

An Uneasy Connection

Abstract: That Dutch Manhattan was a vibrant and dynamic community sounds like a simple enough assertion. However, as a result of the lack of scholarly attention, a deeply entrenched perception in the historiography of Manhattan, and New Netherland in general, is that it was from the beginning an ad hoc, irreligious settlement that was allowed to grow in a state of near anarchy until the English came in and began to make it function. One of the central aims of my research is to dispel this notion and demonstrate the complexities that defined Dutch Manhattan's community life – the difficulties encountered in trying to reconstruct in the New World aspects of societies left behind; the social, cultural, and communal outcome of the interactions of members of the Atlantic's three racial groups in Dutch Manhattan; the emergence of factions and disputes; the communal outcome of the various contestations, both within Dutch Manhattan's society and those with competing European nations and colonies.

Another aim of my research is to demonstrate how religion and religiously infused ideas were deployed in the construction of community in Dutch Manhattan. The prevailing perception has been that New Netherland began as an economically driven extractive venture aimed at the lucrative fur trade; and that settlement of the colony was reluctantly pursued only as a means of securing Dutch West India Company's claim to the region, and monopoly of the region's fur trade. According to this line of argument, because of the economic basis of settlement, religion and religious considerations never figured dominantly in the colony's history. My research seeks to demonstrate that religiously infused ideas were at play during the early contact period, and while the colony had its genesis as a trading venture, once the decision for permanent settlement was made, religion and religious considerations played a prominent role in the internal contestations for control and in the process of community formation. My work also explores the role of trade, contestations for control both within and outside the colony, and war in shaping and redefining the contours of community in Dutch Manhattan.

Written by Karen Sivertsen

Excerpted from *Babel On The Hudson: Community Formation in Dutch Manhattan*

1. Community Development and the Creation of an Uneasy Connection

1.1

February 22, 1643. The settlers around Fort Amsterdam on Manhattan Island were alarmed by the sudden presence of approximately four hundred frightened Wieckquaeskeck Indians, who had been suddenly roused from their slumber. Apparently, a group of eighty or ninety Mahican and Mohawk Indians from Fort Orange, in the upper Hudson River area, had taken advantage of the night's darkness to mount a brutal surprise attack on the unsuspecting Wieckquaeskecks. In one sudden swoop, the Mahicans and Mohawks had descended on the quiet Wieckquaeskeck village with guns blazing.¹ As the gunshots rang out through the night and the arrows pierced the darkness, several Wieckquaeskecks were murdered in their sleep. Others, quickly rousing from their slumber probably knew immediately the cause of the alarm. Some might have been aware of their people's inability to provide the expected tributary payments to the Mahicans and Mohawks. Since it was apparently the first time that they missed their payment after they made the tributary agreement with the Mohawks and Mahicans, there was probably

¹ Some sources state that it was a force of Mohawks, while others say Mahicans. However, the position taken here is that the attackers were probably a combined force of Mahicans and Mohawks, which would explain the various accounts listing one or other of the Upper Hudson River tribes. By 1643, the Mahicans and Mohawks had formed an alliance, which included combining to subjugate the Munsee-speaking tribes in the Lower Hudson River in order to gain access to the valuable wampum needed to purchase guns and powder, which they in turn utilized to continue their battle against the French Hurons and Susquehannocks. For a discussion of this alliance to subjugate the Munsee-speaking Indians in the vicinity of Manhattan Island, see T. J. Brasser, "Mahican," in Bruce G. Trigger, ed. *Handbook of North American Indians: Northeast*, Volume 15 (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 1978), 202-204. For an account of the events of the attack see David Pieterszen de Vries, "Korte Historiae, ende Journaels Aenteychkeninge van verscheyden Voyagiens in de vier deelen des Wereldts-Ronde" (1655), in J. Frankelin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), 225-229. See also David Pieterszen de Vries, "Extracts from the Voyages of David Pieterszen de Vries," Dr. G. Troost, trans., in *Collections of the New York Historical Society Second Series Volume I* (New York: H. Ludwig, 1841), 267-273. While de Vries was residing in New Netherland at the time of the attack, some aspects of his account of the attack was plagiarized from the anonymously written "Breedden-Raedt" or "Broad Advice." See Henry C. Murphy, trans., "Broad Advice to the United Netherland Provinces" (1649), (Ithaca: Cornell University Library, 1993).

some uncertainty as to the exact form that the response would take. They might have heard whispers or rumors that the Mahicans and Mohawks, who the Dutch settlers had amply supplied with guns and powder, were less than pleased with their failure to make the agreed upon payment of wampum. If so, they would have expected some sort of retaliation – a response that had to be memorable if it were to achieve its intent to deter future noncompliance. But when and exactly how it would occur? No one knew, and all were apparently shocked by its swiftness, when it did arrive.

With no time to gather their belongings or food, many Wieckquaeskeck families left hurriedly, some leaving behind moccasins and others leaving with their babies in their arms, not being able to strap them to their carrying boards. Some of those who were not swift enough were cut down as they made their retreat. Others who were caught making their escape were marched back to the Mahican and Mohawk villages, as dozens of men, women and children became captives. Once there, the Wieckquaeskeck men were probably tortured before being killed; the more fortunate were adopted into the group. Trudging through the woods in Manhattan's bitter cold night, those that escaped the initial assault finally arrived among the Dutch settlers – tired, panting, adrenaline still rushing, frantic, probably feeling that they had barely managed to survive with their lives intact. They asked for shelter and refuge, hoping that maybe Director-General Willem Kieft, Wouter Van Twiller's successor, would have compassion on them, particularly since they had made tributary payments to the Dutch ostensibly to ensure their protection from potential enemies.² They found shelter, food and warmth among some of the settlers on Staten Island, Manhattan and Pavonia. The next morning, still afraid to return to their own villages, they

² Ironically, it was probably the Wieckquaeskecks' payment to the Dutch settlers that rendered them unable to fulfill their tributary obligations to the Upper Hudson tribes.

decided to remain in temporary tents at Pavonia across the Hudson River, Corlaers Hook on Manhattan Island and on Long Island with friendly Native groups. Here, they might have reasoned, they would be able to remain secure until possible negotiations were concluded with the Mahicans and Mohawks. Also, these locations meant that they would be near the Dutch settlers, whose assistance would be more easily rendered and relied upon in the event of another attack.

During the first nights after the attack, on February 23 and 24, they probably slept in peace and might have begun to feel as though their place among the settlers would guarantee them continued safety, possibly until the spring when they would be able to meet with their enemies to the north and negotiate a more permanent peace agreement. But that was not to be. During the night of February 25, many of the settlers at Fort Amsterdam saw the gunshots lighting the night and heard the “great shrieking” of the Wieckquaeskecks again being murdered in the dark. The renewed attack irrevocably nullified any thought of peaceful existence until spring. According to one account, “infants were torn from their mother’s breasts, and hacked to pieces in the presence of the parents, and the pieces thrown into the fire and in the water, and other sucklings, being bound to small boards, were cut, stuck, and pierced, and miserably massacred in a manner to move a heart of stone.” Those who escaped the massacre and had thought it safe to come out of their hiding places in the morning to seek food and warmth “were murdered in cold blood and tossed into the fire or the water.” It was said that some appeared at the Dutch settlements “with their hands, some with their legs cut off, and some holding their entrails in their arms, and others had such terrible cuts and gashes.”³ In another account it was stated that at the victor’s settlement,

³ David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiae, ende Journaels Aenteychkeninge van verscheyden Voyagiens in de vier dellen des Wereldts-Ronde” in J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), 227-228.

some of the men who carried out the attack and one of the elderly women took pleasure in kicking about the severed heads of the Wieckquaeskecks that were brought back as trophies.

Such gruesome scenes of violence were typical in Native American inter-tribal warfare; but the attack on the Wieckquaeskecks during the night of February 25 was not carried out by a joint Mohawk-Mahican force, neither did another powerful Native American group accomplish it. That it was done by Dutch settlers and carried out with the sanction of the Director-General is one of the most intriguing and perplexing aspects of Willem Kieft's administration. The slaughter was only one of many skirmishes or battles during Kieft's War. The War was *the* defining moment in Kieft's administration, overshadowing and erasing all the previous accomplishments and advances achieved during his tenure. It was also one of the defining moments of Manhattan's history as a Dutch holding. This chapter investigates the social interactions between the settlers and the Native Americans and their changing relationship in order to limn the social climate that made Kieft's War possible.

1.2

In order to understand the full magnitude of the devastation wrought by Kieft's War and why it occurred when it did, we must first understand the state of the settlement before the War and Willem Kieft's background since he presided over the colony at the time. The first significant change that seemed to have affected both the Native-settler power relations in the colony and the nature of the general interaction between the Natives and the settler was that Willem Kieft was assigned the new Director-General of the colony. Possibly as a result of Lubbertus Van Dincklagen's complaint, Wouter Van Twiller was recalled to Holland because of charges of

purported mismanagement of the colony.⁴ While Van Twiller's drinking and lack of leadership experience made him a less effective leader, he would prove a more adept negotiator with the Native Americans, able to maneuver more skillfully across the middle ground than his successor, Willem Kieft. Although he did not start a family in New Netherland, Van Twiller had planted financial roots there, purchasing real estate and investing his money in various economic dealings. This seemed to tie his economic future to the well-being of the colony and the settlers, and demonstrated that he had a more than transitory stake in the colony. Willem Kieft, however, like many other colonial officials, had apparently considered his appointment a temporary assignment. From the outset, he was a mere sojourner in New Amsterdam and did not intend to establish permanent financial or familial roots in New Netherland. So his stake in the colony was even less than Van Twiller's. He had expected to return to Holland in the summer of 1643 at the end of this assignment, but the War that he had engendered against the Natives forced him to remain in the colony. When he finally left Manhattan aboard the *Princess Amelia*, he apparently took all his belongings, indicating that he did not intend on returning to live in New Amsterdam.

Kieft's background provides some clue as to why he would be reluctant to leave all the trappings of his life in Holland behind for a new and uncertain start in New Netherland. Willem Kieft was born on Saturday, August 24, 1602, the youngest son of the established and influential Amsterdam merchant Gerrit Willemsz. and Machtelt Jans, and was baptized in the Old Church on September 10, 1602. So, on September 1637 when Willem Kieft was appointed Director-General of New Netherland, replacing Wouter Van Twiller, he was only thirty-five years old and only a few years older than Reverend Everardus Bogardus, who would become his main opponent in

⁴ Later, when the DWIC recalled Willem Kieft in the wake of mounting complaints from the settlers, Lubbertus Van Dincklagen's name was being bandied about as a possible replacement before Peter Stuyvesant was finally selected.

Manhattan.⁵ According to one scholar, Willem's decision to eschew usage of the patronymic Willem Gerritsz, which was contrary to contemporary customs, signaled his "ambition to pertain to the rising new bourgeoisie or the regent class."⁶ From the beginning, Willem Kieft was educated to be a merchant. So, as a very young boy, Kieft imbibed the sensibilities, ideas and strivings of Amsterdam's regents and merchant class. After completing Latin school, he was then apparently sent to La Rochelle for a practical education or apprenticeship as a merchant.⁷

In 1632 or 1633, Willem Kieft was forced to flee La Rochelle after becoming bankrupt, and he was allegedly hanged in effigy as a sign of dishonor.⁸ Bankrupt merchants had to regain their honor, and their financial and social credit. According to historian Willem Frijhoff, Kieft decided to volunteer to do charity work to restore his honor and credit. In this capacity, he served as a negotiator on behalf of relatives of captives to redeem enslaved Christians from Turkish captivity in North Africa.⁹ Captain David Pietersz de Vries would later accuse Kieft of redeeming the captives with the lowest ransoms and pocketing the remaining funds, leaving those with high ransoms in captivity.¹⁰

⁵ Willem Frijhoff, "Neglected Networks: Director Willem Kieft (1602-1647) and His Dutch Relatives," in Joyce D. Goodfriend, ed., *Revisiting New Netherland: Perspectives on Early Dutch America* (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2005), 157-158.

⁶ Willem Frijhoff, "Neglected Networks," 160. According to Frijhoff, Willem's father always called himself Gerrit Willemsz., never Gerrit Kieft and his son Jan, who took over the family business, was mostly known as "Jan Gerritsz or Jan Gerretsen, seldom Jan Gerritsz Kieft." And, "it was only the younger son Willem who called himself straightforwardly Willem Kieft, and...never used the patronymic form Willem Gerritsz alone." This, Frijhoff argues, "testifies in itself to his sense of identity in a dynastic family vision: rejecting his patronymic name for a family name."

⁷ For a discussion of Kieft's youth, see Willem Frijhoff, "Neglected Networks," 167-171.

⁸ For a discussion of the charges that he fled bankruptcy and that he mismanaged money to free enslaved Christians from "Turkish" captivity, see Willem Frijhoff, "Neglected Networks," 171-177.

⁹ Willem Frijhoff, "Neglected Networks," 173-174.

¹⁰ Willem Frijhoff, "Neglected Networks," 175. Frijhoff believes that de Vries' accusation probably had no basis in reality. He argues that while Kieft "was often blamed for his lack of competence, his excess of ambition, his pride or anger, his want of faith or humanity...he was from the outset one of the very scarce faithful and non-corrupt Company officers, and that reputation may well have contributed to his appointment and maintenance by the WIC directors."

Despite these scurrilous accusations, his name arose when the Directors of the DWIC were searching for a replacement for Wouter Van Twiller in 1636. Elias de Raedt, an Amsterdam merchant and close associate of Kieft's extensive merchant family, proposed his appointment to the States General.¹¹ Clearly, by 1636 Kieft had been able to regain whatever honor his business misadventure in La Rochelle had destroyed. He received the post, perhaps because (unlike the other Director-Generals before him) he could claim membership in a kinship network at the highest level of society.¹² In New Netherland, Kieft was far above the social class of the common people. Even the wealthier settlers, like Kiliaen van Rensselaer, offered him the respect due a Dutch regent, addressing him as "Heer Commandeur." Since Kieft considered himself a member of the regent, or emerging aristocratic merchant class, he probably shared their concept of sovereign power, wherein sovereignty was vested in the local governments, where his family was closely connected.

Kieft probably also shared the regents' ideology, which was influenced by commercial expediencies and benefits rather than religion. It was not that he was irreligious, but he would have embraced the liberal variant of Calvinism and expressed a desire to see the church subordinate to the state. Like most Dutch regents, Kieft would not have been prepared to share his sovereign power with the authorities of the Dutch Reformed Church, and most certainly not the settlers. Both his concept of sovereign power and his ideas on state-church relationship meant

¹¹ It is also likely that Michiel Pauw (a first cousin of Willem Kieft's father, founder of the patroonship Pavonia in New Netherland, and who along with de Raedt was also a director of the DWIC) may have encouraged de Raedt to propose his second cousin, Willem Kieft for the position.

¹² Willem Frijhoff, "Neglected Networks," 197. According to Frijhoff, "during Willem Kieft's lifetime, virtually all the members of his kinship network [had] reach[ed] their social zenith. They obtain the highest offices in city and state, buy a manor or a seignior, build town and country-houses, get a knighthood from a foreign prince, and adopt a truly aristocratic lifestyle."

that he was distrustful of the church and its ministers' ambitions to control the civic government, and equally suspicious of the commonalty and their democratic aspirations. Additionally, his sense of superiority above the settlers was probably only exceeded by his feeling of being superior to the Natives and Africans in his midst. Together, these ideas – about state-church relationship, sovereignty, and the inhabitants – formed the corpus of beliefs that underscore some of the difficulties Kieft later experienced in New Netherland: his conflict with Reverend Everardus Bogardus, his conflict with the settlers and his War against the Natives in Manhattan.

While it is true that Willem Kieft's background, social ideologies and training had made him ill-qualified to be Director-General in an upstart Dutch colony in the New World, there were also other factors that made it more likely that his tenure would be marred with troubles. Increased concerns with territorial claims and competition from both England and Sweden induced the States General in 1638 to encourage the DWIC to shift the way it structured New Netherland, which ultimately contributed to heightening the tensions between the Native American groups and the settlers in the vicinity of Manhattan Island. The members of the States General and some of the Directors of the DWIC had concluded that it was a mistake to transport only Company dependents to New Netherland. Such a policy, they believed, had served to stymie the progress and growth of the colony. Thus, the States General proposed that the Company relinquish control of New Netherlands and agree to convert it to a colony of Holland. Control of the colony would be wrested from the DWIC and placed instead under the auspices of the States General. Obviously, this planned shift did not sit well with many of the Directors of the Dutch West India Company.

