as did the Crown after him. The new Governor was to put the Crown’s interest first and was thus given the power to control a popular assembly that had a reputation for ignoring imperial policy that it found inconvenient. The Governor also had the right to appoint all of the officials of the judiciary and military with the consent of his council.¹¹³ His choices might be constrained by local interests, however, because the colonial council was chosen by the assembly rather than by the Crown—an innovation peculiar to Massachusetts among royal colonies. The colonial assembly, called the General Court, was to be elected annually in order to select councilors. While it was sitting it could legislate as it saw fit for the colony. Its annual election was fixed by royal charter rather than by the invitation of the governor, who could neither prevent it from sitting, nor guarantee its pliability. This, and the fact that the assembly chose the council gave it primacy over the executive. Its powers were comparable to those of the House of Commons in England. Indeed, a succession of governors would come to agree with William Shute, who reported to the King in 1723, “I found the House of Representatives, who are chosen annually, possessed of all the Powers of the House of Commons, and of much greater.”¹¹⁴

While the form of government might have heartened the Puritan conservatives, the new charter’s provisions for liberty of conscience and broader suffrage did not. Liberty of conscience was granted to all Protestants, and suffrage was secularized, so that all adult men who possessed a forty shilling freehold or property valued at forty pounds sterling had the right to vote. While this innovation over the old ways did not completely destroy the political power of the “theocrats,” as Viola Barnes argues, it had the effect of widening the electorate and opening the doors of Massachusetts politics to the growing politically and religiously moderate urban merchant class of the colony.¹¹⁵ In fact the charter and the legacy of the Glorious Revolution helped to create a new alliance between moderate Congregationalists, who were increasingly more tolerant of other Protestant faiths, and the growing merchant class. This new alliance was based on the imperial politics fostered by the new charter and the ideological legacy of the Glorious Revolution. The Andros regime and the struggle for the new charter had the effect of making Bay colonists, whatever their religious convictions, and whatever their calling, conscious of their relationship with the mother country, and conscious of a common devotion to liberty, property and Protestantism that spanned the Atlantic. In essence, Bay Colonists replaced their provincial Calvinist values for those traditional English values enunciated in William’s revolutionary propaganda and in the more secular and libertarian English Whig ideology.

110 *Ibid.*

111 Lewis, 353.

112 Lovejoy, 371; Lewis, 356.

113 In theory, the governor’s position was powerful because of his patronage rights and his veto. The Crown’s rights were theoretically greater still, but the Crown, for both practical and ideological reasons, rarely exercised a prerogative over the colonies that, in effect, had not changed since Charles II. See Jack P. Greene, “The Glorious Revolution and the British Empire, 1688-1783,” in *Negotiated Authorities: Essays in Colonial Political and Constitutional History* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1994), 84-86.

114 “Memorial of Governor Shute to the King, 1723,” cited in Lewis, 355. For a description of the charter of 1691 see Barnes, 269-271.

115 Barnes, 272; Lewis, 356.

From its founding, Massachusetts had worked hard to earn its own way. It had not been founded or settled to promote economic prosperity or even to avoid political adversity, but “as a positive crusade for an idea.”¹¹⁶ The idea was Congregational utopianism, and the first generation of colonial leaders did all that was in their power to nurture it, including promoting separation between their colony and the tainted politics and established religion of their homeland. In order to “create in New England the kind of society that God demanded of all His servants but none had yet given Him,” the founders removed the colonial charter from London to Boston, so that Massachusetts “could become in effect a self-governing commonwealth.”¹¹⁷ As a result, the Bay Colonists devoted their early years to insular concerns associated with utopia building and largely avoided entanglements in the controversies and events that took place in England from the 1630s until 1685. In Massachusetts before 1691, the social covenant was one made between the people, their God, and their colonial magistrates.¹¹⁸

The new ideas of the Glorious Revolution were not entirely inconsistent with the old covenant theology of the colony. Bay Colony leaders revised the old covenant idea to include the role of providential kings in the political and civil life of the colony. In 1689, Cotton Mather preached an election sermon in which he blamed Massachusetts’ misfortunes, not on King James II or Andros, but on the apostasy of the colonists themselves.¹¹⁹ Before the Glorious Revolution, Bay Colonists feared and distrusted English kings, whom they viewed as erroneous in their religion and arbitrary in their government.¹²⁰ William’s rescue of the liberties and religion of Englishmen and his new charter for Massachusetts, in essence, created a new covenant for the Bay Colony between the people, their God, and their king. Perry Miller notes that “the humiliation of New England under Andros was a covenant affliction” in the eyes of Puritan colonists, “while William and Mary were a providential deliverance, according to the promise.”¹²¹ In July of 1689, Increase Mather claimed that New England would have closer ties to the Crown, because the new rulers had restored and preserved the liberties and Protestant religion of all Englishmen by their “Happy Revolution.”¹²² Henceforth the King and the people were allies (as they had been in the Revolution of 1689) in the great undertaking of government and the preservation of the rights of Englishmen against the dark threats of Popery and slavery. Perry Miller notes that the “substance of the covenant” was “firmly attached to the Protestantism of the English Crown.”¹²³ This theme became part of the stock in trade of New England Ministers from the late 1690s on. In 1700, Cotton Mather preached an election sermon that might best be classified as an anti-Jeremiad. In *A Pillar of Gratitude*, he praised Massachusetts, “the climate, the college, the government with its theocratic and democratic principles, the wise and good English king,” and, although he commented on the absence of heresy in the colony and blasted Popery, he refrained from including Anglicanism on his list of unorthodox positions.¹²⁴ From 1701 through 1766, many election sermons in Massachusetts were to echo Mather’s themes of a free people, ordered government, and good monarchs. Perry Miller argues that these Whig themes

116 Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: The Seventeenth Century* (New York: MacMillan, 1939, Rep., Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), 433.

117 Morgan, *Puritan Dilemma*, 46.

118 Miller, *Seventeenth Century*, 409. Some general works that touch upon the politics of Massachusetts before 1676, see Perry Miller, *Orthodoxy in Massachusetts* (reprint, Boston: Beacon Press, 1959), 144-145, *passim*; Perry Miller, *The Seventeenth Century*, 414-418, 423-431, *passim*.; Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University, 1953, Rep., Boston: Beacon Press, 1961), 119-129, 410-420, *passim*; Edmund Morgan, *The Puritan Dilemma*; T.H. Breen, *The Character of a Good Ruler*, 35-41, *passim*.

119 Cotton Mather, *The Way to Prosperity . . . , May 23, 1689*, in A.W. Plumstead, *The Wall and the Garden: Selected Massachusetts Sermons, 1670-1775* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1968), 109-139.

120 Miller, *The Seventeenth Century*, 410-413.

121 Miller, *From Colony to Province*, 158.

122 *Ibid.*, 159.

123 *Ibid.*, 163.

124 Plumstead, 144.

became an integral part of the post-Revolutionary social covenant idea.¹²⁵ For Miller, “Protestantism was imperceptibly carried over into the new order, not by turning from religion to an absolutist state, but by translating Christian Liberty into those liberties guaranteed by statute.”¹²⁶ In essence, for Miller the Puritans of New England made a gradual transition toward the ideology of post-Revolutionary English Whiggism with its consistent themes of liberty, good order, and support for the Protestant Whig monarchy. The transition was eased by the fact that Puritans had always believed that the people were ruled by their own consent, and the Settlement of the Glorious Revolution allowed them to transfer this idea to English monarchs as well as representative assemblies.¹²⁷

Additionally ministers began to claim that good kings were not only the constitutional bulwark of the peoples’ liberty, but also the moral arbiters of the Protestant English nation. As Soloman Stoddard declaimed in his election sermon of 1703:

Rulers are to be keepers of both tables; and they must practice Religion and Morality themselves, so they must take care that the people do it; they must use all proper means, for the suppression of Heresy, Prophaness & Superstition & other Corruptions in Worship.¹²⁸

New Englanders began their revolutionary journey with the loss of their charter and hence their autonomy under Charles II, and it continued with the deprivation of their rights and property and their enforced Calvinist homogeneity under James II and his servant Sir Edmund Andros. The price that they were willing to pay for the restoration of their rights and property, and some degree of autonomy vested in a new colonial constitution, was Protestant religious tolerance and the acceptance of monarchical government. Although the threat of Popery resonated in the minds of the people of Massachusetts, it was both less substantive and less important in stimulating the Revolution in New England than it would be in New York and Maryland. That is not to say that Bay Colonists’ preoccupation with an imagined Popish Plot in their midst is not significant. The fact that New Englanders made so much of a Catholic Conspiracy from so little evidence should inform contemporary historians that religious considerations were still a focus of concern and anxiety among them and still represented a powerful symbolic rallying cry in seventeenth-century America, just as it did in England. Perhaps the discovery of a Popish Plot in New England also supplied colonists there with a reasonable explanation for the arbitrary rule of Andros and the Dominion government, for, as Englishmen everywhere understood politics, arbitrary government and the Catholic religion went hand in hand. Massachusetts colonists employed a tautological interpretation of the events of their recent history. Where there was tyranny, one should look for Popery. Once the colonists understood that the actions of Andros and his master, James II, were motivated by Popery, the arbitrary government that they had experienced since 1685 could better be explained. In turn Andros’ past political transgressions further confirmed the evidence of a Popish conspiracy in the Bay Colony.

125 Miller, *From Colony to Province*, 159-172, *passim*.

126 *Ibid.*, 171.

127 Both Miller and John Dunn claim that the Puritans anticipated and informed Locke’s political theory of consent in his *Two Treatises*. See Miller, *From Colony to Province*, 296; and John Dunn, “Consent in the Political Theory of John Locke,” *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 10 (1967), 153-182. T.H. Breen offers a different interpretation that is worthy of mention, if less convincing. Breen claims that the aftermath of the Glorious Revolution split colonists into ideological factions based on a Court and Country dichotomy. Breen argues that the new monarchical tone of sermons in New England was symptomatic of the Court persuasion that was largely undemocratic and elitist. Breen contends that “the clergymen in New England tended to favor the Court’s philosophy” (fn. 12, 210), but the people of the colony were, in fact, becoming increasingly democratic (211). The Court party, he argues, “would just have soon forgotten the Glorious Revolution” with its troubling democratic underpinnings and challenge to authority (213), a difficult assertion in the face of a wealth of sermon material from the 1690s into the 1760s that incorporated praise for the king and for ordered, authoritative government *and* emphasized the importance of English popular rights that included representative government, and the preservation of personal property, and the Protestant religion. Although the politics of the colony contained Country and Court factions by the middle of the eighteenth century, Breen’s claim to see such pronounced ideological differences before the 1720s is rather difficult to support from the evidence of the sources.

128 Soloman Stoddard, cited in Perry Miller, *From Colony to Province*, 176. See also Benjamin Coleman, *A Sermon for the Reformation of Manners . . .* (Boston, Fleet & Crump, 1716) 2, *passim*; Ebenezer Gay, *The Duty of a People*, 18-19.

Ultimately, Massachusetts kept its covenant with God by admitting into it both the Revolutionary principles of 1688 and the enthusiastic acceptance of English Protestant limited monarchy. Just over a half-century later, in 1746, Charles Chauncy summed up the Revolutionary covenant of Massachusetts at a time when England was once again under the twin threats of Stuart tyranny and Romanism:

Let us, my *Brethren* . . . express our Love, and Gratitude, and Loyalty, to our Sovereign, and Concern for the Safety of his Kingdom. Let us be constant and importunate in our Supplications to god, that he would preserve the *Person*, and protect the *Crown* of our rightful and Lawful King; . . . that he would mercifully save his people from *Popery* and *Slavery*; perpetuating to them the Enjoyment of their *Rights* and *Liberties*, which distinguish them from the other Nations of the Earth.¹²⁹

129 Charles Chauncy, *The Council of two Confederate Kings to set the Son of Tabeal on the Throne Represented as Evil . . . A Sermon Occasion'd by the present Rebellion in Favour of the Pretender. Preached in Boston . . . February 6th, 1745.* (Boston: D. Gookin, 1746), 43. See also Cotton Mather, *The Glorious Throne*, 30, 35; Benjamin Coleman, *A Sermon Preach'd at Boston in New England, on Thursday the 23rd of August, 1716 . . .* (Boston: Fleet and Crump, 1716), 6-7, 17.