While the members of the States General were contemplating a shift in control of New Netherland, the colony's patroons (Michael Paauw, Kiliaen Van Rensselaer and Samuel Blommaert), who had considerable influence in the DWIC, proposed that the States General expand their privileges and exemptions. Their proposal included extending their access to free trade in the regions throughout and around New Netherland, providing them a greater access to African slaves and migrants from Holland to serve as laborers, granting them a monopoly over a wider territory, investing them with greater feudal powers so that they could govern their patroonship independent of the DWIC, and granting them a longer timeframe to settle their patroonship. Furthermore, the patroons also made the controversial suggestion that all immigrants should be required to settle within the boundaries of the various patroonships under the jurisdiction of the patroons. It was a tall order, and one that the members of the States General found offensive. The States General had become concerned "that the population in New Netherland does not only not increase as it ought, but even that the population which had been commenced is decreasing."¹³ So concerned were they that they instructed the DWIC to open up the new land to competition. This decision was a compromise, given all choices and proposals before them.¹⁴

Additionally, in 1639, the States General commanded the Dutch West India Company to surrender its monopoly in the fur trade, allowing individual colonists to trade legally with the Native Americans. In 1640, the DWIC issued a new set of *Freedoms and Exemptions* which included a new clause promising two hundred acres of land to any person who transported five or

¹³ E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York; Procured in Holland, England and France, by John Romeyn Brodhead, Esq.* Volume I (New York: Weed, Parsons and Company, Printers, 1856), 106.

¹⁴ One wonders whether the patroons' outrageous proposal was a skillful ploy to force the States General to retreat from its initial plan to wrest control of New Netherland completely from the DWIC.

more people to live in the colony. The effect of these two changes – ending the DWIC monopoly on fur trade and settlement of New Netherland – was immediately noticeable in the surge in migration, both from the English colonies (in Virginia, Maryland and New England) and from Europe.¹⁵ Rich and poor, educated and unlettered headed for the Dutch areas of control. With them came David De Vries, Adrian Van der Donck and Cornelis Melyn, who planted a colony on Staten Island and became a fulcrum in leveraging the colony’s future.

New Netherland witnessed a surge in both permanent and itinerant migrants. Some sought new land to settle, but many others arrived intending to trade with the various groups of Native Americans in New Netherland. The DWIC also promised to “exert itself to provide the Patroons and Colonists, on their order, with as many Blacks as possible,” so it can be safely assumed that the population of enslaved Africans also increased during this period, although there are no firm population data to provide clear confirmation. The English, coming mostly from New England, were probably among the most numerous migrants. They created the thriving village of Stratford on the west bank of the Housatonic River, settled Norwalk and Greenwich further west on the Long Island Sound and threatened to push on to the Hudson River. To the south, the Swedes began planting settlements on the Delaware River. In response to these encroachments on territory deemed part of New Netherland, Director-General Kieft began setting up a defensive perimeter in 1640. He purchased from the Natives all the small islands near Norwalk and the domain westward, almost the entire landmass of present-day Westchester County and nearly all of the present-day Queens County on Long Island.¹⁶ Within this defensive perimeter, Kieft allowed

¹⁵ E. B. O’Callaghan, ed., *DRCHNY*, I: 83-88, 96-100, 106-107, 110-114, 119-123.

¹⁶ The purpose of these new land purchases was first to strengthen the original Dutch claim to New Netherland, which was based on the right of discovery through Henry Hudson’s voyage and the subsequent voyages of Cornelis May

various English dissidents from New England to establish settlements and he also allotted land grants to various African families, enabling a fledgling African American community to take root in Dutch Manhattan.

The growth of New Netherland was exponential. By 1646, Kieft reportedly told Father Isaac Jogues, a Jesuit priest visiting from New France, that eighteen different languages were spoken on Manhattan among a population of just “four or five hundred men.”¹⁷ Some estimates place the Dutch portion of the population at fifty percent, with the other major nationalities and ethnicities being German, English, African, Scandinavian and French. By all appearances the town was thriving, but Manhattan was still the size of a small village during Kieft’s tenure; and with the increase in population, it became a small village where larger social pressures were looming.

1.3

Not surprisingly, this sudden wave of new immigration led to increased tensions between the settlers and the Native American inhabitants. There were also conflicts between Native American groups and amongst the settlers themselves. Both intra-group and inter-group conflicts erupted over land use, theft and issues of verbal and physical abuse. Protests arose regarding increased usage of alcohol during trade negotiations and other dishonest trading practices. Such

and Adriaen Block, against Swedish and English claims. The second purpose was that once settled, these outlying lands would act as a shield for New Amsterdam, protecting the settlers in the event of an Indian attack. The third purpose of Kieft’s land purchase was to meet the needs of the burgeoning European migration to the colony.

¹⁷ Father Isaac Jogues, “Novum Belgium” in J. Franklin Jameson, ed. *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), 259. See also Paul Otto, *The Dutch-Munsee Encounter in America: The Struggle for Sovereignty in the Hudson Valley* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006), 107. According to Otto, by 1645, New Netherland’s total “European population” had reached twenty-five hundred, despite the 1640s warfare which saw both the death and flight of many Europeans from the Manhattan Island region.”

conflicts led to increased anger, violence and even murder within the colony. The *Council Minutes* for the period abound with examples of physical fighting, bickering, name calling, and accusations of various forms of licentiousness amongst the inhabitants. Probably the most frequent cases before the Council were those concerned with protecting one's honor, and disputes about money.

On April 29, 1638, Anthony Jansen de Veas was involved in a case of slander as a plaintiff against Hendrick Jansen.¹⁸ While this case was eventually dismissed on June 3, 1638, because Anthony Jansen de Veas (also known as van Salee) was only able to procure one witness to support his claim, this would prove to be one of many times that he would appear before the Council, either as a plaintiff or a defendant, and sometimes he would appear with his wife, Grietje Reyniers.¹⁹ Even Reverend Bogardus and one of the colony's settlers of African descent,

¹⁸ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *Register of the Provincial Secretary, 1638-1642. New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch*, Volume I (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), 11. Hendrick Jansen had apparently called Anthony Jansen "a Turk, a rascal and horned beast." Anthony Jansen was also known as Anthony Jansen van Salee, Anthony Jansen de Veas, Anthony van Sallee, Anthony de Vaes, Anthony de Fes and Anthony the Turck. According to Van Laer, his many surnames possibly refers to a "seaport of Morocco. In other places Anthony Jansen is called from Vaes, Veas, or Fes, meaning Fez, the principal city of Morocco. Occasionally, he is referred to as 'the Turck', as on the Vingboom map of "Manatus," of 1639, on which his name appears as 'Anthoni du Turck'. The inference is that he had been a captive among the Barbary pirates, or else, that he was born at Salee and was the son of a Dutch sailor who had turned pirate, it being not uncommon in those days for Dutch sailors bound for Mediterranean ports to desert and to join the piratical ships which infested the Barbary coast." Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, I: 10. The latter seems more likely, that he was born at Salee, the offspring of a Dutch father and a Moroccan woman based on testimony given by Lysbeth Dircks.

¹⁹ It appears to have been a legal requirement in New Netherland "as a general basis of law, [that] all truth shall be established by the testimony of two or three witnesses." Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *Council Minutes, 1638-1649, New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch*, Volume IV (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), 447. At the request of Reverend Everardus Bogardus, Lysbeth Dircks testified that Grietje Reyniers invited her to "assist her in her confinement" as midwife, and when the baby was born Grietje asked her "whom did the child resemble, was it like Andries Hudde, or her husband, Anthony Jansen?" In response, Dircks asserted, "if you do not know who the father is, how should I know? However, the child is brown." That the child was "brown" would indicate that Anthony Jansen was probably of African descent since Grietje was French. Between 1638 and 1639, Anthony and Grietje were involved in over ten separate litigations. See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 5, 6, 9, 13, 25-29, 32, 35, 41, 45-46.

Anthony Portuguese, lodged complaints against the couple.²⁰ As a punishment, van Salee was “forbidden to carry any arms, whatever they may be called...with the exception of a knife and an axe.” Also, he was enjoined to “refrain from giving the least offense to Domine Bogardus either by word or deed, on pain of corporal punishment.” Additionally, he was further “condemned to pay a fine of fl. 12 for the benefit of the fiscal.”²¹ This punishment did not have the desired effect, and Van Salee and Grietje Reyniers were subsequently banished from “the jurisdiction of New Netherland within the space of six months.”²²

Sixteen affidavits were presented regarding the couple’s “comportment and conduct.” Not only were they seen coming “out of the consistory, being drunk,” but Anthony had pointed a loaded pistol at the foreman of the enslaved Africans, Jacob Stoffelsen. Not to be outdone by her husband, Grietje Reyniers received the ire and scorn of the settlers because of her refusal to conduct herself “quietly and piously as behooves Christians.” According to witnesses, while on the ship coming to New Netherland “she pulled the shirts of some sailors out of their breeches.” Later, “in her house” she reportedly “measured the male members of three sailors on a broomstick.” It was also charged “that during her confinement she asked the midwife whom does the child resemble, Anthony or [Andries] Hudden? Furthermore,...she even went so far as to call

²⁰ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 26, 35. Reverend Bogardus filed a complaint of slander against Van Salee because Van Salee and his wife had publicly stated that Bogardus has “taken a false oath” (26). Anthony “the Portuguese” demanded reparation for damage that Van Salee’s dog caused to his hog (35).

²¹ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 27.

²² Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 46-47. Although they were supposed to be banished from New Netherland, it appears that they were allowed to remain in New Netherland, but forced to leave Manhattan Island, selling their property and removing across the river where they were among the first landowners in modern day Brooklyn.

out in the fort, I have long enough been the whore of the nobility, now I want to be the rabble's whore...." ²³

The decision to banish the couple from Manhattan does not appear to be due to the seriousness of the accusations against them, as much as to the frequency that the two found themselves at odds with the colony's authorities and the commonalty, and the very public and open display of their transgressions. The wife of Englishman Thomas Beeche, was also caught "dishonorably manipulating the male member" of another man, Richard Gitcher, while her husband was asleep in the chair, but she was not banished from the colony.²⁴ Thomas Beeche, in an attempt to protect the honor of his wife, filed a slander suit on May 19, 1639, against Willem Willemsen, who had apparently accused Beeche's wife of committing adultery. But the case ended in default as Willemsen was able to provide corroborating testimony from Pieter Breyley.²⁵

²³ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 46-47. Grietje was probably referring to Andries Hudde in her assertion about being the "whore of the nobility." Since she inquired from the midwife whether the child resembles Hudde or Anthony, it is safe to assume that Grietje had a sexual relationship with Hudde. Andries Hudde was the son of Rutgert Hudde, the burgomaster of Campen. The marriage banns of Andries Hudde and Geertruyt Bornstra were entered at Amsterdam on January 6, 1639, three months before Grietje and Anthony were banished from Manhattan. Grietje might have hoped or thought that Hudde would marry her; the fact that he did not would have triggered her angry outburst at the fort. See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, I: 235.

²⁴ The name of Beeche's wife is never mentioned in any of the allegations against her in this slander case, but we learn from another case that Thomas Smith was married to "Nan Beets, the widow of Thomas Beets, or Beeche." From this we can deduce that Beeche's wife was Nan. Nan is also referred to as Nanna, Nanne and Anna. Thomas Smith was apparently indebted to Isaac Allerton, because his marriage contract with Nanne contained a promissory note, wherein he promised to pay Nanne Beets seven hundred and fifty guilders, which she had paid Isaac Allerton for him. Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, I: 313-314. In an earlier case Harmen Meyndertsz van den Bogaert provided testimony that on August 26, 1638 while a group of the settlers including Thomas and Nan Bescher were "merry at the house of Claes Cornelisen," despite her husband's presence Nan "fumbled at the front of the breeches of most all of those who were present." Embarrassed and jealous, Thomas requested her to go home with him. When she refused to go home, Thomas "struck his wife and Master Geerlyn." Other witnesses provided corroborating testimonies to demonstrate Nan's wayward character. See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, I: 54-57.

²⁵ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 49. In the records, Thomas Beeche is referred to as Tomas Bescher, Tomas Bescher, and Tones Bescher, but he apparently signed his name as "Thomas Beeche." On May 19, 1639, Willemsen claimed that sometime "in the beginning of last month of April, on

Even without Breyley's testimony it seemed that Mr. Beeche's case would have ended in victory for Willemsen, because a few days later, on May 25, 1639, Edward Wilson, another Englishman lodged a complaint with the Council that he witnessed Mrs. Beeche committing adultery with Francis Lastley when her husband "was out shooting."²⁶ Nan Beeche, like Grietje Reyniers, had committed acts unbecoming of a "Christian," yet Beeche was treated differently. It is possible that as a result of the overt public nature of Grietje's transgressions, a stronger punishment was deemed necessary.²⁷ Anthony and Grietje seem to be thumbing their noses at the authorities, willfully usurping both the civic and religious authorities and running afoul of the sensibilities of the colonists. In the end, it was arguably the overt, public and unrepentant nature of their transgressions that justified the Council responding with the full force of the law.

a Sunday night, he saw the plaintiff [Tomas Bescher] sitting in a chair by the fire, being asleep, and Ritsert, the Irishman, lying with the wife of the plaintiff on the bed in which Bescher and his wife are in the habit of taking their night rest. Also, that he could see perfectly that the said Ritsert had carnal conversation with the plaintiff's wife, seeing also that the aforesaid wife dishonorably manipulated the male member of the aforesaid Irishman." Pieter Breyley stated that "while Bescher sat in the chair and was asleep, one Ritsert Pitser [the footnote states that Richard Gitcher is meant here], an Irishman, lay on the bed of the said Tomes Bescher with the latter's wife and that they had carnal conversation with each other."

²⁶ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, I:167-168. Edward Wilson testified that in 1638 while he was laying sick in bed at the house of Thomas Beeche, and Beeche was out hunting "he saw Master Lasle and the wife of said Bescher lying and having carnal conversation with one another. As he...lay...in the bunk and feigned sleep, Tones Bescher's wife...came to the bunk and called three times and when [he] did not answer Master Lasle and said woman immediately laid themselves down on the floor and so committed adultery."

²⁷ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 26. Philip de Truy stated that in 1633 he saw Grietje Reyniers walking to the strand to draw water, as she passed the ship the *Soutbergh* [the ship that brought Director-General Wouter Van Twiller and Reverend Everardus Bogardus to Manhattan] the crew of the ship "called to her 'Whore, Whore, Two pound butter's whore!' Whereupon Grietjen, [sic] paying little attention to this, lifted up her petticoat and turning to the crew pointed to her behind." Grietje's indiscretions were common knowledge, which appear to have gained her a harsher punishment than Nan, and other women like Nan who had committed adultery or fornication. Furthermore, the transgressions of Grietje Reyniers and Anthony van Salee were fairly common complaints heard by the Council and the authorities – drunkenness, adultery, fornication, cursing, fighting, stealing, and slander, but none seem to have been as widely known and broadcasted in such a public fashion as their offenses.

The case of Anthony Van Salee and Grietje Reyniers indicates the manner in which the authorities in New Netherland during Kieft's administration had determined to deal with those who threatened the public peace and *eendracht*. Director-General Kieft seemed to have heeded the Directors of the DWIC's instructions that "every man shall be free to live up to his own in peace and decorum; provided he avoid frequenting any forbidden assemblies or conventicles...and further abstain from all public scandals and offences, which the magistrate is charged to prevent by all fitting reproofs and admonitions...."²⁸ Anthony and Grietje had become public nuisances by disturbing the peace of the colony. Not only had they not conducted themselves "quietly and piously," but they had managed to "disturb and shock the few inhabitants" at Manhattan.²⁹ However, while the Council undoubtedly found Nan Beeche's actions reprehensible, they did not deem her to be a threat to peace and concord in the community. Therefore, she was not punished as harshly as the law permitted.

It was not, as one might suppose, that Willem Kieft and the Council had simply given Nan Beeche a slap on the wrist, but in their decision to hold back the full force of the law in dealing with her transgressions they were engaging in the Dutch practice of *connivance* or "winking at" her indiscretions. In many of the cities of Holland during the seventeenth century, certain aberrant practices, including non-Reformed religious worship, were permitted or overlooked by the civil authorities if they were hidden from public view.³⁰

²⁸ E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *DRCHNY*, I: 110-111.

²⁹ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 47.

³⁰ For a general discussion of this practice and its relevance for community formation and concord see Jaap Jacobs, "Between Repression and Approval: Connivance and Tolerance in the Dutch Republic and in New Netherland," *de Halve Maen* 71 (Fall 1998), 51-58.