The Duke's Province and the Glorious Revolution

This French Government being thus (by Commission) introduced, it was natural that Papists should be employed in the highest Trusts; such as the Council, the Revenue, and the Military Forces; . . . since no Law was left alive to make them unqualified, therefore this obedient Governor admitted . . . professed Papists to assist in making Arbitrary Placats, and forcing obedience to them from a Protestant Free People . . . This was the condition of New York, the Slavery and Popery that lay under it, until the Hand of Heaven sent the glorious King William to break those chains, which would otherwise have fetter'd all Europe. And these were the reasons that moved the Gentlemen concerned with the Revolution of New York to be early in shaking off their Tyrants, and declaring for their Deliverer. — *Loyalty Vindicated*, 1698¹³⁰

News of William's invasion of England, James' flight, and the Revolution in Boston trickled into the New York colony in April and May of 1689 and was welcomed by most colonists. New Yorkers had numerous grievances against James Stuart that extended back more than two decades. As the Duke of York, James had been the proprietor of the colony from 1664 until 1685, when he became King James II and ruled New York as a Royal colony. From the start, James governed his province like a highly centralized feudal state, eschewing representative government there in favor of a governor and council, making laws and levying taxes as he pleased, and meddling in local political and religious affairs when it suited him. Whereas New Englanders had to search diligently and imaginatively to find evidence of Romanist influence in their government under the Dominion, New Yorkers had no such difficulties. James had filled some of the highest civilian and military positions in the province with Catholic appointees, and the trappings of Romanism were apparent there in the form of chapels, roving Catholic missionaries, and even a Jesuit school in the colonial capital. There was much justice in a pamphleteer's claim that in New York, James "at one jump leapt over all the bounds, and Laws of English Right and Government."¹³¹

At the time of its occupation by the English in 1664, New York's population was the most diverse of any colony in North America. As early as 1644, a visiting Jesuit, Father Jogues, observed that eighteen languages were spoken in the province whose residents already included Dutch, Walloons, English, Swedes, Danes, Norwegians, French, Germans, Scotch-Irish, Portuguese Jews and Africans.¹³² In 1666, Col. Richard Nicholls, the first English governor of New York, estimated

130 [Anon.], *Loyalty Vindicated from the Reflections of a Virulent Pamphlet* . . . (London, 1698), in Andrews, *Narratives*, 376.

131 *Ibid.*, 375. For the history of New York under James, both as Proprietor and King, see Patricia Bonomi, *A Factious People: Politics and Society in Colonial New York* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), 19-75; Michael Kammen, *Colonial New York: A History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1975), 73-127; John Webb Pratt, *Religion, Politics and Diversity: The Church-State Theme in New York History* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1967), 27-46; Jerome R. Reich, *Leisler's Rebellion: A Study in Democracy in New York, 1664-1720* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953); Robert Ritchie, *The Duke's Province: A Study of New York Colonial Politics and Society, 1664-1691* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1977); Voorhees, 98-121, 251-265. Jerome Reich and, to a lesser extent, Lovejoy give a balanced coverage to the wide range of constitutional, economic and religious grievances that New Yorkers had against their government under James Stuart, and note that there was no single overriding cause that stimulated the Revolution in the province. Ritchie concentrates on the interaction between the people of the colony and their government through the social, political and economic developments over the period of Stuart domination there. The religious tensions in the province are the focus of Pratt's and Voorhees' studies, and Voorhees attributes the Revolution and its aftermath under Jacob Leisler primarily to religious tensions, both anti-Romanist and internecine among the Calvinists of the province. Kammen and Bonomi focus on the social and economic diversity of New York and the tensions and conflicts caused by the diverse ethnicity and economy in the province. The demographics of the colony and city of New York are the focus of several helpful works by Thomas J. Archdeacon, among them *New York City, 1664-1710: Conquest and Change* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1972), 32-96, and "The Age of Leisler—New York City, 1689-1710: A Social and Demographic Interpretation," in *Aspects of Early New York Society and Politics*, Jacob Judd and Irwin H. Polishook, eds. (Tarrytown, New York: Sleepy Hollow Restorations, 1974), 63-82.

132 E.B. O'Callaghan, ed. *Documentary History of the State of New York* (New York: Weed, Parsons, & Co., 1849-51), 4:21 (*D.H.N.Y.* in future citations). Of course, a number of Native American tribes also lived within the territory of the New York Charter as self-governing groups who interacted with the colonial

that three quarters of the population of the colony were Dutch, and they remained in the majority throughout the century.¹³³ Peter Stuyvesant noted in 1667 that “the most considerable Inhabitants of these parts” were “composed of the Dutch nations,” and Governor Andros reported eleven years later that while there were “some few of all Nations,” most of the two thousand inhabitants able to bear arms were Dutch.¹³⁴

Dutch residents had increasing reason to chafe at the English occupation of New York. The surrender agreement between the Dutch colonists and the English had seemed more than equitable.¹³⁵ Any Dutch inhabitants who wished to leave and return to the Netherlands might do so. Those who stayed were guaranteed liberty of conscience.¹³⁶ Their laws, property, contracts, debts, and inheritance practices were preserved, and their local magistrates were allowed to continue in their offices “til the customary time of a new election.”¹³⁷ No Dutch inhabitant or Dutch ship might be pressed into service in war against any other nation. Article Six of the agreement stated that Dutch settlers were allowed to move into the colony in the future, and “Dutch vessels may freely come hither, and any of the Dutch may freely return home, or send any sort of merchandise home in vessels of their own country.”¹³⁸ Article Seven, in an apparent contradiction to the former, stated that Dutch trade should only continue for six months.¹³⁹

The trade articles of the agreement created confusion and frustration among the Dutch merchants for some time to come. Article Six appeared on its face to exempt New York from the strictures of the Navigation Acts in respect to trade with the Netherlands. It was, however, unclear as to whether it opened the colony to Dutch trade or only enabled Dutch citizens to carry their property with them when they entered or left New York. If the former, an interpretation preferred by the Dutch merchants, then Article Seven presented a clear contradiction. Did Article Seven refer to Dutch ships that only engaged in the carrying trade, or did it also apply to ships carrying settlers to and from New York, thus, essentially limiting intercourse with the Netherlands, apparently guaranteed by Article Six, to six months? If the latter were the case, then Article Six was moot as England and Holland were currently at war and no Dutch ships (at least commercial ones) might be expected in New York until the war ended.¹⁴⁰ These questions caused contention between the colony and the government in England until the Glorious Revolution.

government. On the ethnic diversity of the early New York (and New Netherland) population, see Milton M. Klein, “New York in the American Colonies: A New Look,” in Judd and Irwin, *Aspects of Early New York Society and Politics*, 16-17; Bonomi, *A Factious People*, 18-27; Pratt, *Religion, Politics and Diversity*, 4-5; Michael Kammen, *Colonial New York*, 23-72. For a detailed examination of the population of colonial New York, see Archdeacon, *New York City*, 32-77.

133 *Collections of the New York Historical Society* (New York, 1869), 2:118. Henceforth cited as *N.Y.H.S.C.*.

134 Governor Stuyvesant to the Duke of York, in John Brodhead, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York; Procured in Holland, England and France*, 15 vols. (Albany, New York: Weed Parsons & Co., 1858), 3:164. (*N.Y.C.D.* in future references); “Answers of Governor Andros to Enquiries about New York,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:261.

135 For the treaty itself, see “Articles of Capitulation on the Reduction of New Netherland . . . , August 27, Old Style, 1664,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 2:250-253. For a discussion of expectations of the Dutch, and their understanding of the treaty, see Reich, 8-10, *passim.*, and Ritchie, *The Duke’s Province*, 22-23, *passim.* Governor Nicholls had good reason to forge articles that were lenient to the Dutch residents of the province. Since the Dutch made up two-thirds of the population, Nicholls and future governors often sought their cooperation and looked to Dutch leaders for support. See Steve Stern, “Knickerbockers who Insisted and Asserted: The Dutch Interest in New York Politics, 1664-1691,” *New York Historical Society Quarterly*, Vol. 58 (April, 1974), 117-119, 129-131.

136 For more on religious guarantees and the Dutch Reformed Church, see Milton Klein, “New York in the American Colonies: A New Look,” in Judd and Polishook, *Aspects of Early New York Society and Politics*, 19-20.

137 “Articles of Capitulation . . . ,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 2:252.

138 *Ibid.*, 2:251.

139 *Ibid.*

140 See Reich, 9-10. For a petition from Peter Stuyvesant, see *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:163-164.

Within a few months of the conclusion of peace between England and Holland, city officials and Dutch merchants had begun to petition the Governor and the Duke of York to allow the continuation of the Dutch trade for at least five years with exemptions from various duties.¹⁴¹ Governor Nicholls himself allowed some of the New York merchants to trade with Holland, thus creating a precedent of sorts for reviving the trade.¹⁴² The government in London, in fact, gave permission to the colony to engage in limited trade with Holland in 1667. To encourage trade and commerce in New York, the Privy Council granted the Dutch inhabitants “temporary permission for seven years” to trade with Holland “with three shipp onely” per year.¹⁴³ The next year, the Lords of Trade sent a notice to King Charles requesting that the policy be stopped. They claimed that it was detrimental to English trade and industry, and that, since the Dutch did not allow English vessels to trade at any of their ports or colonies, they should not be allowed to trade with an English colony. Finally, they argued that, once in the American colonies, Dutch goods “will not only suply the consumption of your maj^{ties} afors^d Plantation in New York,” but would be traded throughout English North America, from New England to Barbados.¹⁴⁴ In response to the Lords of Trade, the Privy Council reversed its earlier decision and issued an order prohibiting Dutch trade with New York altogether, even withdrawing the passes that they had already granted to three ships for the current year.¹⁴⁵ Although they kept their thoughts to themselves, New York merchants were undoubtedly frustrated and probably angry at what must have seemed to them little less than calculated duplicity on the part of the Crown.

Dutch merchants had already gone to some expense to outfit and load ships for Holland when the news that the King had revoked his permission arrived in New York. The merchants petitioned Charles II that the trade be allowed for at least one ship, ironically named the *King Charles*, that already stood, fully laden, in New York Harbor.¹⁴⁶ In December 1668, the Council authorized one pass allowing the *King Charles* to sail for Holland but stipulated that it could only make one such voyage. The Council added that the King and Duke “do not for the future grant any other Passe or Passes to any Dutch Shipp or Shippes whatsoever to trade to New Yorke.”¹⁴⁷

The Holland trade was, to a great extent, the life’s blood of the various merchant communities of the New York colony in the mid-seventeenth century. Dutch goods, far less encumbered with taxes and duties than English merchandise, were more profitable to those who retailed them in New York and elsewhere in North America. Some Dutch goods, especially farming implements, were either of a better quality than their English counterparts, or were simply preferred by the Dutch farmers of New York, or perhaps both. Peter Stuyvesant noted that the Dutch “manner of agriculture is wholly different from that way practiced by the English,” and thus the English could not supply them with the necessary “utensills relating to the cultivating of the Land” upon which Dutch farmers depended.¹⁴⁸ In addition, Indians prized the sturdy Dutch cloth, called duffel, and preferred to trade their furs for it over French exchange goods that they could get for their pelts in Canada or English goods in New England. This fact gave the Albany fur traders a distinct advantage over their competitors in neighboring colonies, but the cloth was only obtainable from Holland, so the fur merchants also had an interest in the Dutch trade.¹⁴⁹ Another reason that the merchants favored the Holland trade was

141 *Ibid.*, 9.