A policy of *connivance* allowed Lutherans, Puritans, Anabaptists, Catholics, and Remonstrants to flourish in many cities of Holland and in New Netherland during Kieft's administration.³¹ Such a policy was in accord with the ideology of the Remonstrant wing of Dutch Calvinism, which concluded that vigorous repression would potentially be a greater threat to concord and foreign trade than *connivance*.³² Drunkenness, fornication, and adultery could be dealt with by *connivance*, but transgressions such as rape, sodomy or homosexuality, murder and crimes committed against someone's body or property were often deemed so egregious that the full force of the law was brought to bear upon those guilty of committing such acts. In 1638, when Jan Gysbertsen committed the first recorded murder in Manhattan, it was evident that murders and the latter group of crimes were given greater weight because they were deemed committed against "the highest majesty of God and his supreme rulers as well as against the blood relations of the deceased...all of which in a land of justice can in no wise be tolerated or suffered but ought to be punished with all rigor as an example to others."³³

Drunkenness, adultery and fornication were certainly deemed to be crimes against God, but during Kieft's administration they were often subject to *connivance*. In contrast, murder, theft or rape were non-consensual acts committed against another person, and as such were seen as

³¹ Father Isaac Jogues, "Novum Belgium," in *NNN*, 260. Father Jogues noted the prevalence of non-Reformed groups in New Netherland during his visit to Manhattan.

³² Jaap Jacobs, "Between Repression and Approval," 55.

³³ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 24-25. Jan Gysbertsen from Rotterdam was found guilty of killing Gerrit Jansen, gunner, on May 15, 1638 in a knife fight. Gysbertsen, apparently fled from justice. If apprehended, he was to be punished "by the sword in such way that death shall ensue, with confiscation of all his movable and immovable property, none excepted, and including all his earned monthly wages which are due him by the West India Company, the just half to be paid to the widow of the deceased Gerrit Jansz or his heirs, one quarter part of the Company and one quarter part to the fiscal." He was convicted based on the testimonies of Thomas Hall and Egbert van Borsum. See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 51-53.

more threatening to concord within the community.³⁴ However, sodomy, whether forced or by consent, was judged especially harshly. Sodomy is the one instance in which Kieft and the Council felt that a severe punishment was necessary “in order that the wrath of God may not descend upon” the colony “as it did upon Sodom.”³⁵ On June 25, 1646, members of Manhattan’s African community accused Jan Creoly, a slave of the Dutch West India Company, of “having committed sodomy by force with a boy of about ten years, named Manuel Congo,” who was also a DWIC slave. During examination, Creoly not only confessed to forcefully committing sodomy on the young boy, but also revealed that he “had also committed the said heinous and abominable crime on the island of Curaçao.” In a judgment that was loaded with biblical references, which in itself is a stark departure from the Council’s sentencing for other crimes, it was determined that Jan Creoly was “not worthy to associate with mankind and the crime...may not be tolerated or

³⁴ This is very different than the understanding of crime and punishment that was operative during the administration of Peter Stuyvesant, Willem Kieft’s successor. While Kieft was influenced by the Remonstrant variant of Dutch Calvinism, Stuyvesant, as will be discussed in the next chapter, was influenced by the orthodox Counter-Remonstrant wing of Dutch Calvinism. Stuyvesant and his Council were less likely to connive with those guilty of transgressing the law. An example of how Kieft and Stuyvesant’s divergent religious leanings affected the way that people who went afoul of the law and the community’s sensibilities were dealt with is seen in the case of Elizabeth Feax. See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 486-487. Like Nan Beeche, Elizabeth Feax had committed adultery with Willem Hallet during Kieft’s administration and was not banished. However, on account of her adultery her husband, Robbert Feax, was legally permitted to divorce her. Stuyvesant and his Council, however, thought it “contrary to all good laws and the order issued by them” that after her divorce, Feax was permitted to continue to live and keep company with Hallet. Witnesses had declared that Feax had also had “carnal conversation” with Hallet, and had given birth to his child. “Out of special favor” to her children, Stuyvesant and his Council allowed Feax to “dwell and live at Groenwits [Greenwich]...provided that she remain separated both as to bed and board and common intercourse from her lover, Willem Hallet, and abstains from keeping company with him, on pain of corporal punishment.” Although she was divorced, Feax’s lover, Hallet, was banished from the jurisdiction of New Netherland and was ordered to leave one month from the date (March 6, 1649) on pain of corporal punishment. Additionally, his property and effects were to be “confiscated for the benefit and advantage of his child procured by her.”

³⁵ Berthold Fernow, ed., *Records of New Amsterdam, from 1653 to 1674 Anno Domini* Volume I (originally published New York, 1897; Reprinted, Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1976), 1. Kieft and the Council members during his administration tend not to emphasize “the wrath of God” as a reason for their judgment or legal ordinances. This too was different than in practices during Stuyvesant’s administration, where even drunkenness was expressly stated as being in “contempt of Gods holy laws and ordinances.”

suffered, in order that the wrath of God may not descend upon us as it did upon Sodom.” As punishment, Jan Creoly was to be “brought to the place of justice to be strangled there to death and his body to be burned to ashes, as an example to others.”³⁶

Although both Jan Creoly and Manuel Congo asserted that the “crime...was committed by force and violence...without the consent of the boy,” Kieft and the Council stated that the law affirms that “a person with whom sodomy has been committed deserves to be put to death.” However, because of Manuel’s youth and his innocence, they commanded Manuel to be “brought to the place where Jan Creoly shall be executed and that he be tied to a post, with wood piled around him, and be made to view the execution and be beaten with rods.”³⁷ The Council’s judgment, in effect, harshly punished Manuel, a victim, for a crime committed against him. The harshness of Director-General Kieft and the Council’s ruling in the Jan Creoly case have led some scholars to conjecture that it was due to the race of the people involved.³⁸ There is no evidence to support such an assumption; instead it appears that the severity of the punishment, both for the victim and the culprit, was motivated by a desire to avert “the wrath of God” from falling on the community.

Moreover, as is demonstrated in another case involving Africans, Kieft and his Council were willing to extend their policy of *connivance* to the offenders in a murder case, because it was deemed more conducive to public concord than to punish the perpetrators to the full extent of the law. On January 17, 1641, nine of the Company’s slaves were charged with murdering another

³⁶ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 326-327.

³⁷ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 328.

³⁸ Discussed in Peter R. Christoph, “The Freedmen of New Amsterdam,” *The Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 4 (1983), 140.

DWIC slave, Jan Premero, on January 6, in the woods near their houses.³⁹ The usual statements about the crime being against the “laws of God and man” were made. However, when the men were questioned to determine who was the leader in the assault and who struck the deadly blow, the defendants unanimously asserted that “they did not know, except that they committed the deed together.” Consequently, they were ordered to draw lots to determine which of them would be hanged for the crime. The lot fell upon Manuel of Gerrit de Reus, known as “Ris Manuel” (or “Big Manuel”).⁴⁰ However, on January 24, 1641 when the sentence was carried out, the two “good ropes” that were placed around Manuel’s neck broke when he was pushed off the ladder by the executioner. Seeing this, the community protested and requested leniency. Kieft and the Council in “consideration of the request of the community” decided to grant Manuel “his life and pardoned him and all the other Negroes, on promise of good behavior and willing service.”⁴¹ Although the law required that a murderer be executed, in order to appease the community and maintain public concord, Kieft and the Council decided to show leniency.⁴²

1.4

Just as with Big Manuel’s case, there were various instances where Dutch settlers assisted Native Americans involved in disputes with other settlers. In such instances, the settlers’ support to the Munsees was a means of maintaining peaceful co-existence in the colony. Conflicts

³⁹ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 97. The nine men involved were “little Antonio, Paulo d’ Angola, Gracia d’ Angols, Jan of Fort Orange, Manuel of Gerrit de Reus, Anthony the Portuguese, Manuel Minuit, Simon Congo, and Big Manuel.”

⁴⁰ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 99.

⁴¹ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 100. These men would later become part of Manhattan’s emerging freed black community.

⁴² Of course, it remains a possibility that the authorities orchestrated this entire drama of miraculous intervention and public forgiveness in order to protect (but also intimidate) the Company’s valuable human property. It is also probable that the African executioner and members of the African community conspired to ensure that the ropes would break, opening up the possibility of Big Manuel’s acquittal.

between the Dutch and Native Americans erupted as a result of the lawless character of many of the colonists. Moreover, during Kieft's administration, the wild man tradition continued to shape the Dutch settlers' attitudes towards Native Americans. They felt, for example, that the Natives had to rely on European witnesses if they were to prevail in legal proceedings. However, there were several instances in which Africans prevailed in their legal complaints against European settlers without relying on European witnesses. For example, Pedro Negretto prevailed in a complaint he filed demanding payment from Jan Celes (defendant) for the "trouble he has taken in tending the defendant's hogs."⁴³ In contrast, it appears to have been a policy during Kieft's administration to prohibit Native Americans from initiating suits against European settlers. If Natives were to prevail in court, they needed to secure two or more European witnesses to substantiate their accusations. Such a provision makes it clear that the Dutch authorities did not extend the full rights of citizens to the Natives, because they still viewed them as lawless *Wilden*.⁴⁴ Furthermore, those who had sexual liaisons with Native Americans were judged as

⁴³ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 53.

⁴⁴ Adriaen Van der Donck, "A Description of the New Netherlands, Comprehending the Fruitfulness and Natural Advantages of the Country, and the Desirable Opportunities Which it Presents, Within Itself, and from Abroad, for The Subsistence of Man; Which are Not Surpassed Elsewhere. Together with Remarks on the Character and Peculiar Customs of the Savages, or Natives of the Land" *Collections of the New York Historical Society*, Second Series, Volume 1: 191. In his explanation of why the Dutch settlers referred to the Natives as *Wilden*, Adrian Van der Donck asserts that *Wilden* was perceived as an appropriate national name "on account of their laws, which are so singular as to deserve the name of wild regulations." As Van der Donck's comment makes clear, it was not that the Natives did not have laws, but their laws were so unusual that they did not rise to the European standard of lawfulness. Van der Donck describes his astonishment that "the common rules of order in the administration of justice are not observed among this people...All minor offences, such as stealing, adultery, lying, cheating, and the like wrongs against civil order, pass unpunished among them." He also claims that the Natives "cannot be trusted because they also are thievish." Adriaen Van der Donck, "A Description of the New Netherlands," 212, 207. Added to this unflattering perception of the natives' system of law and order was the prevalent notion that Natives could not be trusted because they were liars. "Journal of New Netherland, 1647, Described in the Years 1641, 1642, 1643, 1644, 1645 and 1646" in J. Franklin Jameson, ed. *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), 270. The unknown writer of the *Journal of New Netherland*, states that the Natives are "hypocritical, treacherous, vindictive; brave and obstinate." Some scholars assume that the author of the "Journal" was Willem Kieft, while others conjecture that it was Cornelis Van Tienhoven, the secretary of the colony. However, J. Franklin Jameson states that Arnold Van Laer, archivist of the

unfit witnesses in court proceedings. Consequently, Jan Damen was able to bar successfully the testimony of Jan Platneus by alleging that he was “incompetent to give any testimony, because he has committed adultery with Indian women.”⁴⁵ When Claes, the cabin boy of the yacht *West Indies Raven*, threw “down a squaw on the path near the Fresh Water and then sit on her” with the intent of cutting “the belt which the said squaw had around her waist,” the Native American

State of New York, assured him that while it may have been “inspired by Kieft, or emanated from one of his supporters,” the original manuscript located at the Royal Library of the Hague was not written in the “hand of Kieft or that of Cornelis van Tienhoven, the provincial secretary” (267). It is however proffered here that it is possible that the *Journal of New Netherland* was written by person/s of the Dutch West India Company and not by Kieft, van Tienhoven or one of the colonists present in New Netherland during Kieft’s War. The language, tenor and narrative of the *Journal* is uncannily similar to that of another extant document, the *Report of the Board of Accounts on New Netherland, 1644*. See E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 149-156. This report was produced in the aftermath of the February 1643 massacre, and as it indicates, it was a “Report and Advice on the Condition of New Netherland, drawn up from documents and papers placed by commission of the Assembly of the XIX., dated 15th Dec^r 1644, in the hands of the General Board of Accounts, to examine the same, to make a digest thereof, and to advise the Assembly how the decay there can be prevented, population increased, agriculture advanced, and that country wholly improved for the Company’s benefit.” Quite possibly, the *Report* was a digest of the information contained in the *Journal*. So, where pages of the *Journal* are missing or there is a break in its narrative, such as after the discussion of the trade in ammunition with the Mohawks and the anger it incited among the Munsees, it is possible to use the *Report* to ascertain the content of the missing pages. In the *Journal*, there is a break, where “two pages are wanting.” See E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 182. The narrative of the *Journal* then continues after the omitted pages with “he of Witqueschreek, living N. E. of the Island Manhattan....” See E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 183. Looking at the narrative of the *Report*, it is possible to determine that the missing pages of the *Journal* dealt with the *Report*’s fourth point: the imposition of a contribution of maize on the Indians. Directly after discussing the contribution, the next paragraph of the *Report* continues with “Next it has happened that a Wechquaeskeck Indian murdered, about the year 1640, an old man in his own house with an axe for which no satisfaction having been afforded by the tribe, 12 men, chosen from the Commonalty, afterwards....” See E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 150. Again, the *Journal* follows the same sequence of events as the *Report*, using similar language, even referring to Claes Swits in a detached fashion, not by name, simply as “an old man.” That Swits is not referred to by name is further proof that the *Journal* was not written by one of the settlers. In the various petitions, letters and journals written by the settlers, the “old man” is consistently referred to by his name, demonstrating their familiarity with him. See for example, David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiæ,” in *NNN*, 213. De Vries refer to him as “Claes Rademaker.”

⁴⁵ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 122. Although Francis Lastley was known to have committed adultery with Nan (Anna) Beeche, he was still deemed a competent witness and was even allowed to be surety for Thomas Hall’s debt to Maryn Adriaensen. See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, II: 100.

woman could not bring a claim against Claes.⁴⁶ Instead, it was Philip Gerritsen and the schout-fiscal, Ulrich Lupolt, who filed the complaint against Claes.⁴⁷

The Indians' inability to seek redress against Dutch settlers within the colony's legal system, independent of European witnesses if necessary, had assisted in fueling many of the conflicts between Natives and settlers. Aware of the legal vulnerability of the Natives, it had become common for the settlers to physically abuse and mistreat them. Claes, the cabin boy's actions were not an uncommon occurrence. There were other colonists, such as Jonas Jonasz, who made it a common practice to "chase Indians and beat them with his sword and also by force to take away and steal their sewant which they were carrying in their pouches."⁴⁸ These types of abuses against the Natives multiplied as European settlements increased and Manhattan's population grew.

Furthermore, desiring to avoid competition from other colonists, many newcomers opted to settle away from the more densely populated town of New Amsterdam. Instead, they lived in

⁴⁶ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 52. See also Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, I: 177. There were several people within the colony who could act as interpreters for Natives in legal proceedings, such as Cornelis van Tienhoven, the secretary of the colony who had lived with a band of Munsee and was alleged to be quite fluent in their language. By this time, there were also other settlers who were born in the colony and spent a lot of time with the Natives, such as Sara Rapalje, Catalina Trico's daughter and the first "Christian" girl to be born in New Netherland; Director-General Peter Stuyvesant, Willem Kieft's successor, used Rapalje's service as a translator.

⁴⁷ The schout-fiscal had a vested interest in filing these complaints because he usually receives a "reward" or fee from the cases he successfully adjudicates.

⁴⁸ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 484. Many of these acts were committed by the soldier and sailors, men like Cors Pietersz, who the schout-fiscal accused of assaulting a Munsee man, stealing his sewant and cloth and then throwing him overboard. Cors claimed that he had "never seen the Indians...much less taken from them any seawan or cloth," but he was found guilty based on the testimony of two European witnesses. See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 29-30. Another case involved Sergeant Jeuriaen Rudolff. See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 65.

outlying areas, so that they could trade more easily with the Natives.⁴⁹ Father Jogues observed that when he visited Manhattan in 1643, the inhabitants were “scattered here and there on the river, above and below, as the beauty and convenience of the spot has invited each to settle.”⁵⁰ Away from the watchful gaze of the provincial authorities, the settlers took the liberty to trade with the Indians without paying the required duties to the DWIC. Adrian van der Donck had noted that “most of the trade of the Hudson River” was centered in the “city of New Amsterdam, on the island of Manhattan.”⁵¹ The settlers traded various European-made items for fur, seawant, and food. The lucrative trade in fur was centered around the beaver pelts that were “mostly taken far inland, there being few of them near the settlements.” Therefore the inland tribes who were closest to beaver supply, “particularly...the black Minquas...the Senecas...the Maquas, and the Rondaxes or French Indians, who are also called Euyrons (*Hurons*),” had a more dominant position in trade negotiations.⁵² Many of the settlers purportedly traveled “far into the country, more than seventy or eighty miles from the river and sea-shore” to procure the valuable pelts. There they met natives from the inland tribes who had come “more than ten and twenty days’ journey from the interior, and who have been farther off to catch beavers.”⁵³

⁴⁹ “Journal of New Netherland,” in *NNN*, 273. The author argues that Kieft’s war stems from the freedom granted to the settlers to trade with the Natives; the liberty to trade led to the growth in population, which in turn led to the War. As a result of the liberty, “every one thought that now the time had come to make his fortune, withdrew himself from his comrade, as if holding him suspect and the enemy of his gains, and sought communication with the Indians from whom it appeared his profit was to be derived. That created first a division of power of dangerous consequence, in opposition to Their High Mightinesses’ motto – [*Eendracht maakt macht*, union makes strength]....”