142 *Ibid.* Trade with Holland continued after 1665 with some regularity, but never reached the magnitude necessary to sustain the demand for Dutch goods. See Jan Kupp, “Aspects of New York-Dutch Trade, 1670-1674,” *New York Historical Quarterly*, 58 (April, 1974), 141. See also A.J.F. Van Laer, ed. and translator, *Correspondence of Jeremias Van Renselaer, 1651-1674* (Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1932), 376, 390-391, 408, 431, 446, passim; and A.J.F. Van Laer, ed. and translator, *Correspondence of Maria Van Renselaer, 1669-1689* (Albany: The University of the State of New York, 1935), 9, 83, 40, 82.

143 “Order of the King’s Council on the Petition of Peter Stuyvesant,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:166-167.

144 The Board of Trade to the King, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:176.

145 *Ibid.*, 3:177.

146 “Petition of Olive Stuyvesant Van Cortlandt, and others . . .,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:179.

147 “Order in Council, 11 December, 1668,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:179.

148 Governor Stuyvesant to the Duke of York, 1667, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:162.

149 “Petition of the Common Council of New York, December, 1669,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:187. See also Reich, 10, and Lovejoy, 103. According to Patricia Bonomi, the Fur traders found a substitute for duffel in the form of

simply that it was dependable. The English trade was established in the older English colonies, but few ships of that nationality put in at the port of New York during the first few years of English occupation. According, again, to Peter Stuyvesant in 1667, it was “most certainly evident noe shippes from England are resolv’d to visit those parts this season, soe that unlesse the Inhabitants be supply’d before spring with all necessaryes from Holland, It will be not onely impossible for them to subsist, but they must be constrained to forsake their Tillage and seeke out a Livelyhood elsewhere.”¹⁵⁰

The paucity of trade that accompanied New York’s transformation from a Dutch to an English colony retarded New York’s economic growth for years to come. When Sir Edmond Andros arrived after the Dutch reoccupation ended in 1674, Dutch residents once more requested that trade that be reopened with Holland.¹⁵¹ Some of the leaders of the merchant community went so far as to request that they be allowed to depart the colony and return to the Netherlands if the trade could not be reopened. Governor Andros was annoyed by the request and had eight of the petitioners arrested and jailed.¹⁵² When the Duke of York appraised Governor Andros that “whosoever pleased might withdraw” to Holland and that Andros go lightly with the offenders, the Governor released them.¹⁵³

The merchants of New York, no matter what their ethnicity, probably realized that their return to English possession boded lean times ahead, and they were correct. Andros reported in 1678 that between ten and fifteen ships totaling some one hundred tons traded with New York in the previous year, and about half of the shipping was comprised of coastal traders.¹⁵⁴ Sir Edmund may have agreed with the merchant community that trade with Holland was in the best interest of both the Duke and the colony. He turned a blind eye on clandestine Dutch trade, at least until his superiors in London rebuked him for his inattention.¹⁵⁵ The tone of Governor Dongan’s report of 1684 indicates that he also thought that trade in New York fell well short of expectations. Dongan reported that, “a thousand ships may ride here safe from Winds and weather,” but admitted that the previous year had seen only about ten “three masted ships of eighty or a Hundred Tuns burthen” and a few coastal traders. Dongan also admitted that some of the colony’s annual trade went to Holland.¹⁵⁶ The decline of trade in New York both increased the frustration of English and Dutch merchants and induced James to look to other methods of raising revenues from his colony. Those means most often chosen by the Duke and his resident governors were land taxes, quitrents and excise taxes. Unfortunately, so long as the colony lacked a representative assembly, these particular methods of garnering revenue angered the other sizeable ethnic population in New York, the Long Island Puritans. These English settlers from Connecticut resisted James’ authority throughout the proprietary period and beyond, generally because the constitution of the province lacked the protection afforded by a representative assembly.

New York had a much longer experience with James Stuart’s style of governing than any of the other colonies. James, the Duke of York, became its proprietor in 1664 when the English wrested the colony from the Dutch. James chose to rule his province like a feudal principality.¹⁵⁷ He appointed a governor who, with the assistance of a council chosen by the Duke, administered the colony’s affairs. In addition to an administration, James established a court system that included lower courts modeled after the English Shire Courts and an annual Court of Assizes that had appellate jurisdiction over the lower courts, heard cases in equity, and heard petitions of grievance from the colonists. Cases from any of the provincial courts might be appealed to the Crown.¹⁵⁸ James might impose what laws he wished so long as they were “not contrary to but as conveniently may be agreeable to the Laws,

English Stroudwaters, “a course woollen cloth produced in superior quality, at less cost in England.” See Patricia Bonomi, *A Factious People*, 42.

150 Governor Stuyvesant to the Duke of York, 1667, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:162.

151 *N.Y.C.D.*, 2:739-740; 3:236. See also Reich, 31.

152 Reich, 31.

153 *Ibid.* See John Werden to Governor Andros, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:239. Werden was James’ personal secretary.

154 “Answers of Governor Andros to Enquiries about New York,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:261.

155 See John Werden to Governor Andros, January 28, 167³/₆, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:236.

156 “Governor Dongan’s Annual Report on the State of the Province, including his Answers to certain Charges against him,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:398.

157 Reich, 4.

158 *Ibid.*

Statutes & Government . . . of England.”¹⁵⁹ The Duke’s grant and his instructions to the governor and council were, in essence, the constitution of New York.

The notable absence of an assembly in the Province’s constitution reflected the Stuart distrust of representative bodies. Additionally, James probably assumed that no assembly was required because the colony had never had one under Dutch administration.¹⁶⁰ The omission of a colonial assembly in the New York constitution provided colonists, especially those who were of English extraction, with a bone of contention from the very beginning of James’ proprietorship. The first governor of the province, Richard Nicholls, promised the English inhabitants of Long Island that he would call an assembly and that they would receive “equall (if not greater Freedomes & immunities) than any of his Mat^{ies} Colonies in New England” but did nothing to bring his promise to immediate fruition.¹⁶¹ Under fairly constant pressure from Long Island residents, Nicholls did call an assembly to meet at the town of Hempstead in 1665, but he only empowered its representatives to approve a code of laws that had already been prepared by the Duke in advance of the meeting. The representatives, realizing that they had been hoodwinked into giving what amounted to popular consent to the new constitution, gritted their teeth, and “publickly and unanimously declare[d]” their “cheerfull submission to all such Lawes, Statutes and Ordinances which shall be made” by the Duke and his heirs forever.¹⁶² The new code, called the Duke’s Laws, went into effect immediately. Having served its purpose, the assembly was dissolved, and the delegates returned home, each undoubtedly reflecting on how he would explain his behavior and that of New York’s first representative assembly to his constituents. Governor Nicholls was positively self-congratulatory at the results of the Hempstead Assembly. He wrote to his master the Duke, “My endeavours have not been wanting to put the whole Government into one frame and policy, and now the most refractory Republicans cannot but acknowledge themselves fully satisfied with the method and way they are in.”¹⁶³ Here the Governor underestimated his subjects. The continued lack of a colonial assembly aroused protest from colonists, especially Long Islanders, from 1665 to 1691.

The people of Long Island vented their anger and frustration by castigating the returned assembly members and by refusing to appoint the local magistrates required by the Duke’s Laws. Although the representatives claimed that they had shown their loyalty to the Duke in order to influence him to liberalize the charter and create a permanent assembly, irate townsfolk apparently behaved so badly toward their erstwhile representatives that Nicholls found it necessary to impose an ordinance that made it a crime to “reproach or defame any person . . . who shall act in any publick Employment . . . or speak against any of the Deputyes” who had confirmed the Duke’s Laws.¹⁶⁴ Towns all over Long Island refused to appoint new officials, and, where magistrates were appointed, so many prominent colonists refused to serve that the Council decided to fine anyone who shirked his civic duty and refused to hold a magistracy.¹⁶⁵ The “seditious practices” of the Long Islanders continued to anger Nicholls, especially when they took every opportunity to remind the Governor of his unkept promise to give the people of New York “freedoms and Immunities” consistent with English government.¹⁶⁶ In 1667, the people of Flushing took their frustration over the government to the streets, and Nicholls became so concerned with the popular disturbance that he decided to disband and disarm the local militia. Shortly thereafter, a Setauket citizen was tried for publicly stating “that the King was none of his King, an y^e Govern’r none of his Governour.”¹⁶⁷ In Jamaica several townsmen were tried and convicted of seditious speech, but pardoned by Nicholls.¹⁶⁸

159 “Grant of New Netherland to the Duke of York,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:660.

160 Lovejoy, 106.

161 *N.Y.C.D.*, 14:501, cited in Reich, 11.

162 “Declaration of the Deputies of Long Island, 1 March, 1665,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:91; *Calendar of State Papers, Colonial Series, America and the West Indies, 1661-1668, Preserved in Her Majesty’s Public Record Office*, W. Noel Sainsbury, ed. (London: Longman & Co., 1880), 6:286. (Series henceforth cited as *Cal. St. P.*).

163 Nicholls to the Duke of York, November, 1665, in *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:104.

164 *Records of Oyster Bay*, cited in Reich, 12.

165 Reich, 12.

166 *N.Y.C.D.*, 14:577, cited in Reich, 12.

167 Reich, 12.

168 *Ibid.*

New Yorkers, especially those who were culturally English, argued repeatedly that, since there was no assembly in the colony, the Duke and his representatives had no right to levy taxes. From 1665 on, the government fought an uphill battle to collect various taxes and duties from irate subjects.¹⁶⁹ Not only did colonists refuse to pay taxes, but on occasion officials even refused to collect them.¹⁶⁹ When Francis Lovelace, who succeeded Nicholls in 1670, levied a new tax on the colony for the much-needed repair of Fort James on Manhattan Island, he encountered stiff resistance to the measure. A town meeting of Huntington claimed that the tax ran counter to the “Liberties of Englishmen” because it was levied without an assembly and also because the town received no direct benefit from the tax.¹⁷⁰ The people of Jamaica, Long Island, agreed to pay the tax only if the King insisted on its payment, but they still maintained that the tax was “contrary to the Liberties his Majesties subjects enjoys in all his territories.”¹⁷¹ Other town meetings issued similar protests. The new Governor pronounced the petitions seditious and ordered that they be publicly burned and their authors investigated.¹⁷²

Innovations in the taxation of the colony meant to increase James’ revenues caused a series of governors grief.¹⁷³ Nicholls attempted to reform the New York land patents during his tenure, both as a means of settling disputes between colonists and Indians and so that the lands might be assessed and quitrents charged to the landowners. Most of the counties reluctantly complied, but the New Englanders of Long Island balked at the notion. In 1665 Nicholls reminded them of their responsibilities, and was still doing so in 1667.¹⁷⁴ Governor Lovelace, who succeeded Nicholls, threatened court action to compel the recalcitrant Long Islanders to renew their patents, to no avail. The residents gave a number of reasons for their failure to comply with the new land policy, but in every case the absence of a representative assembly was a key element of their grievances.¹⁷⁵ For the people of Oyster Bay, it was the only reason; they claimed that they would submit their patents only when the colony received an assembly.¹⁷⁶

After a brief interlude of Dutch occupation from 1673 to 1674, Long Islanders continued to protest the absence of a popular assembly in the colonial constitution. In fact, during the occupation, Long Islanders petitioned both the Dutch and English governments, claiming that they were really part of Connecticut and should be governed by that colony. If that was not possible, they argued, then the New York colony, whether English or Dutch, should at least be granted an assembly comparable to those of other colonies.¹⁷⁷ When the Duke of York recovered his province in 1674, he appointed Sir Edmund Andros to govern it. Andros, like his predecessors, did all that he could to disabuse colonists of the notion of an assembly. His master, James, was pleased that Andros had “done well to discourage any motion” toward the creation of an assembly “w^{ch} y^e people there seeme desirous of in imitacon of their neighbor Colonies.”¹⁷⁸ In his correspondence with the Duke and Lords of Trade, however, Andros appears to have espoused the idea that New York might be better governed if it were allowed a representative assembly.¹⁷⁹

James was not easily convinced. He responding that he suspected such an innovation “would be of dangerous consequence, nothing being more known than the aptness of such bodies to assume to themselves many privileges w^{ch} prove destructive to, or very oft disturb, the peace of y^e governm^t wherein they are allowed.”¹⁸⁰ James informed Andros that an assembly was unnecessary and

169 See Reich, 14-17, and Lovejoy, 107-108.

170 Lovejoy 108. See also Reich, 14-15.

171 *Records of the Town of Jamaica*, 1:41, cited in Reich, 15.

172 Reich, 15; Lovejoy, 108; *Cal. St. P.*, 7:381.

173 For James Stuart’s finances with relation to the New York colony, see Robert Ritchie, “The Duke of York’s Commission of Revenue,” *New York Historical Society Quarterly*, Vol. 58 (July, 1974), 177-187.

174 Reich, 13.

175 *Ibid.*

176 *Ibid.*

177 Lovejoy, 109.

178 Duke of York to Governor Andros, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:230.

179 *Ibid.*, 3:235.

180 *Ibid.*

redundant in New York, as well as “inconsistent wth y^e form of governmt already established” in the colony.¹⁸¹ The Duke argued that the people had the right to redress their grievances by means of addresses to the governor and jurists at the annual Assizes and that the Assize justices were men of such prestige in their localities that “in all probability [they] would be their Representatives if any other constitucon were allowed.”¹⁸² Nevertheless, James told Andros that he would consider future arguments and proposals that the Governor might make in favor of a colonial assembly.¹⁸³ Here again, James betrayed his own distaste at representative government and his fundamental misunderstanding of English colonists’ desire for a representative body in their colonial constitution. To them, as to all Englishmen, an assembly was a necessary ingredient for good, free, and equitable government, not only so that the people might air their grievances, but also so that they might make their own laws and have a vote in the creation of taxes for the upkeep of the colony and the enrichment of the proprietor.

In order to increase his master’s revenues, Edmund Andros instituted a new land patent and quitrent policy. In response to Sir Edmund’s command that New Yorkers once more renew their land patents, many Long Island Town meetings claimed that they were still part of Connecticut.¹⁸⁴ Andros quickly wearied of the Long Island claims. He ordered the leading troublemakers to come to New York City and explain themselves before the Council. Several leaders were punished for “writing & signing seditious Letters . . . against y^e Governm^t.”¹⁸⁵ The Long Island towns ultimately settled their patents when Andros, his patience at its limit, threatened to confiscate their land. Even after the settlement, however, Long Island towns tried, generally without success, to evade their annual rents.¹⁸⁶

The quitrent controversy between the colonial governors and the towns of Long Island increased in vehemence during the tenure of Thomas Dongan (1683-1688). Using a legal technicality as an excuse, Dongan recalled the patents that Andros had issued and required that landowners renew them.¹⁸⁷ “The people,” he informed the Lords of Trade, “for their own ease & quiet & that of their Posterity . . . have renewed their Patents, with a reservation of a certain Quit-Rent to the King to no small advancement to his Revenue.”¹⁸⁸ He added, either too hastily or rather ingenuously that “none will in the least complain but on the contrary express themselves thankful for it.”¹⁸⁹ It may be that Dongan had some success in his land policies because he had established the colony’s first genuine, albeit short-lived, assembly, and colonists hoped that he might call it again if they complied with his demands with only minimal complaint. If this was the case, the colonists must have felt that they had been ill-used again, because the assembly was not recalled, and the “Charter of Libertyes and Privileges,” the chief measure promulgated by that body, was vetoed in 1686 by James Stuart, now King James II. The Lords of Trade notified the Governor in his instructions for that year that the “Bill or Charter passed in ye late Assembly of New York” was “forthwith repealed and disallowed,” but that the duties, impositions and other taxes levied by the body should be kept on the books and collected.¹⁹⁰ Thus, for the second time, New Yorkers saw an assembly created and destroyed after one sitting that benefited only their ruler, and saw themselves taxed without the representation that they understood to be their right as Englishmen.

It was not only quitrents over which New Yorkers evinced dissatisfaction. In the summer of 1680, Andros returned to England. He had neglected to renew the triennial levy of customs and duties for the colony that expired in November. Without the governor to raise them, many New Yorkers claimed that the rates could not be renewed. Ships entered and cleared cargoes in the

181 *Ibid.*, 3:230.

182 *Ibid.*

183 *Ibid.*, 3:235.

184 *Ibid.*, 22; *N.Y.C.D.*, 14:681.

185 *N.Y.C.D.*, 14:683, cited in Reich, 22.

186 See *N.Y.C.D.*, 14:723, 744.

187 *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:412.

188 *Ibid.*

189 *Ibid.*

190 *Ibid.*, 3:370.

colony's ports without paying duties, and the Lieutenant Governor, Anthony Brockholls, and the Council watched impotently as customs revenues dried up. When William Dyer, the Duke's Collector of Customs, tried to collect the duties he was accused of treason. In a bill against the Collector, the city judge of New York alleged that Dyer "severall times . . . trayterously, maliciously and advisedly used and exercised Regall Power and Authority over the King's Subjects."¹⁹¹ The Judge also alleged that, in attempting to collect the duties for which no current law obtained, the Collector had "contrived Innovacons in Government" and subverted "the known Ancient and Fundamentall Lawes of the Realme of England . . . contrary to the great charter of Libertyes [Magna Charta], Contrary to the Peticon of Right."¹⁹² The Court claimed that Dyer's acts offended "the honour and peace of our most Sovereign Lord the King that now is, his Crowne and Dignity."¹⁹³ Dyer argued that the court had no right to try him because both he and the judges held their commissions from the same source, the Duke of York. The court, eager to pass the case elsewhere, agreed, and the unfortunate collector was shipped to England for trial.¹⁹⁴ The Duke hastily sent instructions to Brockholls, informing him that, in the Governor's absence, the Lieutenant Governor could make "temporary ord^{rs}" to continue the customs statutes for the province and should do so posthaste.¹⁹⁵

The controversy over duties led to increased demands for a colonial assembly. Even the grand jury that indicted Collector Dyer complained that their job would be easier if New York, "like their fellow Brethern and subjects of the Realm of England in our neighboring Plantations," had an assembly.¹⁹⁶ If the government of the colony were "settled in the hands of a Governor and Assembly," the grand jury claimed, "wee may enjoy the Benefit of the Good and wholsome Laws of the Realm of England."¹⁹⁷ They argued that the addition of an assembly to the New York constitution would "bring forth the fruites of a Prosperous and fflourishing Government for want of which wee have been (and yett are) in a most wythering and Decaying Condicon."¹⁹⁸ The Court of Assizes in New York City agreed with the grand jury and sent a memorial to the Duke of York. It informed James that for many years the colony had:

Grond [groaned] under unexpressable Burdens by having an Arbitrary and Absolute power Used and Exercised over us by which yearly Revenue is Exacted from us against o^r Wills . . . and the inhabitants wholly shutt out and Deprived of any share Vote or Interest in the Government to their Greate Discouragement and Contrary to the Laws, Rights, Liberties and Privileges of the [English] Subject.¹⁹⁹

In 1681 the Collector for Albany, Robert Livingston, arraigned John De Lavall for refusing to pay the excise on the sale of 510 gallons of rum. In stating his defense, De Lavall asked the court a number of questions. What right, De Lavall asked, did Livingston have to collect the excise? If it was by order of the governor, what power did the governor have to levy taxes? Had the power been given to the chief executive of the colony by the king, Lords and Commons? If so, what statute granted it? Were the king's subjects in New York freeborn English subjects with all the rights that pertained thereto? If not, what statute, in the reign of what king, took their liberties away and enslaved them?²⁰⁰ The jury was shocked at De Lavall's rather novel defense but nevertheless struggled to come to terms with his questions. Jurors were forced to admit that they could find no statute that authorized the excise or any that empowered the governor to raise taxes by what amounted to arbitrary means. The jury was faced with the frustrating realization that New York not only lacked

191 *Ibid.*, 389. For a longer summary of the events, see Lovejoy, 110-111.

192 *Ibid.*

193 *Ibid.*

194 Lovejoy, 110. The charges against him were dismissed in England because no one from New York appeared to bring charges. Dyer was promoted to another post (see Lovejoy, 111).

195 *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:292.

196 *N.Y.H.S.C.*, 45:14, Cited in Lovejoy, 111.

197 *N.Y.H.S.C.*, 45:14.

198 *Ibid.*

199 *Ibid.*, 45:16.

200 Lovejoy, 112. See also Reich, 42-43.

a representative assembly of its own to raise taxes by the consent of the freeholders, but, as a proprietary colony under the rule of James, the Duke of York and what assistants that he chose to exercise power over them, New Yorkers were also denied the protections afforded other English subjects by the government in London as well.

One protection that James did afford residents of his colony from the start was religious tolerance. This was not only appropriate, given the incredible diversity of religious sects present in the colony, but was in keeping with the spirit of Dutch colonial policy after about 1650.²⁰¹ New York was as heterodox in its worship as it was diverse in its ethnicity. By the 1680s, a host of religions were represented. In the main, colonists were Calvinists, the largest group being Dutch Reformed Church members and the second largest being the Congregationalists of Long Island. The colony also contained some French Huguenots and German Calvinists (like Jacob Leisler). Dutch and French Lutherans were also present in fairly large numbers but these sects were certainly not alone. Governor Andros noted in 1678 that the colony hosted “Religions of all sorts.”²⁰² Governor Dongan reported in 1685 that:

Here be not many of the Church of England; a few Roman Catholics; abundance of Quaker preachers men and women especially; singing Quakers; ranting Quakers; Sabbatarians; Antisabbatarians; Some Anabaptists; some Independants;²⁰³ some Jews; in short of all sorts of opinions there are some, and the most part of none at all.

The Governor was well off the mark in his assumption that a diversity of religious sects in the colony indicated weakness in religious principles or passions among New York colonists. The colony’s heterogeneity prevented any one religious group from employing a policy of persecution comparable to that of Massachusetts Puritans. Still, religious tensions in the colony were always evident. Tensions between Calvinists and Lutherans had begun under Dutch rule and continued to be a problem among the Dutch throughout the century. One commentator noted that Dutch Calvinists and Lutherans “behaved themselves so shilly and uncharitably as if *Luther* and *Calvin* had bequeathed and entailed their virulent Spirits upon them and their heirs forever.”²⁰⁴ Both Dutch and English Calvinists opposed the growing number of newer dissenting sects in the colony that included Quakers, Anabaptists and Mennonites.²⁰⁵ Additionally, New York, like New England, proved fertile ground for schism within the ranks of the Calvinists. Like their brethren in New England, New York Calvinist congregations occasionally strayed from the fold into the heresies of Arminianism, Brownism, and Antimonianism. The theological doctrines that had the most influence on both Dutch and English Calvinists, however, were the orthodox pietist teachings of Gysbertus Voetius and Jacobus Koelman.²⁰⁶ These two Dutch church leaders taught an uncompromising Calvinist creed and promoted the purification of the church by the elimination of all lingering Roman Catholic influences from the Dutch Reformed services and traditions.²⁰⁷ Like the Mathers and other conservative New England Puritans, Voetian Calvinists viewed the Church of England as little more than an English

201 On the liberalization of religious tolerance under Dutch rule, see Kammen, *History*, 61-63, and Pratt, 15, 20-21.

202 “Answers of Governor Andros to Enquiries About New York,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:262.

203 “Governor Dongan’s Report,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:415.

204 Charles Wolley, *A Two Years Journal in New York and Part of Its Territories in America* (1701), cited in Voorhees, 71.

205 See Voorhees, 72-73. For religious tensions in New York from the English occupation to the Glorious Revolution, see Voohres, 70-80; Langdon G. Wright, “In Search of Peace and Harmony: New York Communities in the Seventeenth Century,” *New York History*, 64 (January, 1980), 5-21; Donna Merwick, “Becoming English: Anglo-Dutch Conflict in the 1670s in Albany, New York,” *New York History* (October, 1981), 389-414; and Patricia Bonomi, *Under the Cope of Heaven: Religion, Society and Politics in Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986), 74-75. Religious tensions and competition were not new to the colony, for evidence of religious controversies under Dutch rule, see Kammen, *History*, 60-62, and Bonomi, *Cope of Heaven*, 25-26.