⁵⁰ Father Isaac Jogues, “Novum Belgium,” in *NNN*, 262. During the war, the Council noted that “our settlers are scattered here over a distance of 10 miles east and west and 7 miles south and north,” and stressed the difficulty such dispersed residences presented with regard to protecting the settlements. Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 288.

⁵¹ Adriaen Van der Donck, “A Description of the New Netherlands,” 142.

⁵² Adriaen Van der Donck, “A Description of the New Netherlands,” 209.

⁵³ Adriaen Van der Donck, “A Description of the New Netherlands,” 138.

Clearly, by 1639 most of the Indians who came to New Amsterdam with furs were no longer the Munsees; Manhattan's major fur suppliers were the Mohawks (Maquas), Susquehannocks (Minquas) and Mahicans. Some Munsee groups, however, were able to maintain their importance as trade partners by supplying sewant (wampum) or foodstuffs. Even during Kieft's administration, the Dutch maintained a robust trade with the Munsees in corn. Adriaen Van der Donck informs us that the Indians "bring to us their fur trade, worth tons of gold...to which may be added the grain and provision trade, which we proudly enjoy."⁵⁴ This trade in foodstuffs was fueled and necessitated by the rocky and nutrient-deficient soil located in the immediate vicinity of Manhattan.⁵⁵ Although the records do not indicate the exact extent of the trade, it is significant to note that the Dutch continued to rely on the Munsees to supplement their own supply of grain.

In return for corn, the Indians acquired European-made goods, such as duffels, which supplemented animal skins in traditional native apparel. However, the Indians also began to adopt

⁵⁴ Adriaen Van der Donck, "A Description of the New Netherlands," 236. For specific references to the grain and maize trade during Willem Kieft's administration, see: Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, I: 231-232, 441-442.

⁵⁵ It is apparent from the complaint of early Dutch settlers that on lower Manhattan Island's coastal plains and in certain interior regions, the soil was rocky, sandy and subject to drought, and without the aid of irrigation the soils in other areas were thin and infertile, lacking sufficient moisture to support the crops to full maturity. In giving his assessment of the land on the southern end of Manhattan, Jonas Michaëlius wrote: "true, this island is the key and principal stronghold of the country, and needs to be settled first, as is already done; but it is somewhat less fertile than other spots, and gives more trouble..." See "1628 August 8. Jonas Michaëlius to Joannes van Foreest at Hoorn," in Albert Eekhof, ed., *Jonas Michaëlius, Founder of the Church in New Netherland* (Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff's Publishing Company, 1926), 109. See also Isaack De Rasière, "Isaack de Rasière to Samuel Blommaert, (1628?)," in J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), 104 and Jaspas Dankers and Peter Sluyter, *Journal of a Voyage to New York and a Tour in Several of the American Colonies in 1679-80* (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Inc., 1966), 136. As late as 1650, Cornelius Van Tienhoven advised new immigrants to travel with enough food supplies for at least two to three years because "it is found by experience in New Netherland, that farmers can with difficulty obtain from the soil enough to provide themselves with necessary victuals and support." E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *DRCHNY*, Volume 1: 369. Early Dutch sources were consistent in their assessment that the land on the northern end of the island was good, but the land occupied by the settlers on lower Manhattan was sandy, rocky, troublesome and not as fertile.

European-style clothing. According to van der Donck, whereas the Indians formerly had been strangers to white linen, by the 1640s they began “to wear shirts, which they buy from our people, and those they frequently wear without washing until the same are worn out.”⁵⁶ While this statement suggests that the Indians were becoming increasingly dependent on European-made trade goods, it was the illicit trade in alcohol that would have the most serious ramifications for the struggling Native American communities in the vicinity of Manhattan Island. However, even without the widespread illegal trade, alcohol was readily available in the colony for European consumption, which made it increasingly easy for Native Americans to purchase it.

By one account, “a fourth part of the city of New Amsterdam consisted of grogshops and houses where nothing is to be got but tobacco and beer.”⁵⁷ Many of the settlers had transformed portions of their dwellings into taverns in order to profit from the lucrative trade. Van der Donck noticed the tendency of many Indians to abuse alcohol, and “drink to excess, when they become insolent and troublesome, and are malicious.”⁵⁸ Director-General Kieft and the Council later tried to curb these tendencies by prohibiting the sale of intoxicating beverages to the Natives.⁵⁹ What most concerned Van der Donck and the Dutch settlers was the violence and disorder that often ensued from intoxicated Indians. That this trade had more serious effects on the individual Indian is indisputable to us today, but unfortunately there is little extant evidence to indicate alcohol’s transforming effect within the Indian communities as a whole during the Dutch period. We do, however, learn from the extant records about the pervasiveness of alcohol in New Amsterdam.

⁵⁶ Adriaen Van der Donck, “A Description of the New Netherlands,” 196.

⁵⁷ Hugh Hastings, ed., *ERNY*, Volume I: 216.

⁵⁸ Adriaen Van der Donck, “A Description of the New Netherlands,” 192.

⁵⁹ The Ordinance, which was published on June 18, 1643, declared that those who sold “strong liquors” to the Natives “shall for the first offense forfeit fl. 25; for the second offense double the amount; and for the third time be arbitrarily punished.” Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 196.

They show that numerous Dutch men were wantonly spending “their daily earnings, but also when out of money pawning the goods serving to the necessities of their families” to obtain money to spend in the taverns. In this way they “obtain the means of continuing their usual drinking bouts. Their wives and children suffer in consequence and become a burden to the Deaconry and City.”⁶⁰ If alcohol use was already having such detrimental effects among the settlers, most of whom were already very familiar with alcohol, we can only imagine the havoc it was wreaking in Native American communities.⁶¹ As we will see in Kieft’s War, the Natives’ proclivity to drink to complete inebriation often led to violence and bloodshed.

1.5

While the ramifications of the sewant trade were probably not as serious for Native American communities as the trade in alcohol, the increased production and commodification of sewant altered Native American work patterns and changed the manufacture impetus from that of ceremonial gift-giving and reciprocal exchange between Native American groups to simple

⁶⁰ According to the Ordinance, “many tapsters and tavernkeepers, who to keep their business going detain such persons, as for their own sake and advantage would better attend to their occupations and protect their families honorably with God’s help, but cannot make up their minds to it, because of the pleasures they find in drinking....” Berthold Fernow, ed., *Records of New Amsterdam*, I:35. The practice had become so common-place that Peter Stuyvesant’s Council was prompted to pass an ordinance forbidding “all tapsters and tavernkeepers to receive in pawn any goods, of whatever nature they may be, such as clothing, furniture or the like, and to sell drinks thereof under the penalty of 25 fl. the first time, of 50 fl. the second time with a suspension of their business for 6 weeks and for the third offence closure of the place and restitution of the pawned property.”

⁶¹ For a discussion of the influence of alcohol on Native Americans and their communities, see Peter C. Mancall, *Deadly Medicine: Indians and Alcohol in Early America* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995). Mancall argues many Native Americans consumed large amounts of alcohol as a means of escape. He further asserts that their frequent overdrinking to utter inebriation, and their pervasive addiction to alcohol, did not stem from a genetic disposition but rather derived from many other factors, such as incorporating alcohol into various rituals. The topic is still a matter of debate.

economic exchange.⁶² By the 1640s, both the Dutch and the neighboring English were actively regulating the value for sewant in their respective colonies, protecting its status as an established local currency that served both Native American and settler societies in a manner shaped by both peoples. Europeans had transformed and accommodated the usage of sewant to serve a wholly economic purpose, but Native Americans had determined its valuation in trade goods.⁶³ The trade triangle that emerged in the Hudson River region dictated that European-made trade goods, such as duffels, were sent from Holland by the DWIC and other investors to be traded for sewant with the various coastal Munsee tribes in the vicinity of Manhattan, who were the main producers of the valuable bead. Next the sewant, which the inland tribes coveted, were transported inland to the Mohawks, Mahicans and Susquehannocks and exchanged for furs; and finally, the furs were transported back to Fort Orange and New Amsterdam and then shipped to Holland, enriching the coffers of the DWIC and other Dutch investors.⁶⁴

⁶² For a discussion of sewant (wampum) and its place in the early Atlantic World economy and contestation for power see Lynn Ceci, "Native Wampum as a Peripheral Resource in the Seventeenth-Century World System" in Laurence M. Hauptman and James D. Wherry, ed., *The Pequots in Southern New England: The Fall and Rise of an American Indian Nation* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1990), 48-63.

⁶³ As a result of its value and status in trade, the production of sewant was significantly escalated during Kieft's administration without uniformity in the qualities. Thus, the Dutch tried to safeguard the integrity of sewant as legal tender by setting a low valuation for the "unpolished stuff" while simultaneously securing higher prices for the "Manhattan seawan." According to this ordinance, "the price of the well polished seawan shall remain as before, to wit, four [beads] for one stiver, provided it be strung." Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 107. See also Harmen Meyndertsz van der Bogaert, "Narrative of a Journey Into the Mohawk and Oneida Country, 1634-1635," in J. Franklin Jameson, ed., *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1634* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), 151. During Harmen Meyndertsz van der Bogaert's journey to the Mohawk settlement, the leading sachems were interested to learn "whether they were to have four hands of seawan or not for their skins." He was assured that if the Dutch would give them four hands of sewant then the Mohawks would not sell their furs to any other nation. It is during similar types of trade negotiations that the inland tribes determined the price they were willing to accept for the furs that the Dutch desired. Lynn Ceci has also noted that "the French learned that these beads were 'esteemed more highly' than trade goods by northern fur suppliers, who would buy them 'very dear'." Lynn Ceci, "Native Wampum," 55.

⁶⁴ This New Netherland triangular trade route was described by Lynn Ceci. See Lynn Ceci, "Native Wampum," 58.

As long as European demand for fur continued, fur-bearing animals remained plentiful and quality sewant was produced in abundance, this triangular trade could persist without having many violent repercussions for the Munsees in the vicinity of Manhattan. However, after several decades of escalating fur trading in the Hudson River, beavers were hunted almost to extinction in the Manhattan Island region and were severely depleted in the areas near Mohawk settlements. The Mohawks and Mahicans were forced to seek new hunting territory to secure more furs, in order to obtain sewant. Moving further inland for fur meant that they would have to trespass on the enemy territory of the French Indians, which ultimately led to open warfare. This, in turn, necessitated more weapons to fight these enemy tribes. Since the currency for guns was sewant, the Mohawks and Mahicans resolved to demand forcefully tribute from weaker Munsee and Wappinger tribes in the Lower Hudson River. It is not difficult to imagine the anger and frustration these tribes in the vicinity of Manhattan Island probably felt towards the Dutch, particularly when one considers the refusal by officials of the DWIC to sell them weapons while simultaneously providing guns to their enemies to the north. They undoubtedly felt that the Dutch were indirectly threatening their economic and political sovereignty. Gradually, the relationship between the Dutch and the Munsees, their erstwhile extremely valuable trade partners, became increasingly strained, exacerbated by bitterness, suppressed hatred, anger and possibly even a sense of betrayal.

The Munsees and Wappingers, facing an increasingly marginalized position, struggled to cope with the new dominant order in the Hudson River Valley. Without significant quantities of furs to trade and facing the imminent possibility of diverting control of the sewant trade to the Upper Hudson River Indians through forced tributary payments, these coastal groups were

reduced to trading foodstuffs and their land. Native groups who decided to take this option were probably also hoping to secure alliances with the Dutch settlers. With each passing year, the Munsees and Wappingers were faced with adjusting to the expanding settler population that was rapidly converting traditional hunting land into farms. In turn, this escalation in contact led to a rise in disputes over land use. Land problems were compounded by the fact that the initial inhabitants often retained a right of continued residence and usage even after “selling” grounds to the colonists. A deed of January 15, 1639, indicates that although the Munsees were selling their land to the settlers, they reserved the right to “remain upon the aforesaid land, plant corn, fish, hunt and make a living there as well as they can.”⁶⁵ From the foundation of the colony, it was customary for the Natives to continue to use the land they deeded to the settlers. On Manhattan Island, for example, the Natives maintained a local tobacco field for several decades after they had sold the land to Peter Minuit.⁶⁶

⁶⁵ Charles T. Gehring, trans. and ed., *Land Papers. New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch Volumes GG, HH and II* (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., 1980), 9. This 1639 deed should not be construed as a sign that the Munsees were signifying a complete acceptance and accommodation to their position as subservient dependents of the Dutch, or the Mohawks and Mahicans for that matter. The 1639 deed was probably quite similar to the 1626 deed Peter Minuit negotiated for Manhattan Island – both allowed the Native Americans to maintain control of the land, while securing an alliance for mutual security and protection with the Dutch. These forms of alliances were necessary for all Native groups, and were arguably the *raison d'être* for the emergence of such Native American confederacies as the Iroquois Confederacy. Furthermore, the 1626 and 1639 deeds' granting of usufructuary rights to the Dutch did in no way relinquish the Natives' rights to the land, but from the Natives' perspective was a means of sealing the new alliance. It is through these extensive alliances that Native groups who were not independently powerful could shore up their power base when needed, such as when attacked.

⁶⁶ There was a plot of land on Manhattan called Sapohanikan that the Natives continued to utilize. Sapohanikan (or *Sappokanikan*), which means “tobacco plantation,” lacked a nearby source of fresh water, and so was probably appropriately described by Reginald Pelham Bolton as “a place of trade on the shore of the Hudson River, between Bethune and Horatio Streets in Greenwich Village.” Reginald Pelham Bolton, *Indian Life of Long Ago in the City of New York* (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1972), 133. Some scholars have mistakenly thought that this was the site of an Indian village, probably thinking that crops other than tobacco were cultivated there. According to Ann McMullen of the National Museum of the American Indian, Smithsonian Institution, tobacco required a different level of care than the food crops cultivated by Native American women and was grown by their men while they were away on fishing or hunting trips (telephone conversation, November 2, 2004). Like the Iroquois and Narragansetts, among the Munsees “it was the men’s job to fish, make war, and...grow tobacco.” See Nan A. Rothschild, *Colonial Encounters in a Native American Landscape: The Spanish and Dutch in North America* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution, 2003), 66. According to Dean Snow, the “men raised a strong tobacco (*Nicotiana rustica*) by simply scattering the seeds in the

It is the Natives' continued usage of deeded land that incited many of the disputes. The Munsee utilized the land to grow foodstuffs, such as corn, beans, and squash, which formed a major part of their diet and also became an increasing part of the goods they traded with the settlers for European commodities. However, since the Natives did not enclose their fields, their crops were vulnerable to the predations of European livestock, particularly pigs, which were permitted to forage freely. One author asserted in his journal that "as the cattle usually roamed through the woods without a herdsman, they frequently came into the corn of Indians which was unfenced on all sides, committing great damage there; this led to frequent complaints on their part and finally to revenge on the cattle without sparing even the horses." To remedy the situation, the Director-General and Council enacted a law commanding the inhabitants "whose lands adjoin plantations of the savages to have their horses, cows, hogs, goats and sheep herded or else to prevent them by fences or otherwise from damaging the corn of the Indians...."⁶⁷ But legal remedies proved insufficient. Europeans continued to complain that the Natives' semi-wild dogs often attacked their free-ranging livestock, particularly their sheep and calves.⁶⁸ Eventually, simmering tensions would boil over into open conflict.

spring and drying the leaves over the fire in the fall." See Dean R. Snow, *The Iroquois* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1994), 69-70.

⁶⁷ "Journal of New Netherland, 1647," in *NNN*, 273. Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 75-76.

⁶⁸ For a general discussion of the disputes arising from the close proximity of the colonists' farms with Native American settlements and farmlands, see James Homer Williams, "Great Doggs and Mischievous Cattle: Domesticated Animals and Indian-European Relations in New Netherland and New York," *New York History* 86, no. 3 (July 1995): 245-264. See also the impressive broader work of Virginia DeJohn Anderson, *Creatures of Empire: How Domestic Animals Transformed Early America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).