206 Voorhees, 72-73.

207 *Ibid.*, 73.

brand of Catholicism.²⁰⁸ They also considered any meddling by the secular state in the affairs of the local churches an intolerable and tyrannical imposition.

James Stuart violated that principle when he placed appointments to vacant ministries within the purview of his resident colonial governor. Probably out of political considerations rather than religious ones, to create more patronage within his colony, James authorized Governor Dongan to fill vacancies in any “churches, chapells, or other Ecclesiastical Benefices . . . as often as any of them shall happen to be void.”²⁰⁹ In fact, James’ orders to Dongan only systemized the haphazard meddling that the Duke and his governors had exercised in church matters for just over a decade. In 1675, James appointed Nicholas Van Renselaer, an ordained Anglican priest, to the pulpit of the Dutch Reformed Church in Albany. The senior minister of the community, Domine Schaets, and many prominent parishioners resented the imposition on both doctrinal and sectarian grounds.²¹⁰ At the behest of Domine Newenhuysen of New York City and the elders of the Church, Van Renselaer was forbidden to perform his duties. The controversy appeared settled after Governor Andros called a convocation of sorts, comprised of Domine Newenhuysen, and a number of influential New York City Reformed ministers and elders. After a long debate (and some pressure from Andros) the ministers agreed that Van Renselaer should be restored to his position. Van Renselaer, for his part, agreed that he would perform his religious functions in strict conformity to the doctrines, rites and traditions of the Dutch Reformed Church. The next year, two Reformed visitors from New York City, Jacob Leisler and Jacob Milbourne, complained against Van Renselaer after hearing him preach, alleging that his performance was heretical, and that he should thus be removed.²¹¹ Andros had had enough of the controversy. He told the magistrates of Albany that he was fed up with the dispute and ordered them to use their “utmost indeavour to asuage and prevent all animosity whatever and to stop all disputes . . . or arguing over the mater.”²¹² In spite of the Governor’s warnings, the dispute continued until Van Renselaer’s death in 1677.

Two years later, Andros meddled in the affairs of the Dutch Reformed Church once again. Parishioners of a congregation on the Delaware River requested that the New York elders ordain their interim preacher, one Peter Tesschenmaker, so that his ministry there might be made permanent. Tesschenmaker held the necessary degree of Bachelor in Divinity, but the elders declined to ordain him, explaining that they had no authority to do so. They said that only the Classis of Amsterdam could give the necessary examinations required for ordination. Andros entered into the controversy and ordered that the minister be ordained. His heavy-handed behavior in the matter offended both the traditions of the Dutch Church and the sensibilities of the New York Calvinist community.²¹³ In

208 See Voorhees, 170. See also Captain Leisler to King William and Queen Mary, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:615-616; and *Loyalty Vindicated*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 398.

209 “Commission of Governor Dongan, June 1686,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:379. See Ritchie, *The Duke’s Province*, 144-146.

210 See Kammen, *History*, 85; Reich, 33-34; and Voorhees, 75-76. For more on the Van Renselaer controversy, see Lawrence Leder, “The Unorthodox Domine: Nicholas Van Renselaer,” *New York History*, 35 (April, 1954), 166-176.

211 Leder, “The Unorthodox Domine,” 169, and Ritchie, *The Duke’s Province*, 144-147. Leder notes that Van Renselaer’s theology was unusual—at least two individuals had remarked on some of his rather odd ideas. Charles II apparently assumed, after conversing with Van Renselaer, that he was a Quaker (Leder, “Unorthodox Domine,” 167-168). Ritchie claims that the controversy went beyond theology. The Van Renselaer family was unpopular in Albany because of a longstanding altercation over Albany real estate, so a member of that family was a poor choice for an Albany pulpit regardless of Nicholas’ religious affiliation. In addition, Van Renselaer was foisted on the Dutch Reformed Congregation by a Catholic Duke and Catholic Governor and was thus viewed as at least a Catholic “sympathizer.” Ritchie notes that “being English subjects was one thing, but suffering crypto-Catholics in their Churches was another” (Ritchie, *The Duke’s Province*, 147).

212 “Governor Andros to Officials at Albany Concerning Charges Brought by Jacob Leisler and Jacob Milbourn Against Domine Nicholas Van Renselaer, September 16, 1676,” in *The Andros Papers: Files of the Provincial Secretary of New York During the Administration of Governor Sir Edmund Andros, 1674-1680*, 2 Vols., Peter R. Christoph and Florence A. Christoph, eds., (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1989), 1:435. Henceforth cited as *Andros Papers*.

213 Voorhees, 76. Tesschenmaker’s ordination was confirmed by the Amsterdam Classis the following year.

1686, the Roman Catholic Lieutenant Governor, Anthony Brockholls appointed an Anglican priest to a multi-ethnic Calvinist congregation on Staten Island, only to find that the congregation adamantly refused to support their new minister.²¹⁴ Both English and Dutch congregations resented the meddling of James and his officials in the affairs of their churches.

Regardless of the denomination or doctrines of the Protestant Churches in New York, all were united in their hatred of Roman Catholicism. From the late 1670s on, James Stuart used his policy of religious toleration in the colony to allow Catholics to practice their religion there. Catholic priests traveled freely in the province. James not only gave tacit support to Catholic missionaries in his colony, he appears to have been planning to promote them more energetically. Edward Randolph noted in March, 1688, that James intended to “send over some priests to New York” and worried about the Protestants’ response to the policy.²¹⁵ Catholic churches were built and the Mass celebrated openly in the colony—Governor Thomas Dongan even created a Catholic chapel for himself in the fort.²¹⁶ During Dongan’s administration, a Jesuit school was built in New York City, and many of the town’s most important merchants and officials sent their sons there.²¹⁷ James also began to use New York as a source of patronage for his co-religionists whose faith excluded them from lucrative positions in England and other colonies.

In 1681 James appointed Anthony Brockholls, a Roman Catholic, to the position of commander of New York’s military forces. The next year he commissioned the Irish Catholic, Colonel Thomas Dongan, to the governorship. Dongan increased local anxiety when he arrived with his personal chaplain, Father Thomas Harvey, S.J., in tow.²¹⁸ During his tenure, Dongan filled a number of important and lucrative posts with fellow Catholics. He began circumspectly enough, appointing co-religionists to fairly humble occupations. In 1684, for example, he appointed Irish Catholic James Cooley to be the blacksmith of the city fort. In 1687 Dongan began to fill more important positions with Catholics. In the spring of that year, he granted the manor lordship of Cassiltowne, an estate of twenty-five thousand acres, to John Palmer, an English Catholic, whom Dongan also hired to be his agent to England.²¹⁹ The same year, the Governor appointed Catholics to several important colonial offices, including commands of the Albany garrison and Fort James, and places on the customs commissions and the provincial granary. Residents of the colony hoped that once Dongan had gone and the colony became subsumed within the Dominion of New England under Anglicans Edmund Andros and Francis Nicholson, the placing of Catholics in positions of power and trust would be reversed, or at least stopped. Their hopes were frustrated, however, when King James continued to employ Catholic friends in colonial offices. In 1688, the King appointed his co-religionist, Matthew Plowman, to the lucrative post of customs collector for the port of New York City.²²⁰

As New York Protestants watched with increasing anxiety, some of the most important civilian and military posts in the colony were filled, either by the governor or the King, with Roman Catholics. Dutch and English Calvinists and other Protestants viewed the process as one more indication that the colony was being moved toward a “French” tyranny. They were governed by a Catholic king by means of an autocratic constitution without the traditional English safeguard of a representative assembly. Their property had been periodically alienated from them, reassessed, and sold back to them, burdened with new taxes that the freeholders had no voice in raising. Their Protestant magistrates and rulers were being gradually replaced with Papists. New York Protestants began to look at these signs and compare their own plight, and that of Englishmen everywhere, with that of Huguenots in France under Louis XIV.

214 *Ibid.*, 76-77.

215 “Randolph to Sir Nicholas Butler Proposing a Romanist Mission,” *Randolph Papers*, 6:243.

216 “Deposition of Andries and Jan Meyer,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:17.

217 See “Letter from the Members of the Dutch Church in New York to the Classis in Amsterdam, October 21, 1698,” *N.Y.H.S.C.*, 1868, 398-399; and Leisler to the Governor at Boston, August 13, 1689, *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:14.

218 Voorhees, 76. See also “Early Catholic Clergymen in New York,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 3:110-111.

219 Voorhees, 68.

220 *Ibid.* For more on Roman Catholic officials before the Glorious Revolution, see William Harper Bennett, *Catholic Footsteps in Old New York: A Chronicle of Catholicity in the City of New York from 1524 to 1808* (New York, 1909, rep. Yonkers, New York: United States Catholic Historical Society, 1973), 82-111, 196.

French Protestants had been protected, at least from official persecution, by the Edict of Nantes of 1598. In 1685, Louis XIV repealed the settlement with the Edict of Revocation, which banned Protestantism in his realm, banished Protestant ministers, and commanded that all French children be baptized into the Catholic faith. Although the Edict stated that Protestants should not be molested “while awaiting the time when it may please God to enlighten them,” in fact, the Revocation began a period of persecution against Protestants unparalleled even in European history.²²¹ Thousands died, and historians estimate that as many as a million Huguenots fled France.²²² James II, a co-religionist and ally of Louis XIV, provided ample evidence to anti-Catholic observers that he was bent on replicating a French Papist tyranny in his own realm. James’ policy of employing religious toleration to relax sanctions against Catholics in England and the colonies, especially New York, became suspect to his Protestant subjects as more and more Roman Catholics were given important positions in the government and military. There also existed ample printed material in the colony to help readers make the connection. In the mid-1680s, William of Orange exploited the situation in France and England to promote his own European territorial ambitions. The Dutch press published a vast number of pamphlets that portrayed Louis XIV’s policy toward Protestants in the most graphic terms and warned readers that England under James II was headed in the same direction. Despite James’ attempts to ban the publications in England, at least 230 anti-Catholic tracts were in circulation there between 1685 and 1688.²²³ These works were written in both English and Dutch and appeared in the American colonies in both languages by 1687.²²⁴ By the time that William of Orange’s *Declaration of Reasons* appeared in New York in the spring of 1689, New Yorkers were well prepared to accept the Prince’s rationale for his invasion.

When Lieutenant Governor Francis Nicholson first received word that William and Mary had landed with an army at Torbay, he was shocked, but he quickly regained his composure and assured himself that if the rumor was true, the Dutch invasion would have no better success than the ill-fated Monmouth Rebellion. Nicholson asked, “Hath he [William] not an example from Monmouth?” He responded to his own question that “there [is] burrying place enough for him and his people with him . . . the very prentice boys of London will drive him out again.”²²⁵ Nicholson forbade those who knew about the invasion to tell anyone else in the colony, but the news spread through the city within a few days anyway. Jacob Leisler received information about the Orange landing from a friend in Maryland, and more news arrived in letters and by word of mouth as several ships arrived in New York in March.²²⁶ On 1 March, Nicholson received confirmation of the news of James’ flight and capture in a letter from Pennsylvania Governor John Blackwell.²²⁷ The news had been received in Albany by March, when Robert Livingston wrote to Edward Randolph to tell him that “there is a total Revolution at home.”²²⁸ Nicholson and the Council decided to consult with Andros (who was in Maine at the time) and await his orders, but did little else.

On 26 April, Nicholson received news of the revolt and subsequent arrest of Andros and several Dominion Council members in Boston. He met with the four remaining Council members, and they resolved to assemble with the Mayor and aldermen of New York City to decide what should be done.²²⁹ The aldermen complained that the fort was inadequately manned and should be reinforced. They suggested that militia companies from the surrounding counties be employed for the purpose.²³⁰

As word of the events in England spread, anti-Jacobite and anti-Catholic agitation increased throughout the New York province. On 3 May 1689 the freeholders of Suffolk County, Long Island,

221 Voorhees, 9-10.

222 *Ibid.*, 10-11.

223 *A Catalogue of all the Discourses Printed Against Popery* (London, 1689), cited in Voorhees, 31.

224 Voorhees, 29-32.

225 “Affidavit of Andries Greveraet and George Brewerton, 22 March, 1689,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:660.

226 *Ibid.*

227 Voorhees, 120.

228 Robert Livingston to Edward Randolph, Albany, 22 March, 168⁸/₉, *Randolph Papers*, 4:262.

229 “Minutes of the Council of New York,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 242, 244.

230 *Ibid.*, 245-246.

in a town meeting, declared their readiness to join their brethren in Boston and the Orangist cause to secure “our English Liberties and propertyes from Popery and Slavery, and from the Intended invasion of a forraign French design and more than Turkish cruelties.”²³¹ The Suffolk freeholders claimed that it was the “bounden duty” of New York Protestants to secure the colony’s fortifications against Papists and Jacobites until they received further instructions from Parliament.²³² A few days later the Council received word that the Queens County militia were “all in armes and the whole country in an uproar.”²³³

The trained bands and militia were among the most important members of the Orangist movement in the colony. According to the account of Joost Stol, an ensign in the New York City trained band, virtually every militia company in the colony had some members who worked together “to bring the Gouernment without threat of bloodshedding under obedience of King William and Queen Mary.”²³⁴ Stol reported that the Militia companies tried to convince the provincial Council to disarm Papists and fortify the city against a possible French invasion. The Council replied that, “wee deserved, that six or seven persons of our assembly should be hanged for our paines.”²³⁵ When word arrived that William and Mary were on the throne and James in France, Stol noted that the bearer of the news to the Council was “turned out the doore with hard threatenings and scoldings,” and that the Lieutenant Governor and Council declined to proclaim the new monarchs. Since the Jacobite government refrained from announcing the new rulers, the Orangist militiamen “resolved for the behoofe of their Majesties King William and Queen Mary and for the security of the inhabitants, to make ourselves masters of the Fort or castle . . . as we happily did.”²³⁶

On 30 May, Nicholson and a militia officer quarreled about the placement of guards at the fort. Nicholson, in frustrated rage, threatened to shoot him. Betraying fear of his current predicament, Nicholson stated that he was in constant fear for his life, and “before it would go longer in this manner he would set the town in fyre.”²³⁷ Nicholson’s rash statement circulated throughout the city over the next few hours, and by the next day New York residents were shocked to hear that the Lieutenant Governor and his Council, with the aid of numerous Papists, were preparing to burn the city to the ground and massacre those Protestant residents who escaped the flames.²³⁸ Rumors flew as they had in Boston in the previous month. On Staten Island it was reported that Catholics planned to massacre Protestants and burn New York City. The English troops in the fort, it was said, were all Papists, and were daily reinforced with co-religionists from all over New England. Ex-Governor Dongan was said to be outfitting a warship to plunder the New York coast.²³⁹ It was rumored that Nicholson had turned the guns of the fort on the city and only awaited more Catholic reinforcements before opening fire and massacring the Protestant inhabitants.²⁴⁰ All of the rumors shared a common theme, an unholy alliance of Catholics and Jacobite government officials.

In the midst of the panic, the colonial militia seized the fort at New York City, declaring themselves the allies of Prince William and promising to preserve the city from Papists and Jacobites—the Prince’s enemies and their own. They stated that they would only surrender the fort to “the person of the Protestant religion that shall be nominated” by the English government.²⁴¹ On 1

231 “Declaration of the Freeholders of Suffolk County, Long Island in the Territory of New England, 3 May, 1689,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:577.

232 *Ibid.*

233 *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 254-255.

234 “Account of Ensign Joost Stol’s Proceedings,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:632.

235 *Ibid.*

236 *Ibid.*, 633.

237 “Henry Cuyler’s Disposition Concerning Governor Nicholson, 10 June, 1689,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 292-293. Reich notes that Cuyler’s “uncorroborated evidence would be highly suspect, except for the fact that it was never frankly denied.” (Reich, fn.16, 58). Whether it was true or fabricated by Cuyler, the anecdote quickly became the foundation for rumors that Nicholson was part of a conspiracy to fire the town.

238 “A Declaration of the Inhabitants Soudjers Belonging Under the Severall Companies of the Train Band of New York, 31 May, 1689,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:7.

239 “Affidavit Against Col. Bayard & Certain Papists on Staten Island,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:17-18.

240 *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 400.

241 “Declaration of the Inhabitants Soudjers . . .,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:7.

June, the militia asked Dominion Councilor Nicholas Bayard to lead them, and, when he refused, they turned for leadership to militia captain Jacob Leisler, who was then commander of the fort. On 8 June, five militia captains and some 400 freeholders elected a Committee of Safety that, in turn, confirmed Leisler's leadership.²⁴² At about the same time, the city learned that William and Mary occupied the throne.²⁴³ On 22 June, Leisler and his militia companies proclaimed the new rulers in front of the fort and then again at the City Hall.²⁴⁴ Two days later Governor Nicholson took ship for England, leaving behind him two governments in the province, one comprised of the few remaining Dominion Council members, the New York City mayor, and a few aldermen, and the other, a Committee of Safety presided over by Captain Jacob Leisler.²⁴⁵

The composition of the New York Committee of Safety was almost as diverse as the province itself, but its makeup did not reflect the ethnic demography of the colony. Five members were English, four were descendants of French Huguenots, and only one was Dutch.²⁴⁶ As might be expected, all of the members were either wealthy merchants, like Leisler himself, or substantial husbandmen. The common tie that bound the members together was their fervent Calvinism. All of the Committee Members held prominence in either a Voetian Reformed Dutch congregation or an English Congregationalist church.²⁴⁷ Under the Committee of Safety the political Revolution in New York quickly became a spiritual reformation as well. Leisler and the Committee began early to purge the colony of Catholic influences and to try to enforce their own brand of Calvinism. Leisler reported in July that "I hope before two days [come] to an end . . . to have some Papists disarmed & also those Idolls destroyed which we heare are daily still worshipped."²⁴⁸ By September, the Committee had begun to collect affidavits against Roman Catholics and their "fellow travelers" in the province.²⁴⁹ The reformers displayed their Voetian zeal, targeting for harassment and persecution not only Roman Catholics, but also Quakers, Anglicans, and even some non-Voetian Calvinist clergymen who displayed a conciliatory attitude toward Anglicans and even Roman Catholics.²⁵⁰

242 "Commission from the Committee of Safety [of New York]," *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:7; Stephen Van Cortlandt to Governor Andros, July 9, 1689, *Cal. St. P.*, 13:81, and *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:595-596.

243 Voorhees, 130.

244 John Tudor to Francis Nicholson, October 23, 1689, *Cal. St. P.*, 13:131.

245 See "Colonel Bayard's Narrative of Occurrences in New York from April to December, 1689," *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:636-644. See also Lovejoy, 255-256; Kammen, *History*, 122; Reich, 76-78. Reich notes that if Bayard, a detractor, was correct in his assertion that about one third of the people of the province participated in the selection of the Committee of Safety, this turnout was "amazingly large" and signifies wide popular support for the Revolutionary government in New York (Reich, 77).

246 Voorhees, 165-166.

247 *Ibid.*, 166. Leisler, the son of a German Calvinist minister, had married into an old Dutch family in 1663 and become prosperous. He had connections to the leading Dutch merchant families, the Bayards, Van Cortlandts, and Lookermans, among them. For a biographical sketch of Leisler, see David William Voorhees, "The Fervent Zeale of Jacob Leisler," *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3rd ser. 51 (July, 1994), 447-472. Kammen argues that the Leislerian Revolution represented an attempt by the older Dutch elite, among them Leisler, to regain their primacy over the new "Anglo-Dutch establishment." He quotes Colonel Bayard's statement that Leisler's supporters were mostly Dutch in support of his thesis. Bayard's accusations appear inconsistent with the outcome of the election. If the "ignorant and innocent" Dutch populace had dominated the elections, why were no old Dutch trading families represented in the outcome? Why was only one Dutch member selected by the freeholders? Why did the predominately Dutch community of Albany consistently oppose Leisler and his government throughout his regime? All of these facts seem inconsistent with Kammen's thesis. (Kammen, *History*, 120-124). Voorhees' argument that Committee of Safety members' religion was more significant than their ethnic ties or class seems to hold more substance. See also Stern, "Knickerbockers," 133-136.

248 Leisler to William Jones in New Haven, July 10, 1689, *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:6.

249 *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:17-18; *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:610.

250 See Voorhees, *Glorious Revolution in New York*, 170-171. For the Committee and Quakers, see Lieutenant Governor Leisler and Council to the Bishop of Salisbury, January 1, 1689[90], *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:656. For Anglicans, see Captain Leisler to King William and Queen Mary, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:615-616. Several Dutch Reformed Ministers who did not feel the zeal of their Voetian and Congregationalist brethren were harassed by Committee representatives. See *A Letter from a Gentleman of the City of New York . . .*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 367, and Leisler's comments, Lieutenant Governor Leisler and Council to the Earl of Shrewsbury, October 20, 1690, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:753.

While Voetian reform and anti-Catholic fervor in New York provided, what William Smith would later call “the leaven of opposition,” colonists had a wealth of complaints against James Stuart and his policies of governance that stretched back nearly thirty years and a variety of reasons to support the Dutch Protestant Prince William of Orange.²⁵¹ Prince William’s allegations that James and his minions had ruled arbitrarily and unconstitutionally and were part of a Catholic conspiracy to deprive English Protestants of their liberty, property and religion, validated the grievances and suspicions of Protestant New Yorkers whatever their ethnicity. Residents of the Duke’s Province could justly claim that they had “groaned under the heavy burdens” of James Stuart’s preferred methods of government far longer than any other Englishmen.²⁵² For English subjects at home, the new monarchs offered a sort of tonic, a preventative from the worst excesses of arbitrary government yet to come. To the inhabitants of New England, James’ innovations were recent since barely four years had passed since the New England colonies had been brought under his domination. But New York had seen more than two decades of James Stuart’s rule. Their taxes and laws had been imposed by James or his officials without consultation with a representative assembly since 1664. On the two occasions when assemblies had been convened, they had been manipulated to the detriment of New Yorkers, benefiting only the Duke. Since 1673 positions of trust in the colony had been filled with Roman Catholics as the Protestant New Yorkers watched impotently. Thus William and Mary’s promise to restore the liberties and privileges of English subjects, to preserve the Protestant religion, and to purge the nation of Catholics who held high office had a particular resonance among the people of New York. Additionally, the Dutch citizens of the colony held William of Orange in very high regard, looking upon the Prince and his family as national heroes.

The Dutch viewed the House of Nassau as special defenders and protectors of the Dutch nation and of Dutch Protestantism. New York Reformed clergymen noted that the magistrates of New York were bound to support the Prince of Orange whose “forefathers liberated our ancestors from the Spanish yoke and his royal highness had now again come to deliver the Kingdom of England from Popery and Tyranny.”²⁵³ Patriotism was not, however, the only factor that motivated the Dutch to support the new rulers of England. The mercantile interests in the colony likely viewed the accession of the Dutch Prince as the answer to their prayers for more practical reasons. If Stadholder William ruled both England and Holland, it was probable that the Dutch trade might be resumed. To New York merchants a combination of English colonial status and Dutch trading privileges was an excellent prospect because, although they wanted to trade with Holland, they had no desire to see New York revert to a Dutch colony. Return to Dutch control would mean that the colony would be placed under the auspices of the Dutch West India Company or some similar concern, in “which case, the colonists would be squeezed to fill the coffers of the commercial oligarchy in the United Provinces.”²⁵⁴ The New York merchants had no desire to reopen the lucrative Holland trade only to see their profits fall into someone else’s pockets. The merchants’ prayers were answered and trade between New York and Holland was resumed. By 1720, they “conducted an extensive and lucrative business between New York and Amsterdam.”²⁵⁵

That the Dutch merchants supported William and Mary in no way implied that they supported Jacob Leisler. Indeed, they may have viewed the Leislerian coup as an impediment rather than a blessing. In May of 1690, the New York Merchants sent an address to the King and Queen in which they pledged their loyalty to the new rulers but complained of Leisler and the “ill men amongst us who have assumed your Ma^{ty}s Authority over us . . . assisted by some whom we can give no better name than Rable.”²⁵⁶ Opposition to Leisler was especially fierce in Albany, where those involved in

251 William Smith, Jr., *The History of the Province of New York*, 2 vols., Michael Kammen, ed. (London, 1757, Rep. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 1972), 1:70.