2. Community Connections And An Uneasy Connection Unveiled

2.1

The colonial officials observed with concern the settlers' mounting level of contention with the Indians, caused by the close proximity of their settlements and the recent revocation of the DWIC's monopoly on trade with the Natives. They believed that this freedom to trade had led to the dispersed settlement around Manhattan. Dispersion weakened the possibility for concord within the colony by turning the colonists into competitors and making it difficult to keep every one secure when trouble arose with the Natives. One of the officials claimed that the scattered nature of the settlements had "produced altogether too much familiarity with the Indians." This, in turn,

brought forth contempt, usually the father of hate-not being satisfied merely with taking them into their houses in the customary manner, but attracting them by extraordinary attention, such as admitting them to the table, laying napkins before them, presenting wine to them and more of that kind of thing, which they did not receive like Esop's man, but as their due and desert, insomuch that they were not content but began to hate when such civilities were not shewn them.⁶⁹

Inherent in this description are elements of the uneasy connection steadily unfolding between the Munsee and the Dutch settlers in the vicinity of Manhattan Island. The Dutch believed they had been more than generous towards the Natives and had treated them with hospitality. In return, the Natives appeared to repay this kindness with disdain and even hatred. The Munsee perspective, however, was that their erstwhile trade partners, whom they had welcomed on their lands, had multiplied like locusts. Increasingly, the newcomers seemed to constitute a threat to the very existence of the tribe. The pressure from Dutch settlers, combined with the Mohawk-Mahican onslaught, left the Munsee caught between the proverbial "rock and a

⁶⁹ "Journal of New Netherland, 1647, Described in the Years 1641, 1642, 1643, 1644, 1645 and 1646" in J. Franklin Jameson, ed. *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1953), 273.

hard place.” Feeling trapped in this manner, they did what they believed would best secure their interests with the least risk of bloodshed; they placed “themselves under the protection” of the Dutch West India Company, expecting “all possible assistance and favor by their representative in this country.”⁷⁰ It was a gamble for the continued survival of the Munsee peoples in a region that confident outsiders now claimed as New Netherland. As long as both sides accommodated the other, the strained peace and amity that underscored their uneasy connection was maintained and bloodshed averted. However, the combination of pressures could not be denied: the settlers’ thirst for land, the depleted beaver supply, and the Dutch practice of restricting the weapons trade to the Upper Hudson River tribes and excluding the Munsee. All these factors underpinned the movement towards war, but the shift from accommodation to open violence also turned upon the persistent influence exerted by the wild man mythology in New Netherland and the conflicting notions of community.

For many years, the settlers had bemoaned their “smaller number” vis-à-vis the Indians. It had forced them to swallow their pride and withstand the “insufferable arrogance of the Natives,” in order to avoid open conflicts.⁷¹ The motto of the DWIC was *eendracht maakt macht*, or union makes strength. But complaints of the settlers make clear that they acknowledged the power of a related truism: *bevolking maak macht*, or population makes strength. The Indians in their midst were numerically superior for the moment, but many settlers felt that a shift in relative numbers would allow them to assert at last their own sense of cultural superiority over the Indians that they had felt from the outset. They were convinced that if New Netherland had a “sufficient population” it would be able “to support, sustain, and defend itself against Indians.” So convinced were they regarding the link between population and strength that they had even calculated the number of inhabitants that would be necessary in order to achieve a shift in the

⁷⁰ Charles T. Gehring, trans. and ed., *Land Papers*, 9.

⁷¹ E. B. O’Callaghan, ed., *DRCHNY*, Volume I: 263.

power relations in New Netherland. In a petition submitted to the States General in Holland in 1649, the leading members of the community had asserted that “were there a thousand or fifteen hundred inhabitants in New Netherland, or even more, the Indians...would never think or dream of daring to offer us any insult.”⁷²

The colony was finally able to boast a population of about “a thousand or fifteen hundred” during Kieft’s administration. Now, with the population of the colony increasing, the settlers began to “dread neither Indians nor other enemies.”⁷³ For the settlers, a large population meant that they could defend themselves against possible attacks, but more importantly, they could silence the Indians’ taunting, jeering and “insolence.” Also, a large population would enable them to match their might against any perceived wrongdoing or use of force by the Munsees. No longer would they have to hold their tongues when the Munsees teased them about being “no account on land,” no longer would they have to accept the slaying of their people by the Munsees.⁷⁴ With a significant population increase, they could determine the terms of negotiation and the terms of interaction. The settlers made a clear connection between population strength in their ongoing tension with the Munsees. Once the settler population finally swelled, it was probably not a coincidence that there were those in the Dutch settlement who believed the time was appropriate to move preemptively against the Munsees.

2.2

Although it was clear that for the settlers, population meant strength, it was not apparent how they defined unity or thought it could be achieved in a heterogeneous society. Did they

⁷² E. B. O’Callaghan, ed., *DRCHNY*, Volume I: 264. And although this petition was authored in the aftermath of Kieft’s War, the awareness of an ideal numerical goal for the population was shared by many settlers before the eruption of the war.

⁷³ E. B. O’Callaghan, ed., *DRCHNY*, Volume I: 261. In the 1649 Remonstrance, which is believed to be authored by Adrian van der Donck and signed by the representatives of the “Communalty,” the connection that the inhabitants made between population, power and safety is quite evident.

⁷⁴ “Journal of New Netherland,” in *NNN*, 274.

equate strength with unity; did they believe that once a large population had provided them with strength, then that strength would somehow lead to unity? It is difficult to glean from the extant records. What is evident is that the settlers also saw a correlation between a sizable population and improved trade. In the 1649 Remonstrance to the States General, some of the leading inhabitants of the colony made the argument that “after population shall have increased” they would be able to “carry on a very large trade.”⁷⁵ The population of the colony was not increasing as readily as it could, they argued, because of the import and export duties that the DWIC placed on items. They further asserted that “there is not a man in New Netherland who does not believe, that the duty is the cause of the intolerable scarcity, and of the disorder and want of population there.”⁷⁶ According to this line of reasoning, “by the abolition of the duty, New Netherland would obtain and acquire: 1, population; 2, great trade; 3, reasonable profit on all goods and wares; 4, internal peace; 5, security from all foreign and domestic attacks...in addition to all the advantages which flow from these principal points.”⁷⁷

It is apparent from this line of reasoning that trade and security were deemed two extremely desirable and beneficial corollaries of a large population. However, as one of the settlers made clear, while “the liberty to trade with the Indians” led to an increase in population, it was also one of the causes of the colony’s ruin. Rather than leading to a greater sense of unity, the freedom to trade (for which the 1639 *Freedom and Exemptions* provided) added to the elements of divisiveness in the colony. Settlers were already divided by religion, language, ethnicity, and race. With the inauguration of the new freedoms for trading, the settler “thought that now the time had come to make his fortune, withdrew himself from his comrade, as if holding him suspect and the enemy of his gains, and sought communication with the Indians from whom

⁷⁵ E. B. O’Callaghan, ed., *DRCHNY*, Volume I: 347.

⁷⁶ E. B. O’Callaghan, ed., *DRCHNY*, Volume I: 375.

⁷⁷ E. B. O’Callaghan, ed., *DRCHNY*, Volume I: 376.

it appeared his profit was to be derived.”⁷⁸ In this manner, trade became one of the forces of divisiveness. Under previous administrations, some level of unity was possible among the settlers, when they had primarily defined themselves and their colony as being diametrically contrary to the Indians. Open trade and the ensuing connection it created between individual settler-trader and the surrounding Munsee groups had gradually rendered such definitions untenable.

This trade relationship was different from that found in the early contact period between ship captains and Native Americans in the Manhattan area. With this new trade relationship, many of the settlers lived with the Indians in their villages, or the Indians stayed with the traders in their houses in the Dutch settlements in order to conduct trade.⁷⁹ There is one recorded instance where the Dutch trader, sea captain and patroon of Staten Island, David Pieterszen de Vries, returned to his little cottage to find five Indians sleeping there.⁸⁰ This practice of living together formed the basis for a new level of familiarity. Where familiarity existed between the colonists and the Indians, it shifted their perception of each other. The Indians no longer viewed all Dutch settlers as liars, and the Dutch settlers increasingly separated the Indians into two divisions: “good” and “bad,” or “friendly” and “unfriendly.”⁸¹

However, the settlers also made a distinction between those Indians they considered “friendly.” The settlers’ relationship with the Indians in New Netherland had left them with two conflicting, yet inextricably linked, perceptions. Their relationship with the Munsees in the

⁷⁸ “Journal of New Netherland,” in *NNN*, 273.

⁷⁹ For the most part, during the early contact and settlement period (before the monopoly on the fur trade was lifted) sea captains and representatives of trading factions conducted trade aboard ships or at the forts; it does not appear that living amongst the natives was a widespread practice. Probably the one known exception to this was when Adriaen Block and the crew of the *Tiger* remained in the vicinity of Manhattan to construct the *Onrust* with the assistance of the native inhabitants, when their ship burned.

⁸⁰ David Pieterszen de Vries, “Extracts from the Voyages,” 267.

⁸¹ While the settlers had determined that all Indians were not the same, this new understanding did not lead to a complete rejection of the perception of the Indians as *wilden*. Despite his familiarity with the Native Americans in Manhattan, David Pieterszen de Vries still concluded that the Indians’ “disposition is bad” and that “they are very revengeful; resembling the Italians.” David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiae,” 217.

vicinity of Manhattan Island was quite different from that with the Indians in the vicinity of Fort Orange (modern day Albany). The Mahicans and Mohawks near Fort Orange lived in more fortified communities and were seen as powerful, and even fierce allies of the Dutch, while the settlers characterized those near Manhattan Island as “lambs,” so peaceful were they that it was deemed unnecessary to build a strong fort for protection against any possible assault from them.⁸² If we consider the image of the mythological wild man that the Dutch had conflated with New Netherland’s natives, it can be argued that the Indians at Fort Orange and those around Manhattan Island were two different sides of the same Dutch portrayal. As discussed in previous chapters, for the Dutch settlers, the wild man was both fierce and violent, but also serviceable and helpful; the Dutch perception of New Netherland’s Indians was a merging of both medieval and Renaissance representations of the wild man.⁸³

It is apparent that the Natives in the vicinity of Manhattan Island were viewed through the lens of the Renaissance portrayal of the wild man, while those around Fort Orange in the Upper Hudson region were perceived as having more of the qualities of the medieval representations of the wild man. It is not being argued here that the Dutch viewed the Indians in the vicinity of Manhattan as being incapable of violence or savagery; David Pieterszen de Vries and Adriaen van der Donck’s description of them does not support such a conclusion.⁸⁴ However, the Dutch were

⁸² A. J. F. van Laer, trans., *Documents Relating to New Netherland 1624-1626 in the Henry E. Huntington Library* (San Marino, California: The Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1924), xxiii. When the Dutch first settled Manhattan, it was thought that they should build a fort to protect themselves against possible attack from the Indians in the vicinity. However, afterwards the need for a fort was deemed less necessary. Although Fort Amsterdam was constructed to protect the settlement from possible English invasion, it was never maintained. Throughout Manhattan’s entire Dutch period, there were complaints by both the settlers and the Director-Generals about the walls of Fort Amsterdam being more like a “mole-hill” rather than a fort.

⁸³ Richard Bernheimer, *Wild Men in the Middle Ages: A Study in Art, Sentiment, and Demonology* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1952), 24-25. While both medieval and Renaissance representations portrayed the wild man as savage, violent, heathenish, and devoid of religion, the Renaissance period saw portrayals of the more utilitarian possibilities of the wild man – he assists the peasants in planting, shares his knowledge of herbs and hunting. The friendly or “good” Indians often provided these types of services for the settlers.

⁸⁴ Both de Vries and van der Donck assert that the Indians are “revengeful.” See David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiael,” 217; and Adriaen van der Donck, “Representation of New Netherland,” in J. Franklin Jameson, ed., 301. Van der Donck assert that “the desire of revenge appears to be born in them.”

more apt to focus on the utilitarian potential of the Munsees around Manhattan Island while emphasizing the fierceness of the Indians near Fort Orange, even though the Mohawks and Mahicans were rendering a valuable service by supplying the settlers with lucrative furs. Both groups of Native Americans were viewed as savage and violent, but whereas the savagery and violence of those near Manhattan were comparatively latent, that of the Indians around Fort Orange were depicted as being more overt. Also, while both groups of Indians were perceived as serviceable to the Dutch, the service of the Fort Orange Indians was mediated through violence and probably explains the Dutch settlers' divergent trade policy with both groups of Indians even before there was a marked depletion in beaver pelts – why the Dutch willingly provided the Indians at Fort Orange with ammunition while simultaneously denying it to those in the vicinity of Manhattan Island. Although it was argued, both by contemporary Dutch and Indians, that the Mohawks and Mahicans at Fort Orange needed the weapons to defeat their French Indian enemies in their quest to procure the valuable furs the Dutch desired, the Dutch decision to supply them with guns preceded the depletion of fur-bearing animals in the Hudson River Valley and the corresponding need to push further inland in “French Indian” territory in search of pelts.⁸⁵

2.3

While the settlers' trade relationship had altered or refined their perception of the Indians, it also engendered fierce competition between the settlers, serving to divide rather than unify

⁸⁵ E. B. O'Callaghan, *History of New Netherland; or New York Under the Dutch* Volume II Second Edition (New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1848), 391-393. Of course, the Mohawks and Mahicans did not confine their usage of firearms against the French Indians, but also used them to subjugate the less powerful Munsees and Wappingers near Manhattan Island. This, as stated previously, was also a source of the tension between the Munsees and the Dutch. See also Nicolaes Janszoon van Wassenauer, *Historisch Verhael* in J. Franklin Jameson, ed. *Narratives of New Netherland, 1609-1664* (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1946), 84-85. Wassenauer's discussion of Daniel van Crieckenbeeck's, (the commander of Fort Orange) ill-fated decision to march against the Mohawks with a force of Mahican allies in spring 1626 was quite possibly the first time that Dutch settlers began supplying the Upper Hudson River tribes with firearm. This practice was accelerated as trade and the necessity to secure and maintain their allegiance in the face of competition from other European forces increased.

them.⁸⁶ One of the defining qualities of Manhattan, and perhaps New Netherland in general, was the prevalence of trade. Trade has been a prominent feature of Manhattan since the settlement's inception. In 1628, Reverend Jonas Michaëlius commented on the prevalent practice of the settlers' trading with the Indians, although he was uncertain "whether it was permitted by the laws of the Company."⁸⁷ Years later, in 1650, Nicasius de Sille, councilor to Director-General Peter Stuyvesant, proffered his view of Manhattan that "everyone is a trader here."⁸⁸ When it came to trading, occupational labels had little meaning; many settlers, tailors, smiths, farmers, bakers – supplemented their income with proceeds from trading. Joris Rapalje, Catalina Trico's husband, owned a tavern in Manhattan, but he also brokered grain for farmers at Rensselaerswyck and worked as a chief boatswain for the DWIC. Hendrick Jansen, tailor, supplied the sailors anchored in the harbor with merchandise from his brewery.⁸⁹

Women also participated in this pervasive trading. In 1628, Isaack de Rasière complained to the Directors of the DWIC about the wives of Wolfert Gerritsz and Jacob Lourissz, who were usurping the Company's monopoly on fur trade. Gerritsz's wife had apparently approached de Rasière with two otters. When he offered her three guilders, ten stivers for the pelts, she refused and instead asked for five guilders. He rejected her offer, but when he discovered that Jacob Lourissz's wife had offered her five guilders, "to prevent the otters from being purloined," de Rasière was forced to give Gerritsz's wife the five guilders she had requested.⁹⁰

⁸⁶ For a discussion of trade and community formation in Manhattan, see Dennis J. Maika, "Commerce and Community: Manhattan Merchants in the Seventeenth Century," (Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University, 1995). For a general discussion of commerce in New Netherland see Thomas J. Condon, *New York Beginnings: The Commercial Origins of New Netherland* (New York: New York University Press, 1968); Van Cleef Bachman, *Peltries or Plantations: The Economic Policies of the Dutch West India Company in New Netherland, 1623-1639* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1969); Oliver A. Rink, *Holland on the Hudson: An Economic and Social History of Dutch New York* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986).

⁸⁷ "1628 August 11. Jonas Michaëlius to Joannes van Foreest at Hoorn," in Albert Eekhof, ed., *Jonas Michaëlius, Founder of the Church in New Netherland* (Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff's Publishing Company, 1926), 136.

⁸⁸ Isaac Newton Stokes, ed., *Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909* (Union, New Jersey: The Lawbook Exchange, Ltd., 1998), IV: 148.

⁸⁹ Dennis Maika, "Commerce and Community," 38.

⁹⁰ A. J. F. van Laer, trans., *DRNN*, 216-219.