252 “Declaration of the Freeholders of Suffolk County, Long Island,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:577. See also “Address of the Militia of New-York to William and Mary,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:583; and *Loyalty Vindicated*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 375.

253 “Letter from Members of the Dutch Church in New York to the Classis of Amsterdam,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 399. See also *Letter from a Gentleman in New York . . .*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 361.

254 Voorhees, *Glorious Revolution in New York*, 179-180.

255 Kammen, *History*, 169.

256 “Address of the Merchants of New York to the King and Queen, May 19, 1690,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:748. Dutch, French and English names appear upon the address.

the Indian trade feared that Leisler and his government would do harm to the lucrative enterprise.²⁵⁷ The city government there proclaimed William and Mary in July of 1689 with “y^e ringing of y^e bell, bone fyres, fyre works and all other demonstrations of joy.”²⁵⁸ The next month city officials and some remnants of the Dominion regime, employing the wording of a royal proclamation that Protestant magistrates and officials should retain their offices, established a government that they called a “convention” over the Albany area until further instructions should arrive from England.²⁵⁹

English New Yorkers also had good reason to welcome William and Mary to the throne. The monarchs had taken full advantage of English anti-Catholic sentiment in both their *Declaration of Reasons* and in their communications with the colonies, and New Yorkers, especially the Long Island Puritans, viewed the new rulers as their liberators from the chains of Popery, but colonists rarely praised them solely for their anti-Romanism. Instead they invoked the English constitutional trinity of liberty, property and religion together, thanking the new rulers for restoring all three to England and delivering English subjects from the opposite conditions, tyranny, Popery and slavery. The New York militia made the comparison eloquently when they gave thanks to God for their delivery:

blissing the great god of heaven and earth who has pleased to make your majesty so happy an instrument in our deliverance from Tyranny, popery and slavery, and to put into your Royall breasts to undertake the glorious work towards the reestablishment and preservation of the true Protestant religion, liberty and property, had we tho in so remote a part of the world, presumed to hope to be partakers of that blessing, we having also long groaned under the same oppression, having been governed of late, most part, by papists, who had in a most arbitrary way subverted our ancient priviledges making us in effect slaves to their will contrary to the laws of England; and this was chiefly effected by those who are known enemies to our Religion and liberty.²⁶⁰

In the wake of the revolution neither Leisler’s government nor the Albany Convention rushed to create a colonial assembly. This fact proved less of a detriment to the Convention than to the Committee of Safety in New York City. Since the former was comprised of the aldermen of the city, as well as remnants of the Dominion Council, and held authority only over the city of Albany and the surrounding countryside, its members could argue with some justice that it represented the “Burghers and Inhabitants” of the area.²⁶¹ Leisler’s government did claim authority over the whole colony, and was faced with the need to raise revenues for its defense and upkeep. To that end the Committee of Safety renamed itself the Royal Council and gave the title of Lieutenant Governor to Leisler. The new

257 See Bonomi, *A Factious People*, 46.

258 *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:5.

259 See Mr. Livingston to Mr. Ferguson, March 27, 1690, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:699. Reich notes that while the Albany elite who led the Convention refused to negotiate with Leisler’s government, the “common people” of the town were more sympathetic to the New York Committee of Safety, as some one hundred Albany residents “menaced the members of the convention” in support of the Leislerians (Reich, 81-82). Both Bonomi and Reich cite delicate relations between Albany and the Iroquois and a distrust of Leisler’s diplomatic abilities as the chief reasons why Albany leaders, influenced by Peter Schuyler and Robert Livingston, refused to support Leisler (Reich, 81; Bonomi, *A Factious People*, 46). Voorhees cites religious differences between Leisler and the Voetians who supported his regime and the Cocceian clergy of Albany, especially Godfrey Dellius, the most influential of the Albany Reformed clergymen (Voorhees, *Glorious Revolution in New York*, 306-307). Lawrence Leder also refers to religious differences between Leisler and Albany leaders going back as far as the Van Renselaer controversy as a reason why Albany refused to support the New York City regime (Lawrence Leder, *Robert Livingston (1654-1728) and the Politics of Colonial New York* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1961), 59). Voorhees notes that the major centers of resistance to Leisler came from areas where either non-Pietist Cocceian Dutch Reformers were in the majority, like Albany, or where Anglican or Quaker leaders were predominate in local society (Voorhees, *Glorious Revolution in New York*, 310-312). Longstanding economic differences between New York and Albany over the fur trade and export and Albany commercial leaders’ fear of domination by the New York City merchant community also contributed to the split. See Kammen, *History*, 107-108; Leder, *Robert Livingston*, 61-62; Voorhees, *Glorious Revolution in New York*, 309-310.

260 “Address of the Militia of New York to William and Mary,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:583; See also *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:64-65; Stephen Van Cortland to Captain Nicholson, August 5, 1689, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:609; *A Modest and Impartial Narrative . . .*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 321; *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:64-65; and “Leisler’s Declaration or Protest against Ingoldsby, March 10, 1691,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 306.

261 *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:61.

regime revived the acts of the 1683 Assembly “for defraying the expenses of the Government” by proclamation in December of 1689.²⁶² That Leisler proclaimed the 1683 taxes, created by the short-lived Assembly of that year, rather than simply continuing the taxes of the previous year probably indicates that he and his council wanted the legitimacy that statutes created by a representative body, even an extinct one, conveyed, but feared the possible outcome of actually seating a new assembly before his regime could exert more complete influence over the whole colony.²⁶³

The Council’s authority to raise taxes without representation met with immediate resistance not only in those areas like Long Island, that had always resisted taxation without an assembly, but even in New York City itself. Wherever tax proclamations were posted, they were torn them down by frustrated citizens and replaced them with a broadside written by the “English Freemen” of New York.²⁶⁴ These broadsides declared that the government had no right to levy taxes without representation. Sustained protest forced Leisler and his Council to counter criticism with the response that the taxes were necessary for the support of the colony and were constitutional, having been created by the “supreme legislative Authority” of New York that “reside[d] in the Governor, Council & the People met in general Assembly.”²⁶⁵ By the spring of 1690 the Leisler regime’s existence was less precarious, in part because Albany had surrendered its authority to New York City in exchange for aid against the French and Indians. The Lieutenant Governor then issued writs in King William’s name for the election of a new assembly to meet in April.²⁶⁶ The New York Assembly met twice that year, and after 1692 met almost continuously until the American Revolution.

The Glorious Revolution in New York remolded the character of the province, making it both more democratic than it had ever been, and at the same time, drawing it closer to the Crown—fostering loyalty and devotion to the ruling monarch from the participants in New York politics and government. The first two Governors appointed by the Crown after the Revolution allied themselves with members of the old Jacobite regime. When Leisler and the militia surrendered the fort to the new Royal Governor in May of 1691, the militia leader was promptly arrested along with some of his chief supporters for high treason. The New Yorkers were given a quick trial, condemned and attainted, and executed.²⁶⁷ In the aftermath of Leisler’s execution and the resumption of royal control under Governors Sloughter and Fletcher, both Leislerians and Anti-Leislerians sought support from the Crown not only to advance their political aspirations but also to validate their past acts. In 1692, Leisler’s widow and son began to petition the government in England in order to clear the names of the Leislerians and have the attainder lifted from their estates.²⁶⁸ The petitions initiated a flurry of claims and counter-claims in London between Leislerians and anti-Leislerians. The latter feared that if Leisler and his supporters were cleared and the English government agreed that the New York militiamen and their leaders had acted out of loyalty to William and Mary and in support of the principles of the Revolution in England, then those responsible for their prosecution had committed treason, and were themselves liable to trial, execution and confiscations.

For almost the rest of the century, Leisler’s supporters worked to gain support from London for their contention that the New York City regime had been legitimate, and the Leislerians’ punishment

262 *Cal. St. P.*, 13:192. See also *A Modest Narrative*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 340-341.

263 See Lovejoy, 276.

264 “By the Leiut. Governor & Council, December 28, 1689,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:30.

265 *Ibid.* See Reich, 91-92. The author of *A Modest Narrative*, possibly Dominion Councillor (and Leisler’s bitter rival) Nicholas Bayard, ignored the fact that the taxes were raised by a representative assembly and claimed that the taxes were levied by the Catholic Governor Dongan and were thus void. Ironically, the author of the *Narrative*, a supporter of the Dominion government, accused Leisler of taxing the people of the colony “without and contrary to their own consent, notwithstanding the many wholesome laws” of England (*A Modest Narrative*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 341).

266 Lovejoy, 277. See also Mr. Van Cortland to Sir Edmund Andros, May 1690, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:717.

267 In 1691 Jacob Leisler refused to surrender the New York City fort, renamed Fort William, to Captain Ingoldsby, an officer who preceded the new Governor to the colony. Ingoldsby had no written orders, but, encouraged and supported by his new friends, members of the old Dominion Council, he demanded control of the fort. Leisler refused to surrender under those circumstances. When Governor Sloughter arrived, he too allied with the old regime. Leisler quickly surrendered the fort to him, only to find himself and a number of his followers arrested for high treason. For a more detailed narrative of these events, see Reich, 108-126.

268 See Reich, 131-134. For relevant primary documents, see *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 314-396.

at the hands of their enemies, primarily members of the old Dominion Regime, had amounted to treason. At the same time, Anti-Leislerians contended before the Crown and Parliament that Leisler had usurped power from a legitimate government in the colony without cause. Both sides claimed that they had participated in the Glorious Revolution on the winning side, and both factions accused their opponents of disloyalty to William and Mary and to the principles of the Glorious Revolution.²⁶⁹

Anti-Leislerians, especially Colonel Bayard and other members of the old Dominion regime, claimed that they represented the legitimate governing authority in the province before and after the Revolution and had always been supported by “every man of Sence, Reputation, or Estate” in New York.²⁷⁰ They argued that they had recognized the accession of the new rulers as soon as they were required to do so by Whitehall and had complied with their command to purge the government of Roman Catholics. Leisler, and his accomplices, they argued, were usurpers, demagogues who had taken advantage of the distraction of the Revolution in England and the Boston rebellion to set up an arbitrary “Olliverian” state in New York.²⁷¹ Anti-Leislerians claimed that Leisler became a tyrant, that he ignored the “Laws and Liberties of the English Nation” and that he found “the sweetness of arbitrary Power agreeable.”²⁷² Leisler’s detractors further alleged that the new regime in New York City ruled arbitrarily, levying taxes without Crown authority, imprisoning their Majesties subjects “without and Warrant of Commitment . . . as the Law directs,” and ruling the colony “according to [the] maxim, The Sword must rule and not the Laws.”²⁷³ Bayard and his supporters also claimed that Leisler, “that incorrigible brutish coxcomb,” had stirred up the “ignorant and innocent” people of the city, the rabble, with “lyes and falcities” in order to take power purely for selfish motives.²⁷⁴ Worse still, they stated that Leisler and his accomplices ruled without the authority of the Crown “in violation of the s[ai]d Prerogative and in Contempt of their May^{ties}.”²⁷⁵

Members of the old regime claimed that they had complied with William and Mary’s command that Catholics be put out of their offices and cited the dismissal of Collector of Customs Mathew Plowman. The Collector had been a scapegoat, however, since Anthony Brockholls, Major Baxter, and other known Catholics remained in positions of authority for some time after Plowman was

269 Lovejoy, 301-302. For a few examples of accusations against Anti-Leislerians, see *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 341, 366-368, 383, 387, 391, 393, 414-415; *Loyalty Vindicated*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 383, 385, 393; “Depositions of Sundry Persons,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:226-233; “Humble Petition of Johannes Provoost,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 3:239. For accusations against Leislerians, see *Letter from a Gentleman of the City of New York*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 364, 369; *A Modest Narrative*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 321, 329, 331-333; “House of Representatives of the Province of New York, April 17, 1691,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:207; “A Narrative in Answer to their May^{ties} Letter,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:222; John Lyon Gardiner, “Notes and Observations on the Town of East Hampton,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1869), 246; and Cadwallader Colden, “Letter on Smith’s History, July 5, 1759,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1869), 203.

270 *Letter from a Gentleman*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 364. See also Messrs. Philips and Van Cortland to Secretary Blaithwayt, August 5, 1689, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:608; “Col. Bayard’s Narrative,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:637; and Governor Slougher to the Committee, May 7, 1691, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:762.

271 See Mr. Tudor to Captain Nicholson, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:617; “Col. Bayard’s Narrative,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:637-645; Col. Bayard to Mr. John West, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:661; “Memorial of the Agents from Albany to the Government in Massachusetts, March 20, 16⁸⁹/90,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:696-697; Mr. Newton to Captain Nicholson, May 26, 1690, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:721; and John Clapp to the Secretary of State, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:754-755.

272 *A Modest Narrative*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 329.

273 *A Modest Narrative*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 341, 333, 332. See also “Dispositions,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:208-209; and “A Narrative in Answer to their Maj^{ties} Letter,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:222.

274 Mr. William Nicholls to Mr. George Farewell, January 14, 1689, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:662. “Col. Bayard’s Narrative,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:638-639. See also Col. Bayard to Mr. John West, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:661; Mr. Livingston to Mr. Ferguson, March 27, 1690, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:699; Mr. Livingston to the Government of Connecticut, May 13, 1690, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:730; “Address of the New-York Merchants to the King and Queen,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:748; John Clapp to the Secretary of State, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:754-755; and Chidley Brooke to Sir Robert Southwell, April 5, 1691, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:757.

275 “Col. Bayard’s Narrative,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:645. See also “Memorial of the Agents from Albany to the Government of Massachusetts, March 20, 16⁸⁹/90,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:696; Mr. Livingston to Mr. Ferguson, March 27, 1690; *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:699; “Address of the New-York Merchants to the King and Queen,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:748; and “Answer to the Memorial Presented by Captain Blagge to the King,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:764-765.

dismissed.²⁷⁶ Although the old regime made frequent protestations of loyalty and devotion to their new sovereigns in their petitions and pamphlets after 1691, the evidence indicates that they had done nothing to proclaim the accession of the new rulers formally until forced to do so by the militia on 22 June 1689.²⁷⁷ The remnants of the Dominion Council still seemed rather tentative in respect to the new political order in England even after the new monarchs had been proclaimed, as for some time later, they had still had not taken the oath of loyalty required of Crown magistrates, nor changed the letter “J” for James to “W” on the coat of arms in the council chamber.²⁷⁸

The seeming reluctance of the old regime to recognize William and Mary and to take the requisite steps to ally themselves formally to the new government in London provided further evidence to the Leislerians that the old Council and their supporters were Jacobites. Council members had, after all, received their commissions from James II and were part of the “arbitrary” Dominion government that the New York militia had overthrown.²⁷⁹ The old regime had also shown tolerance to Roman Catholics, even promoting them to positions of trust in the civil government and colonial military, and, with the exception of the unfortunate Mr. Plowman, most Catholics were still in those positions. Leislerians gave credence to the rumors that the old regime had conspired, hand in glove, with Catholics in the province to bring about its ruin and could thus never be trusted with authority and never be true friends of William and Mary.²⁸⁰

Supporters of Leisler contended that they had undertaken the Revolution in New York with popular support and in allegiance with the Prince of Orange in order to defend the colony from James’ arbitrary government.²⁸¹ Jacob Leisler wrote that the “inhabitants by the encouragement of the Prince of Orange (now our gracious King), . . . for their security have secured the fort for their Ma[jesties] King William and Queen Mary.”²⁸² Leislerians alleged that New York had long been governed by “commission,” its rulers having “quite forgot the English Constitution of calling the representatives of the People.”²⁸³ They further claimed that the old regime had been prepared to join with the French and local Catholics to destroy the colony rather than to allow it to fall into the hands of William and Mary’s supporters and loyal subjects, the people of New York. To that end, the colonial militia had taken the fort, secured the city, sought out and neutralized Catholics and their allies who lived among

276 Stephen Van Cortland to Governor Andros, July 9, 1689, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:596; “Abstract of Colonel Bayard’s Journal,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:682; and Messrs. Philips and Van Cortland to Secretary Blathwayt, August 5, 1689, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:608.

277 See “The Case of Mr. Jacob Leisler,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 262-263; *Loyalty Vindicated*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 378, 380, 382; “Letter from Members of the Dutch Church in New York to the Classis of Amsterdam,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 399-400. Bayard claimed that the council and aldermen of New York City were prepared to announce the accession of the new rulers publicly as soon as they received the official announcement from London, but that the militia intercepted the royal proclamation en route to the Council and thus deprived them of the opportunity to act before Leisler did. See “Col. Bayard’s Journal,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:600-601.

278 “Col. Bayard’s Journal,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:602-603.

279 See *Loyalty Vindicated*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 376-377; “Petition of Captain Benjamin Blagg to the King,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:737; Leisler to William Jones, *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:5-6; and “At a Convention &c., Albany, November 9, 1689,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:64.

280 See *Loyalty Vindicated*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 377-379; “Deposition of Robert Sinclair, February 23, 1691,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:229; “Deposition of Jacob Williams, February 24, 1691,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 232; and “Deposition of Citizens of New York, August 22, 1691,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 345-346.

281 See “Commission of Capt. Leisler to be Commander in Chief, August 16, 1689,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:14-15; “By the Governor & Council &c., December 30, 1689,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:32; “A Memoriall of What Has Occurred in their Mat^{tes} Province of New York,” *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:23; “Representation of Joost Stol for the Committee of Safety in New York,” *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:630; Lieutenant Governor Leisler to the King, January 7, 16⁸⁹/₉₀, *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:654; “Leisler’s Declaration and Protest Against Ingoldsby,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 306-307; “Affidavit of George Dolstone, February 19, 1691[2],” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 314; “Affidavit of Thomas Jeffers, February 19, 1691[2],” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 319-320; “Affidavit of Isaac De Riemer, February 24, 1691[2],” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 324-325; “A Letter from Members of the Dutch Church in New York to the Classis of Amsterdam,” *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 399; and *Loyalty Vindicated*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 381-383.

282 Leisler to the Governor of Barbadoes, November 23, 1689, *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:24.

283 *Loyalty Vindicated*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 379.

them, and strengthened the city fortifications the better to preserve the colony from their Majesties' foreign enemies.²⁸⁴

New Yorkers after 1692 were still a factious people, but the discourse of New York politics had changed. No prominent local leader would ever again promote the oligarchic constitution that had been the chief political feature of the colony since its occupation in 1664. In fact, Dominion Council members like Bayard and Robert Livingston adopted the language of the Glorious Revolution in their rhetorical struggle against Leisler's regime. They and their adherents accused their political adversaries of much the same misconduct that James Stuart and his minions had been criticized for by New Yorkers in the past. Indeed, the old party members conveniently glossed over their own past sins against the people of New York. Anti-Leislerians like the author of *A Modest and Impartial Narrative* grew adept at celebrating the "good providence of Almighty God, in their Majesties happy accession" and the "Late Happy Revolution in England," without expending much ink on the causes of that Revolution and accession.²⁸⁵ Neither did they mention their own complicity in the government of the colony under the "Late King James," beyond claiming that the legitimacy of the Dominion government was founded in James' authority. Anti-Leislerians protested that the Dominion leaders in New York were no Jacobites. They asserted that they had done everything that they could to comply with the desires of William and Mary once the new rulers desires were made known.²⁸⁶ Leislerians, in turn, claimed that the legacy of the Glorious Revolution was theirs and accused their opponents of rank Toryism, even Jacobitism. Both factions were in agreement that they supported the set of political values that reflected the English Whig principles of the Glorious Revolution—English liberties, the protection of personal property, and the Protestant religion, and both factions accused the other of violating the rights of English subjects, and of unfaithfulness to their new rulers.

As was the case in Massachusetts, perceived interests encouraged Revolutionary principles and promoted loyalty to William and Mary's government in England. The new Monarchs' devotion to Parliament and fervent anti-Romanism provided validation to Long Island Puritans who had long pleaded for a representative assembly and worried about increasing Papist influence in their colonial government. Ethnic political and economic differences between English and Dutch residents were no longer relevant by the 1690s.²⁸⁷ The merchants of New York, both Dutch and English, saw the alliance of England and Holland through the agency of their new rulers as an opportunity to profit concomitantly from Dutch trade and benevolent English rule. All of the political factions competed with each other for the support of the English government in London and the English Governor in New York, and they all viewed the adoption of the Whig principles of the English Revolution and the enthusiastic support of the English monarch as good politics. Regardless of their political affiliations in local affairs, New Yorkers agreed that the new rulers and their successors were guarantors of the lives, liberty, property and Protestant religion of their subjects wherever they might reside. New Yorkers grew to acknowledge English monarchs as allies—protectors of their rights—rather than as potential tyrants. In short, New York colonists accepted the Whig premises of government and kingship that became the standard line of thought of eighteenth-century English political culture. In fact, in New York, there was no competing political paradigm for a politician to embrace. In 1698

284 See Leisler to the Governor of Barbadoes, November 23, 1689, *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:24-25; "A Memoriall of What Has Occurred in their Mat^{ies} Province of New York," *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:33; "Humble Petitions to Governor Slougher . . .," *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:209; "Dying Speeches of Leisler and Milbourne," *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:313-215; "Depositions of Sundry Persons," *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:226-228, 230-231; "Petition of Captain Jacob Mauritz, May 10, 1699," *D.H.N.Y.*, 2:238; "Representation of Joost Stol," *N.Y.C.D.*, 3:630; "Affidavit of George Dolstone," *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 314; "Affidavit of Isaac De Reimer," *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 325; "Affidavit of Kiliaan Van Renselaer, March 7, 168¹/₂," *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 328, 330, 331; "Deposition of Citizens of New York," *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 345-346; "Petition and Remonstrance of the New York House of Representatives to Governor Bellomont . . ., May 15, 1699," *N.Y.H.S.C.* (1868), 413-414; and *Loyalty Vindicated*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 377, 379-380- 384-385.

285 *A Modest and Impartial Narrative*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 320-321. *A Letter from a Gentleman of the City of New York*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 360.

286 *A Modest and Impartial Narrative*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 332, 344; *A Letter from a Gentleman of the City of New York*, Andrews, *Narratives*, 363-364, 369, 370.

287 At least one scholar, Steve Stern, argues that these differences had all but vanished by the Revolution in New York, replaced by differences of class and geography (i.e. competition between Albany and New York) (see Stern, "Knickerbockers," *passim*).

Governor Bellomont noted that there were “parties here as in England, Whigs and Tories, or rather Jacobites,” but the New York politician who might accept the latter title was rare and had little future in the politics of the province or the Empire.²⁸⁸ Even during Queen Anne’s reign, Toryism did not take in New York. So while political factionalism became the rule in New York, all parties gave unflagging support to their king, and to the principles of the Glorious Revolution: to liberty, property and the Protestant religion.

288 Alison Gilbert Olson, *Anglo-American Politics, 1660-1775: The Relationship between Parties in England and Colonial America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), 101.