While competition rather than cooperation generally defined trade relations among the colonists, some settlers did develop close business ties and partnerships with other inhabitants in Manhattan. These ties were often reflected in the baptismal records of the Dutch Reformed Church in New Amsterdam. Within the Dutch Reformed Church, baptism was viewed as a means of adoption into the Christian Church or the Christian family, and as such was extended to children of Christian parents, irrespective of parents' membership in the Dutch Reformed Church.⁹¹ Although churches were free to restrict access to the Communion table to the small circle of the *elect*, they were expected to baptize the entire community of Christians. Furthermore, although Church laws stated that parents and sponsors (god-parents/witnesses) were to be present at the baptism of their children, these acts were not strictly enforced in Holland and thus were not "very strenuously insisted on" in New Netherland either.⁹²

The effect was that godparents were given equal weight in baptismal ceremonies, in terms of being able to accept responsibility for the religious upbringing of the child and "fulfill the promises made in regard to the children...bound by the Word of God." Therefore, it was after careful consideration that parents selected their children's godparents, and many decided to accept the responsibility of godparents. Taking on such a weighty responsibility "bound by the Word of God" was a fairly concrete indication of a strong connection between the parties involved.⁹³ The

⁹¹ Hugh Hastings, ed., *ERNY*, I: 76-77. For a discussion of baptism in the Dutch Reformed Church as it pertains to Africans see also, Robert Swan, "Slaves and Slaveholding, in Dutch New York, 1628-1664," *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 17 (1998), 57.

⁹² Hugh Hastings, ed., *ERNY*, I: 429-430.

⁹³ Hugh Hastings, ed., *ERNY*, I: 430. Apparently, in New Netherland, they had even permitted young children to present babies for baptism. According to Reverend Johannes Megapolensis and Samuel Drisius, "sometimes there are bastards presented for baptism, who have no known father. Some charged to be the father, deny it. In such cases, others have been known to interpose, and to present the illegitimate child. Subsequently we noticed that young persons, who could hardly carry the child, and who had scarcely more knowledge of religion, baptism, and the vows, than the child itself, brought and presented other young children for baptism. Whereupon it was resolved and published from the pulpit, that no half grown youths should present other young children for baptism; but that it should only be done by those who had arrived at years of discretion..." (429-430).

frequency with which trade or business partners appeared as witnesses at baptisms indicates that strong connections were created as a result of trade relationships.⁹⁴

Govert Loockermans first arrived in Manhattan in 1633 as a sixteen-year-old employee of the DWIC. In 1639, after he left the employ of the Company, he became the agent for the influential and wealthy Amsterdam merchant family, the Verbrugges. Loockermans traded in Albany, New England, Virginia and Delaware with Indians and European settlers. Through his trade networks he developed connections with other local merchants, such as Isaac Allerton, Oloff Stevenson van Cortlandt and Jacob van Couwenhoven.⁹⁵ On March 17, 1652, when he presented his son Jacob for baptism, Jacob van Couwenhoven, Pieter Prins, and Annetje Loockermans stood as witnesses.⁹⁶

Some of the colony's Director-Generals, including Willem Kieft and Peter Stuyvesant, also had close ties to other settlers through trade relationships. Stuyvesant was quite discreet with his business transactions that blurred the line between his private activities and public roles, but in one instance Kieft openly speculated in a privateering contract. In 1644, the Director-General Kieft and the Council commissioned the frigate *La Garce*, commanded by Captain Willem Albertsen Blauvelt, to "go privateering against the enemies of the High and Mighty Lords the

⁹⁴ See "Baptisms in the Dutch Reformed Church of New Amsterdam and New York City dated December 25, 1639 to December 27, 1730," in New York Genealogical and Biographical Society, *Record 2* (1890), 10-41.

⁹⁵ These connections were also sealed in marriages between members of these various families. For marriage records see "Marriages in the Dutch Reformed Church of New Amsterdam and New York City, 1639 to 1801," in New York Genealogical and Biographical Society, *Record 9* (1901): 17, 18, 26, 29. It is not surprising that Loockermans married Gillis Verbrugge's widowed niece, Adriantje Jans. Also, Oloff Stevenson van Cortlandt married Loockermans' sister, Anna, and Jacob van Couwenhoven married Adriantje Loockermans' sister, Hester Jans. Couwenhoven and van Cortlandt were also connected to the Verbrugge family through trade. See David William Voorhees, "First Families," in *Seaport, New York's History Magazine*, vol. xxxvi, no. 1 (Fall 2001), 17. When Govert Loockermans died in 1671, he was one of the wealthiest men in colonial New York. For a discussion of Loockermans' spectacular rags to riches story see David M. Riker, "Govert Loockermans: Free Merchant of New Amsterdam," *De Halve Maen* Vol. LIV, no. 2 (June, 1981). Loockerman's relationship to the Verbrugge family is discussed in Oliver Rink, *Holland on the Hudson*, 177-180.

⁹⁶ In 1643, all three were blessed with children and stood as witnesses at their children's baptism. On May 10, 1643, van Cortlandt's son, Stephanus, was baptized with Govert Loockermans as witness. On September 6, 1643 when van Couwenhoven's daughter, Lysbeth, was baptized Govert Loockermans stood again as witness, and on September 27, 1643 Jacob van Couwenhoven returned the favor, standing as witness at Jannetje's baptism, the daughter of Govert Loockerman. See, "Baptisms in the Dutch Reformed Church of New Amsterdam and New York City dated December 25, 1639 to December 27, 1730," in New York Genealogical and Biographical Society, *Record 2* (1890), 12.

States General.”⁹⁷ When Blauvelt was seeking financing for another expedition, as a result of the past successful voyages, Director-General Kieft purchased a “just eighth share.” Other Manhattan investors included Jan Damen, Jacob Wolphertson van Couwenhoven, Martin Cregier, Jacob Stoffelsen, Hendrick Jacobsen PaterVaer, Hendrick Arentsen, Cristiaen Pietersen Rams, Willem DeKey, Adriaen Dircksen, Augustin Heermans, Harmen Meyndertszen van den Bogaert, Cornelis Antonisen, Cornelis Teunisen and Harmanus Bogardus.⁹⁸ Shortly after, Director-General Kieft stood as witness at the baptism of Martin Cregier’s son, Willem.⁹⁹

Manhattan’s Dutch settlers also used fellow workers or their own employers as godparents. When his first son, Balthazar Lazarus, was baptized on October 13, 1647, Director-General Peter Stuyvesant asked some of the members of his Council to stand as witnesses: Lubbert Dincklagen, Jan de La Montagnie, Brian Nuton, Commissary Keyser, Paulus Leendertszen and Cornelis van Tienhoven. Although it seemed like a strange request to the Directors of the DWIC, in 1648 Director-General Stuyvesant requested the Directors of the Company to be the “godfather” to his second son, Willem.¹⁰⁰ Although the Directors normally rejected “for certain good reasons” invitations to be “godfather of any children,” they decided to grant Peter Stuyvesant his request. With receipt of their approval, Stuyvesant was able to signal to the Directors his commitment to the Company, but also secure for his son a favored position with the Company.¹⁰¹

⁹⁷ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, II: 269, 287. See also, Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 219-220.

⁹⁸ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, II: 373-374, 436-437.

⁹⁹ “Baptisms in the Dutch Reformed Church,” *Record 2* (1890), 12. Cregier apparently named his son after the Director-General.

¹⁰⁰ “Baptisms in the Dutch Reformed Church,” *Record 2* (1890), 15.

¹⁰¹ Charles T. Gehring, ed., *Correspondence, 1647-1653* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2000), 72. The Directors asked for his son’s name so that they could “have it properly registered that the Company, when in a better financial condition, may be reminded to reciprocate this honor by a keepsake.”

2.4

Manhattan's European settlers were not alone in utilizing the ceremonies of the Dutch Reformed Church to forge connections. The burgeoning population of enslaved Africans also availed themselves of the marriage and baptismal rites of the Dutch Reformed Church in order to create enduring connections to replace the kinship networks that were severed by the transatlantic slave trade. In Article 35 of the Synod of North Holland's *Church Regulations for the East and West Indies* that was written in 1629, in response to the question "whether it could be understood as approved, in the case of children whom they do not as yet find to be fit for baptism and whose parents are heathen, that a blessing and confirmation might be used, with the laying on of hands, instead of baptism," it was decided that "what was proposed, ought not to be done. Such a practice was not Christian, and was not in conformity with the Word of God." The Synod explained that "adoption into the Christian Church in such a way, would produce evil consequences, and could in no sense be justified by the example of Christ's laying his hands upon the children of the Jews; inasmuch as those children were partakers of the covenant." Furthermore, they concluded instead that rather than confirming the children, they "should be diligently instructed in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity."¹⁰²

It is evident from the Synod's decision that the children of unbaptized Africans could not be baptized, or even confirmed, without instruction in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. From September 1639, when the extant baptism records of New Amsterdam's Dutch Reformed Church begin, until August 1647, when the Reverend Everardus Bogardus departed for Holland

¹⁰² Hugh Hastings, ed., *ERNY*, I: 76-77. Furthermore, in 1661, the Classis of Amsterdam stated that "no one, who is an adult, is admitted to baptism without previous confession of his faith. Accordingly the adult Negroes and Indians must also be previously instructed and make confession of their faith before Holy Baptism may be administered to them. As to their children...as long as the parents are actually heathen, although they were baptized in the gross, (by wholesale, by the Papists), the children may not be baptized, unless the parents pass over to Christianity, and abandon heathenism." *Ibid.*, 508. The Classis reiterated the earlier stance of the Synod of Holland, but with a stricter position regarding parents who refuse to "abandon heathenism." For a count of the number of people of African descent who availed themselves of baptism and marriage in the Dutch Reformed Church see Robert Swan, "Slaves and Slaveholding, in Dutch New York, 1628-1664," *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 17 (1998), 51-52.

aboard the *Princess Amelia*, he baptized thirty-nine children of African descent. It is possible that, like Reverend Michael Zyperius in Curaçoa, Reverend Bogardus decided once he was able to determine that the parents were previously baptized he “also baptized their children...for fear that otherwise they might” revert to Catholicism.¹⁰³ Given the Synod’s explicit instructions regarding baptizing Indians and Africans, the fact that so many Africans in New Netherland succeeded in having their children baptized and even bothered to have their marriages consecrated by the Dutch Reformed minister meant that Manhattan’s religious authorities had concluded that they met the requirements for the administration of these rites.¹⁰⁴ Their familiarity with and introduction to Christian rites had set these Africans apart from other enslaved Africans who were not baptized prior to being enslaved by the Dutch. Furthermore, it is argued here that their treatment by the Dutch authorities in Manhattan was influenced by their ability to convince successfully New Netherland’s civil and religious authorities that they had received Christian baptism prior to their migration to Manhattan.

However, it also appears that many of these enslaved Africans continued to adhere to traditional African beliefs.¹⁰⁵ Why then did they submit their children for baptism? A letter written to the Classis of Amsterdam by the Reverend Henricus Selyns, one of the Dutch

¹⁰³ Hugh Hastings, ed., *ERNY*, I: 493.

¹⁰⁴ Since the vast majority of the enslaved Africans arriving in Manhattan were either from the Kongo-Angola region of West Africa or various New World Spanish and Portuguese colonies, it is plausible that many had been exposed to Catholicism either in Africa or during their residence in the new World. It was not until 1654 that the first reported cargo of enslaved Africans would arrive direct from other areas of Africa. Robert Swan, “Slaves and Slaveholding in Dutch New York,” 67-68. On Christian contacts in Africa, see John Thornton, *Africa and Africans in the Making of the Atlantic World, 1400-1680*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

¹⁰⁵ This argument is based on Reverend Jonas Michaëlius’ complaints about Africans speaking jeeringly of their Creator. See Albert Eekhof, ed., *Jonas Michaëlius*, 132. Church membership in the Dutch Reformed Church is probably a more accurate gauge of the Africans’ attachment to the Reformed faith. While several people of African descent were married in the Dutch Reformed Church and many of their children were presented for baptism between 1639 and 1664, only six Africans were actually listed on the Church’s membership roll during that same period. See Robert Swan, “Slaves and Slaveholding in Dutch New York,” 58. According to Swan, “the most conclusive evidence that Blacks were not admitted into the Dutch church is demonstrated by church membership records. A list of members was kept from 1649-683. Only one, Susanna Negrin was a communicant before 1660. Six Blacks were enumerated from 1675; Solomon Pieters, 1677; Claes Emanuel, 1679; and two from Domine Selyns’ list, Susanna Negrinne and Thomas d’Moor, 1686.”

Reformed ministers at Manhattan, provides some clues as to the Africans' motivation. Selyns reported that

the negroes occasionally request, that we should baptize their children, but we have refused to do so, partly on account of their lack of knowledge and of faith, and partly because of the worldly and perverse aims on the part of said negroes. They wanted nothing else than to deliver their children from bodily slavery, without striving for piety and christian virtues...Not to administer baptism among them for the reasons given, is also the custom among our colleagues.¹⁰⁶

These Africans, whose children Selyns rejected for baptism, might have been aware of the idea that held currency in some New World societies that Christians could not or should not be enslaved. It appears that many of Manhattan's enslaved Africans viewed baptism as a means of ensuring freedom for themselves and their descendants. As enslaved laborers, what was most important to Manhattan's African inhabitants was freedom; baptism was one means of attaining freedom and being fully able to determine one's future.

Furthermore, just as with the larger European settlers, baptism signaled that there was a strong connection between parents, children and witnesses. For Africans, whose transatlantic voyage had forever separated them from their past kinship ties, baptismal and marriage ceremonies signaled their resolve to re-create these important bonds to survive in Manhattan. One case demonstrating the close connection between the parents and the godparents, is that of Domingo Anthony and Emanuel Swarger.¹⁰⁷ Domingo Anthony appears in the records with different names, since the Dutch diminutive of "Domingo" or "Anthony" is often used or misspelled. (Domingo is rendered as Domincus, Mincus, Dominicus or Dominco. Anthony

¹⁰⁶ Hugh Hastings, ed., *ERNY*, I: 548.

¹⁰⁷ The name "Swarger" means brother-in-law. It is uncertain whether Emanuel was Domingo's brother-in-law, given their close connection in the baptismal record, or whether the name refers to Manuel's previous employer. Little Manuel, or Emanuel Trompetter (not the same person as Emanuel Swarger), was also known as Manuel Minuit, indicating that he worked with the late Director-General Peter Minuit. It is possible that the Company assigned Emanuel Swarger to work with Peter Minuit's brother-in-law, Jan Huygen, who was one of the first *comforter of the sick* at Manhattan. Jan Huygen was Minuit's "Swarger," and he might have been known as "Swarger" during Minuit's administration. Hence, Emanuel would have been known as Emanuel Swarger, in the same fashion that "Big Manuel" was also known as Manuel Gerrit de Rous, signifying that he was assigned to one of the settlers during Minuit's administration, Gerrit de Rous (or Reux). See "Baptisms in the Dutch Reformed Church," *Record* 2 (1890), 11, 15.

appears as Teunis, Douroens, Thoni, Theunis, Thys, Tijs, Tice, Deis, Dees, or Dies.) Emanuel was also shortened to Manuel. On January 27, 1641, Emanuel Swarger presented his son Dominicus for baptism. This child apparently died before 1648, because in that year “Emanuel – brother in law of Van Angola” presented Dominicus for baptism. It was common Dutch practice for the next baby born after a child died to take the deceased child’s name if the newborn was of the same sex. In any event, On November 10, 1641, Dominco Douroens presented his son Emanuel for baptism. That they took pains to name their children after each other was significant. From October 2, 1639, several African fathers presented their children for baptism, and were joined by other Africans who stood as godparents, thus securing for their descendants the possibility of freedom in the future and an extended kinship network to watch over them.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁸ Between 1639 and 1646, seventy-seven slaves, “including 32 men, 19 women and 26 children” appear in the baptismal records. See Robert Swan, “Slaves and Slaveholding in Dutch New York,” 50-52. Swan also states that “from baptismal records, 121 names of Africans have been identified for the Black population of New Netherland to the year 1644. This number includes 9 deaths and 22 baptisms” and when “adult Black witnesses were tallied for the entire year...the total number of adults is 99, composed of 51 men and 48 women.” According to the genealogist Henry B. Hoff, while researching African American families in New Netherland shares some of the problems encountered with working on families of European descent during the same period, such as “lack of records, incomplete records, unpublished records, and poorly indexed records,” there are also other difficulties that are unique to studying African Americans. These include: “many records fail to identify African Americans as such,” “African Americans were not included in some records,” “African Americans who may appear with both first and last names changing,” and “the major genealogical problem of linkage: do record A and record B pertain to the same person?” Henry B. Hoff, “Researching African-American Families in New Netherland and Colonial New York and New Jersey,” Unpublished essay, 2. There are several genealogical publications on New Netherland’s enslaved Africans and their descendants, including Henry B. Hoff, “A Colonial Black Family in New York and New Jersey: Pieter Santomee and His Descendants,” *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 9, no. 3 (1988), 101-125; Henry B. Hoff, “Additions and Corrections to ‘A Colonial Black Family in New York and New Jersey: Pieter Santomee and His Descendants,’” *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 10 (1989), 158-160; Henry B. Hoff, “The De Vries Family of Tappan, New York,” *The American Genealogist* 72(1997), 345-352; Robert Swan, “Slaves and Slaveholding, in Dutch New York, 1628-1664,” *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 17 (1998), 48-81; Joyce D. Goodfriend, “Black Families in New Netherland,” *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 5, nos. 3 and 4 (1984), 95-107; George Levesque, “Commentary,” *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 5, nos. 3 and 4 (1984), 119-122; Willie F. Page, “The African Slave During the Early English Period, 1664 to 1700,” *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 5, nos. 3 and 4 (1984), 123-132; David S. Cohen, “In Search of Carolus Africanus Rex,” *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 5, nos. 3 and 4 (1984), 149-162; Thomas J. Davis, “New York’s Long Black Line: A Note on the Growing Slave Population, 1626-1790,” *Afro-Americans in New York Life and History* Vol. II, no. 1 (January 1978), 41-59; Richard Dickenson, “Abstracts of Early Black Manhattanites,” *The New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* Vol. 116, no. 2 (April 1985), 100-104, no. 3 (July 1985), 169-173; Peter R. Christoph, “The Freedmen of New Amsterdam,” *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 5, nos. 3 and 4 (1984), 109-118; Peter R. Christoph, “The Freedmen of New Amsterdam,” *Journal of the Afro-American Historical and Genealogical Society* Vol. 4, no. 4 (1983), 139-153; Henry B. Hoff, “Frans Abramse van Salee and His Descendants: A

However, the list of Africans should not be construed as being exhaustive, or representing the total Black population of Manhattan. Almost all the slaves listed were Company slaves. After 1644, the slave trade to Africa was opened up to the settlers, which led to more colonists owning slaves and utilizing slave labor in their homes and on their farms. Furthermore, since only the baptismal records from September 1639 are still extant, very little is known about those Africans baptized or married before then, or those who decided not to partake in these Christian rites. Later, when the requirements for baptism became more stringent, the number of baptisms of people of African descent plummeted from fifty-seven during the period 1639-1654 to only one from 1655-1664.¹⁰⁹

The extant *Baptismal Records* present some interesting patterns that shed light on the creation of an African community in Manhattan. Firstly, the godparents were almost always Africans or of African descent; on the rare occasions when the witnesses were not of African descent, they were usually neighbors. Peter St. Anthony presented Barent Jan for baptism on October 2, 1639, and Dominco Anthony, Jan Francoys, Tryntje Van Camp, Susanna D'Angola stood as godparents.¹¹⁰ That same year, Dominco Deis presented his daughter, Tryntie, for baptism, and Anthony Fernando "Portagees" and Tryntie Jans stood as godparents.¹¹¹ The presence of Tryntje Jans (van Camp) at these baptisms represents some of the few instances where

Colonial Black Family in New York and New Jersey," *The New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* Vol. 121, no 2 (April 1990): 65-71; Vol. 121, no 3 (April 1990): 157-161; Vol. 121, no 4 (April 1990): 205-211.

¹⁰⁹ Robert Swan, "Slaves and Slaveholding in Dutch New York," 59.

¹¹⁰ "Baptisms in the Dutch Reformed Church," *Record* 2 (1890), 10. On July 13, 1643, Domingo Anthony was one of the first person of African descent in the extant records that was granted land in Manhattan. Manuel Trompetter and Catalina (widow of Jochem Anthony) were also granted land in 1643. See Charles T. Gehring, trans. and ed., *Land Papers*, 24.

¹¹¹ Tryntje Van Camp and Tryntie Jans refer to the same person, but she is not the same person as Tryn Jonas. Although Tryn Jonas was the official midwife of the DWIC, other women also filled the role of midwife in the colony: Lysbeth Dircks, Anneken Bogardus (Reverend Bogardus' wife), Anneken Loockermans, Rachel Vigne and Tryntje van Camp.

a European appears as a witness at a baptism for a child of African descent.¹¹² Tryntje had probably served as the midwife, assisting the mother during labor.

Also, Susanna D'Angola appears to have possibly been a midwife as well, possibly trained by or working with Tryntje. Susanna appears as a witness at the baptisms of other children of African descent, where she is listed as Susanna Negrinne (which was transcribed incorrectly and written as Ederinne), Susanna Simons, or Susanna van Angola. Her possible role as a midwife or assistant to Tryntje van Camp explains her presence as a witness on March 25, 1640, at the baptism of Jan Suyderken's son, Gerrit; it is the only time that someone of African descent appears as a witness for a child of European descent. Furthermore, on this occasion Tryntje Van Camp appears alongside her as a witness as well.

Both the given and the surnames of the Africans listed in the *Baptismal Records* indicate that they belonged to the group of Atlantic creoles described by historian Ira Berlin.¹¹³ A further indication of their status as Atlantic creoles was their selection of European names for their children; all of the children in the baptismal records have distinctly non-African names. The most common male names (both given and surnames) were Anthony, Jan, Domingo and Emanuel (Manuel), and the most popular female names were Marie (or a derivative of it – Maryse, Maria, Mary, or Mayken), Anna and Catharina (or its derivative or diminutive – such as, Tryntie). It also appears that these were the names of the Africans that were most frequently cited in the colony's *Council Minutes*, bringing suits against Dutch settlers, petitioning for freedom, petitioning for

¹¹² Reverend Everardus Bogardus appears with the wife of Anthony trumpeter, Anthony van Angola and Emanuel Congo as witnesses at the baptism of Anna, Philippe Swartinne's daughter. When Marcus Emanuel presented his triplets (Jan, Maryse and Anna) for baptism, his neighbors, Thomas Hall and his wife, Frans Barentszen, Elizabeth Thorisen, and Willem Barentsz. and his wife stood in as godparents.

¹¹³ See Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003) and Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998).

land, giving testimonies for other Africans so that they would prevail in their legal suits, and translating for other Africans in court cases.¹¹⁴

In 1662, the Council heard the case of Andries Jochemsen, a white colonist accused of having his tavern open on Sunday during the hours of divine service. His three customers were all members of Manhattan's enslaved African community – Matthew, Swan and Frans. All testified that they had not begun drinking until services were letting out. Other settlers of European descent often used this line of defense in order to evade conviction under the colony's prohibition against drinking during the times of the service.¹¹⁵ On the strength of their testimony, the tapster was freed. In another case Manuel Pieters and Pieter Tambour were called to make a statement on behalf of Domingo Angola concerning an incident of more than a year earlier. They reported that, with the consent of the excise farmer, Domingo had taken a half barrel of beer and some food to a Saturday night party that lasted into Sunday morning, at which time they had asked the homeowner if they owed him anything, and he said they did not. This testimony was apparently sufficient to obviate the need for a court hearing.¹¹⁶

Aside from showing that these Africans were quite skilled in navigating their way successfully within the colonial structure, these episodes also demonstrate that there were spaces in the lives of enslaved Africans to allow for bonds of friendship to be fostered – that they were learning how to create a niche within the system for experiences and activities that were responsive to their particular needs. Furthermore, these cases also show that some of the names most popular in the baptismal records coincidentally also belonged to the Africans who appeared

¹¹⁴ Domingo was called to translate for Jan Angola in his suit where he and Wolfert Webber were accusing each other of stealing firewood; That Jan needed a translator after living in the colony for many years indicates that he was still not conversant in or did not understand Dutch very well.

¹¹⁵ What is also interesting is that all three men were married in the Dutch Reformed Church and presented their children for baptism, yet it is evident that on Sundays, they were not attending services. Again, it speaks to the meaning of baptism and the Dutch Reformed marriage rites for these men, demonstrating that participation in these ceremonies did not necessarily mean attachment to the Dutch Reformed Church. Church membership is probably a better representation of attachment.

¹¹⁶ For a discussion of all these cases see Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, I: 23, IV: 35, 53, 60, 62, 208-209.

to have mastered many of the skills necessary to get ahead in the colony. It is this mastery that might have gained them positions of leadership within the emerging community. In any event, that many parents chose to assign these names to their children indicates that the names of children were carefully selected to draw a connection with and an awareness of the leaders in Manhattan's fledgling African community.¹¹⁷

Like Jan Rodrigues, who arrived in the colony before them, these Africans were also distinguished by their "linguistic dexterity, cultural plasticity and social agility."¹¹⁸ As Atlantic creoles they were adept at navigating within the Atlantic's various competing cultural groups and adept at mastering the social intricacies of each culture in order to gain a favorable position for themselves. Besides recognizing baptism as a possible means of emancipation, there were free members in the community who understood that the colonial authorities were apt to free orphaned slave children if someone from the freed community was willing to provide for the child, as a "foster" parent. Thus in 1663, Domingo Angola successfully petitioned that Christina, the baptized orphan of Manuel Trompeter and his wife, Antonya, be set free as he was willing to provide for her.

On March 15, 1655, Anthony Matysen, a freed African, and his wife filed a suit against Egberts van Borsum for lack of payment. At issue was an agreement between the African couple and van Borsum and his wife to rear a child of the van Borsum's slave woman, who was probably deceased and may well have died in childbirth. The African couple had agreed to nurse the child, who was apparently an infant. What is interesting in this case is that rather than seeking remuneration that was owed, the Matysens requested that "the child be declared free," at which point they would raise the child at their expense. The Matysens were not successful in their suit,

¹¹⁷ For a discussion of naming practices within the community of enslaved Blacks, see John W. Blassingame, *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979).

¹¹⁸ Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone*, 17. See also Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity*, 24. As evidenced by the Council Minutes, they had acquired fluency in several European languages – Portuguese, English, Spanish and Dutch. Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, I: 248.

because van Borsum's wife gave testimony that she had "bargained with pltf's wife for the child for one year at least, and had not refused her payment of what she promised her in the presence of other negroes." Anthony and his wife were enjoined to "deliver the negro child up to defendant, and that Egbert van Borsum shall pay what he promised at the time."¹¹⁹ Although their attempt to free the infant was not successful, the Matysens' case demonstrates that once Manhattan's enslaved Africans had secured freedom for themselves, they did not fail to use every means at their disposal in seeking to extend the same status to the younger generation.

Consider the case concerning the family of Little Anthony, a black man who was still a slave when he married Lucie d'Angola on May 5, 1641.¹²⁰ Their son, who was also named Anthony, was baptized on July 30, 1643. Perhaps as a result of difficulties experienced during childbirth, Lucie died four weeks post-partum. The father, Little Anthony, was apparently unable to provide for his son and he was therefore raised by Dorothy Angola, his godmother.¹²¹ Little Anthony, the father, later died in 1648, and his son remained with Dorothy. Dorothy's husband subsequently died and she remarried Emanuel Pieters (also known as Little Manuel or Manuel Minuit) in 1653. In 1661 Dorothy and Emanuel petitioned Director General Pieter Stuyvesant and Council to declare their "foster" son free "so that he could inherit by last will and testament." After recounting how they had cared for him as their own, giving him motherly affection and raising him without burden or expense of the colonial authorities, Emanuel and Dorothy requested that he may be declared by your noble honors to be a free person."¹²² With its two-pronged approach – focusing on inheritance rights and parental care – their petition was approved. Little Anthony was later deeded land on Manhattan, joining the ranks of freed Black landowners.

¹¹⁹ Berthold Fernow, ed., *Records of New Amsterdam*, I: 298.

¹²⁰ E. B. O'Callaghan, ed., *Calendar of Dutch Historical Manuscripts in the Office of the Secretary of the State of New York*, Volume I (Albany: Weed, Parsons and Co., 1865), 256.

¹²¹ This case also demonstrates the importance of the godparents and fictive kin in the community and specifically in the lives of the children.

¹²² E. B. O'Callaghan, *The Register of Salomon Lachaire*, (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co, Inc., 1978), 22-23.

The petitions on behalf of Christina, Anthony and the van Borsum's infant slave demonstrate that children of Manhattan's enslaved African community were surrounded by a support network of biological and fictive kin, who assumed responsibility for their welfare. However, as enslaved laborers, it is evident that what was most important to the community was securing freedom for the next generation. While it is apparent from Reverend Henricus Selyn's comment in the *Ecclesiastical Records* that many Africans utilized Christian baptism as a means of securing freedom for themselves and their progeny, it is also possible that the marriage rites of the Dutch Reformed Church also served the same purpose. In one of its earliest extant instructions, the Directors of the Dutch West India Company enjoined the colony's Director-General that "whosoever shall contract marriage on sea or land shall immediately be discharged from the Company's service...and from that moment be regarded as a free man and colonist."¹²³ This is indeed a very intriguing stipulation, one that probably distinguishes New Netherland from other colonies and might also explain why New Netherland initially turned to enslaved laborers although its *raison d'être* and economy did not rely on producing a labor-intensive crop.¹²⁴ As a result of this policy, the Africans might have viewed marriage in the Dutch Reformed Church as yet another means of eventually gaining freedom.

¹²³ A. J. F. van Laer, trans. and ed., *Documents Relating to New Netherland, 1624-1626 in the Henry E. Huntington Library* (San Marino, California: The Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery, 1924), 125-126. The Directors' instructions further explain that once discharged from the Company's service, these erstwhile employees should enjoy "the privileges granted to others...unless he, being competent, should with his family wish to enter the Company's service and employ, in which case the Council shall be permitted to engage him at reasonable wages and distribute and employ him and his family in the same way as other farm laborers."

¹²⁴ Since marriage dissolved the contractual obligations of the Company's servants to the Company, then it would explain why the colony might have experienced a shortage in labor and would resort to using labor for the Company as a means of punishing the colony's wrongdoers. On Thursday, February 3, 1639 Gysbert Cornelissen was "condemned to the usual punishment of trouble makers." This meant that he was "to work with the Negroes for the Company until such time as the first sloop shall sail for the South River and to serve the Company there." See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *Council Minutes, 1638-1649, New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch*, Volume IV (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), 37. It might also explain why some of the Company's soldiers refused to "comply with...repairing Fort Amsterdam," refusing "to lend a helping hand, although they were offered as much as 10 stivers a day, with express promise of receiving a stiver or two more if they worked well and faithfully." See Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Stryker-Rodda, eds., *Council Minutes, 1638-1649, NYHM*, Volume IV: 54. It certainly could not have been because the wages were too low since normal daily wages for "a strong, healthy man" was "8 stivers a day and his board." See A. J. F. van Laer, trans. and ed., *Documents Relating to New Netherland*, 140.

So on May 5, 1641, Anthony van Angola, widower of Catalina van Angola marries Lucie D'Angola, the widow of Laurens van Angola. On November 24, 1641 Jan Fort Orangien, widower of Magdalena van Angola marries Marie Grande, widow of the murdered Jan Premier. On February 26, 1642 Emanuel van Angola marries Phizithaen D'Angool, the widow of Leen Laurens. Ten days later, Franscisco van Angola marries Palassa van Angola, the widow of Francisco d'Angola. And on September 28, 1642, Andries van Angola marries Anna van Angola, the widow of Francisco van Capo Verde.¹²⁵ It is possible that Anna van Angola and the other Africans who availed themselves of marriage in the Dutch Reformed Church, viewed it as a strategic move to increase the likelihood that both they and their children would one day be free. Of course, it is not being implied that genuine affection did not exist between the couple or that their union was only a means to an end. That their relationship was one of true affection is attested by the birth of children after the marriage. Just as there were Africans in the community who did not baptize their children, so too were there Africans who did not solemnize their union in a Christian marriage. That Anna van Angola and other Africans decided to marry in the Dutch Reformed Church meant that they placed certain significance or value in the marriage ceremony.

It is argued that for many, marriage in the Dutch Reformed Church signified freedom for their descendants and themselves, which was of paramount importance for those who were enslaved. It might also explain why in their 1644 petition for freedom Manhattan's eleven Africans gave as their reason "that they are burthened with many children so that it is impossible for them to support their wives and children, as they have been accustomed to do, if they must continue in the Company's service." A request for freedom based on "many years in the service of the Hon^{ble} West India Company" and the need to take care of their wives and children was an appeal invoking the DWIC's law regarding the ability of marriage and the corresponding

¹²⁵ There are more cases of widows or widowers remarrying in the early extant marriage record than in later years. It is uncertain whether the structure of reporting marriages in the colony changed in the later period of the colony's history, but there is a notable tapering off of widows and widowers in the records.

responsibilities to loosen the hold or contract that the Company held on its servile class. Although the petition did not free their children from servitude, it did set the petitioning Africans and their wives “free and at liberty, on the same footing as other Free people...in New Netherland, where they shall be able to earn their livelihood by Agriculture, on the land shewn and granted to them.”¹²⁶ To attain freedom, the enslaved Africans utilized every means available within Manhattan’s colonial structure. It should, then, not be surprising that those who could claim familiarity with Christianity utilized the rites of the Dutch Reformed Church in order to secure a more favored position for themselves and their progeny in the colony, and ultimately freedom.

2.5

Against this background of community development, one policy that the Dutch settlers had long pursued was increasingly inflaming the Indian populations. The settlers’ partiality for the Mohawks and Mahicans, with whom the Dutch had traded at Fort Orange, aroused the jealousy of other Lower Hudson River tribes. From the colony’s earliest years of settlement, Isaack de Rasière, the colony’s commissary and Secretary, had made it a policy that the Indians should be “well treated, each according to his station and disposition.” Under his guidance, particular care was taken in trade negotiations with “two different nations” to ensure that “one is not shown more favor than the other, of which they are very jealous...All of which should from time to time be looked into, to prevent discontent and to keep all the nations devoted to” the Dutch settlers.¹²⁷

This was a prudent policy, one that apparently was not followed during Willem Kieft’s administration. Furthermore, the Directors of the DWIC were concerned that the Indians “see that both in civil and criminal cases” New Netherland’s officials were careful to “do justice without

¹²⁶ E. B. O’Callaghan, ed., *Laws and Ordinances of New Netherland, 1638-1674* (Albany, New York: Weed, Parsons and Company, 1868), 36-37.

¹²⁷ A. J. F. van Laer, trans. and ed., *Documents Relating to New Netherland*, 200-203.

regard to persons.” Consequently, they gave the colony’s Director-Generals strict instructions for dealing with the eventuality if any settlers suffered “violence or be wronged by any Indian or native either in his person or with regard to the property entrusted to him.” They were instructed to

notify the tribe to whom such Indian belongs of the wrong done and the person who committed it, demanding that he be punished therefore and that our people be notified of the punishment [and advising them] that in default thereof we shall, for our protection and the maintenance of justice, seek to get hold of the delinquent and have him punished by the Council according to his deserts and as will be right and reasonable.¹²⁸

This policy did not lead to the desired effect, as the Indians had a very different means of dealing with wrongdoings; under the Native American system of justice payments were made to the wronged party to “remove” the transgression. Such a system of “justice” was not recognized by the colonists and only served to anger them when the Indians did not comply with their request to submit the suspected wrongdoer to European-defined and determined forms of punishment. Moreover, although the Directors also expressed the desire that if any settler “commits any wrong against the Indians or the natives, he shall be punished as the circumstances of his crime require,” the practice of barring the testimony of Indians in court cases unless it was corroborated by another non-Indian settler invariably nullified this instruction.¹²⁹ The result was that the Indians were angered by the prevalent dishonesty of the settlers who bilked them when they were drunk and the apparent acquiescence and silence of the Director-General and the colonial authorities when these crimes were committed.

In the midst of this tense environment, Director-General Kieft and his Council in September 1639, asserting that “the Company is put to great expense both in building fortifications and in supporting soldiers and sailors,” made an imprudent attempt to tax the Indians for the maintenance of the Dutch militia and the Fort on the grounds that the Dutch soldiers were

¹²⁸ A. J. F. van Laer, trans. and ed., *Documents Relating to New Netherland*, 110-113.

¹²⁹ A. J. F. van Laer, trans. and ed., *Documents Relating to New Netherland*, 110-113.

protecting the Indians around Manhattan Island from “their enemies.” This “contribution” was to be in the “form of skins, maize and seawan.” They further threatened that those “nations which is not in a friendly way disposed to make such contribution...shall be urged to do so in the most suitable manner.”¹³⁰

Viewing this new law as a further attempt by the Kieft administration to extend Dutch rule upon the local tribes, one sachem sent back a sharp reply, warning the Dutch not to attempt to collect such “contributions.”¹³¹ It was evident that this new tribute law had incensed many of the local Indians. The following spring, the Raritans, a band of Munsee Indians who lived in villages in northern New Jersey west of Staten Island, boarded the Dutch trading yacht, *Peace*, and insulted the crew by bringing squirrel pelts to trade instead of beaver, and slapping a crew member in the face with them. It is possible that this vessel was not only there for the purpose of trading, but also with the intent of collecting “contributions” from the Indians. The Dutch aboard the *Peace* feared for their lives, but were able to escape before anyone was hurt. This “insolence” had angered Kieft and his officials, who were then intent on finding an excuse to punish the Raritans in order to protect “the reputation of the Lords States General, the respect and interests of the honorable Company, and the safety of” the settlers’ “lives and cattle.”¹³² Shortly after this

¹³⁰ Arnold J. F. van Laer (trans. and ed.), *Council Minutes, 1638-1649*, New York Historical Manuscripts: Dutch, Vol. IV (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), 60.

¹³¹ Henry C. Murphy, trans., “Broad Advice,” 253-254. The Indians argued that “they did not consider themselves bound to contribute to the director or the Netherlanders: 1. Not for the purpose of maintaining the soldiers, as they did them no service when they were engaged in war with other tribes; that they...could be killed a thousand times before any tidings could come to the fort, which was situated far from them, much less could they be rescued by the soldiers, or seconded in time by them. 2...that they had allowed [the Dutch] to take possession of the country peaceably; that they had never demanded any thing for it; and that [the Dutch] were indebted to them for that reason, and not they to [the Dutch]. 3...that when [the Dutch] having lost a certain ship there, had built another new ship, they had assisted [them] with provisions and all kinds of necessaries, and had taken care of them for two winters, until the ship was finished, for which [the Dutch] were indebted to them, and not they to [the Dutch]. 4. Wherefore, they asked, for what reason should they give [the Dutch] maize for nothing, when they paid for every thing they came to buy of [the Dutch], as much as [they] asked?...”

¹³² David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiæ,” 208. Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 87. It is stated that “this spring, anon 1640, it happened that [the Raritans] attempted to capture our sloop which had but three men on board, to kill the crew and to take the cargo, but through the grace of God this was courageously prevented, the Indians being driven again from board, with the loss of only our canoe, whereupon

incident, when some hogs were killed on Staten Island, Kieft and his Council were quick to blame the Raritans, connecting it to the events aboard the *Peace*, although it was later discovered that the hogs were stolen by other settlers.

Director-General Kieft charged the innocent Raritans with the crime and sent “50 soldiers and 20 sailors, together with the secretary and the sergeant,” armed with muskets and pikes, across the harbor “to attack them, to cut down their corn and to make as many prisoners as they can, unless they willingly come to an agreement and make reparation.”¹³³ When Secretary Cornelis van Tienhoven arrived with the troops to demand payment of the tribute, the Indians refused to relinquish payment. The Dutch troops then requested that they be allowed to “kill and plunder.” According to David Pieterszen de Vries, Secretary Cornelis van Tienhoven stated that he had no orders to do so and left the troops, “protesting against any injury which should happen by reason of their disobedience and violation of orders.” However soon after he left, the troops killed several Raritans, including the brother of the sachem. One of the soldiers, Govert Loockermans, was reputed to have “tortured the chief’s brother in his private parts with a piece of split wood” before killing him.¹³⁴

Kieft had probably concluded that a show of power, would deter the Indians, but the tactic backfired. Instead of acquiescing, the Raritans retaliated. They burned and ruined de Vries’ Staten Island settlement and killed four of his workmen. They also murdered any settlers they met in the forests. Furthermore, neighboring Munsee tribes who were allies of the Raritans and had apparently acquiesced to Kieft’s request for “contribution” were angered and refused to pay tribute any longer. Kieft’s reaction to the growing hostilities was to outlaw the Raritans and

they came to Staten Island, shot some of the Company’s hogs and plundered the house of the Negro. Wishing to obtain satisfaction thereof, we notified them to come here to indemnify us, but they laughed at us.”

¹³³ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 87.

¹³⁴ David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiae,” in *NNN*, 208.

eliminate them through genocide.¹³⁵ He placed a bounty of 10 fathoms of sewant on the head of each Raritan who was killed. It was not an effective policy, as many of the local Indians were allied. However, in November, Pacham, a sachem from another Munsee group, the Tankitekes, and “who was great with the governor at the fort” brought Kieft a stick with a hand whose owner was never verified, claiming that “it was the hand of the chief who had killed or shot with arrows” the Dutch men on Staten Island. He further explained that he had carried out this act “because he loved the Swannekens...who were his best friends.”¹³⁶

Soon, however, other heads would roll. In 1641, another incident, which while unrelated to the sequence of events surrounding the Raritans, served to intensify tensions between the Dutch and the Munsee groups around Manhattan. Many years earlier, prior to the settlement of New Netherland some Dutch traders had murdered an Indian from the Wieckquaeskeck tribe north of Manhattan. His nephew, who was then a young boy, vowed revenge. In 1641, amid the growing tension, the boy (who was now grown) attacked Claes Swits in his wheelwright shop at the north end of Manhattan Island. While Swits was bent over retrieving tradegoods, the young Indian seized an axe and almost cut the worker’s head from his body. The Indian returned to his tribe in triumph, carrying the worker’s scalp. The murder that was committed on the Wieckquaeskeck road years earlier thus became an element in the grim logic of retribution that often governs culture clashes, as one event triggers another, across space and time, leading to greater, bloodier reprisals. Director-General Kieft ordered the murderer turned over, but the sachem refused to give him up, saying “that he was sorry that twenty Christians had not been murdered and that this

¹³⁵ According to David Pieterszen, Kieft stated that he wanted to “exterminate” the Indians. David Pieterszen de Vries, “Extracts from the Voyages of David Pieterszen de Vries,” Dr. G. Troost, trans., in *Collections of the New York Historical Society* Second Series Volume I (New York: H. Ludwig, 1841), 268.

¹³⁶ David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiae,” in *NNN*, 208.

Indian had only rightfully avenged “the death of his uncle who...had been slain by the Dutch twenty-one years before.”¹³⁷

Kieft was determined to punish the Wieckquaeskecks the way he had the Raritans, but he needed the sanction of the community. Kieft may also have become aware of the tenuousness of his position amongst the colonists, as several key members of the community began voicing their disapproval of his policies and leadership; it was their opinion that his Indian policies were not conducive to the prosperity and security of New Netherland. Consequently, he enjoined the settlers to select twelve men who were “empowered...to resolve on everything with the Director and Council.”¹³⁸ They would be the voice of the people and assist him in making decisions regarding how to deal with the Natives. Without becoming aware of it, Kieft in effect created the first representative assembly in New Netherlands. David Pieterszen de Vries was chosen president. Through the *Council of the Twelve Select Men*, the inhabitants were extended a voice in governing the colony. Furthermore, it had united them as a group, and encouraged them in their expectation that their wishes and vision for the colony would be given weight in deciding the course of the government and the future of the colony.

Kieft convened these twelve representatives in November 1641, and presented three proposals for their consideration: “First. Is it not right and proper to punish the scandalous murder lately perpetrated by a savage on Claes Swits.” They were further asked that if the murderer’s tribe did not surrender him to the Dutch was “it not right to destroy the whole village

¹³⁷ “Journal of New Netherland,” in NNN, 275. This event probably occurred, then, in 1620 before actual settlement of Manhattan Island.

¹³⁸ “Journal of New Netherland,” in NNN, 415. The *Twelve Select Men* included “Jacques Bentyn, [Maryn Adriaensen], Jan Damen, Hendrick [Jansen], tailor, David Pietersen [de Vries], Jacob Stoffelsen, Abraham Molenaer, Frederick Lubbertsen, [Jochim Pietersen], Jacob van...., Gerrit Dircksen, George Rapalie, Abraham Planck.”

to which” the Indian belongs. Next, they were asked “in what manner and at what time should it be done?” And finally, “by whom shall it be executed?”¹³⁹

The *Twelve* resolved that war should be commenced if the Indians refused to relinquish the murderer, but that the attack should “be made in the harvest when the Indians were hunting.”¹⁴⁰ However, in the meanwhile in order to not create suspicion among the Indians “a friendly traffic” should be “carried...until the maize trade be over, and until an opportunity and God’s will be made manifest.” It was suggested that the Director send a sloop as much as three times in order to demand peaceably the surrender of the murderer “for the purpose of lulling the suspicions of the Indians without any threats.” However, once the Indians were out hunting, the settlers would form two war parties and “the Director shall personally lead the expedition” to harass the Indians “from two directions; and that the Director shall employ hereunto as many of the strongest and most active of the Negroes as he can conveniently spare and provide them with a small ax and half-pike.”¹⁴¹ It is evident that the *Twelve Select* representatives agreed that declaring war against the Indians was a viable response, but they were awaiting the opportune time to execute their plan.

When Kieft again summoned the *Twelve* delegates later in November to ascertain whether they thought it advisable, “as the time and opportunity now present themselves to surprise the Indians” only one man thought that “war cannot be carried out successfully as the undertaking against the Raretangs came to a standstill.”¹⁴² All of the other representatives were in favor of

¹³⁹ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 414. See also Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 124-125.

¹⁴⁰ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 183.

¹⁴¹ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 415. See also, Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 125.

¹⁴² Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 126. Joachim Pieterszen Kuyter “says that it will be best to have patience and to lull the Indians to sleep. Jaques Bentyntyn says that it will be best to kill the Indians so as to fill them with fear. Jan Eversen says that he does not think it advisable to undertake anything against the savages but to lull them to sleep so as to avoid suspicion. Jacob Stoffelsen says that it will be best to wait for a ship to come from the fatherland. George Rapalje, Gerrit Dircksz., Hendrick the tailor agree with the above opinion. Abraham Pietersz says that he thinks it advisable to begin war and to exterminate the savages if

war, differing only in when such an action should be engendered. Jaques Bentyn and Abraham Pieterszen were the most hawkish, calling for killing or exterminating the Indians in order to “fill them with fear.” The dominant opinion, however, was that the Director-General and Council would “watch for the proper time and opportunity, it being understood that the barbarous murder must be revenged for the sake and security of our lives.” But there was an important stipulation that “if anything be undertaken...everyone will be notified as promptly as possible...”¹⁴³

Many obstacles prevented the execution of the representatives’ proposal. Finally in 1642 “it was resolved to avenge the perpetrated outrage.”¹⁴⁴ Instead of leading the attack against the Indians as the *Twelve* suggested, Kieft acted on February 25 by sending an expedition against the Wieckquaeskecks in Westchester County under the leadership of Ensign Hendrick van Dyck.¹⁴⁵ This expedition was thwarted when the soldiers were lost en route “in consequence of the darkness of the night.”¹⁴⁶ Eventually, the Indians signed a treaty, once they realized that they had only narrowly escaped death at the hands of the Dutch settlers. The Wieckquaeskecks promised to “deliver up the murderer or inflict justice themselves...but did not keep their word.”¹⁴⁷

While these events were unfolding, another situation developed across the Hudson involving yet another Munsee group, the Hackensack Indians, who were already irritated over a questionable takeover of their land by Myndert Myndertz van der Horst. Van der Horst had apparently settled on the land against the advice of Director-General Kieft and without the approval of the Indians. Van der Horst’s cattle had destroyed the Hackensacks’ garden and provision ground. This had created a lot of tension between the Indians and the settlers. Some Hackensack Indians killed an Englishman, one of David Pieterszen de Vries’ servants. A few

possible. Fredrick Lubbersen says that the war cannot be carried out successfully as the undertaking against the Raretangs came to a standstill.”

¹⁴³ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 126.

¹⁴⁴ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 183.

¹⁴⁵ This failed expedition was carried out exactly one year prior to the brutal attack at Pavonia and Corlears in February 1643.

¹⁴⁶ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 183.

¹⁴⁷ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 183.

days later, the son of one of the Hackensack sachems was invited to Van der Horst's house. The sachem's son was sold brandy and then his beaver-skin coat was stolen when he had fallen into an alcoholic induced stupor. When the Indian woke up and discovered his coat missing, he shot an arrow that killed a Dutch man who was thatching the roof of van der Horst's house. Kieft, of course, demanded the surrender of the murderer, even promising a reward, only to get the usual response: "a scoffing answer" and laughter. Furthermore, the Hackensacks asserted that the murderer had fled to the Tantiketes, another Munsee group that lived "a two day's journey."¹⁴⁸

The frequent eruption in violence was unnerving to the settlers, serving to increase their paranoia and distrust of the Indians in the vicinity of Manhattan Island. What was further unsettling was that after Ensign Hendrick van Dyck's failed expedition, the settlers now faced the realization that their practice of "having the Indians daily in their houses" was tantamount to living with and entertaining their enemies. This thought was given further credence when the Narragansett sachem from Rhode Island, Miantonomi, visited the Native American villages on Long Island during the summer of 1642 with one hundred of his warriors to recruit allies for a war against the Mohegans in Connecticut. Tensions were further aggravated, as Kieft and the settlers out of paranoia misinterpreted Miantonomi's intention and became convinced that a secret uprising was being organized against the Dutch and English. They saw the treacherous intentions of the Indians behind every unexplained or extraordinary event. They claimed that "some of the neighboring Indians attempted to set our powder on fire." Not succeeding in this "devilry," it was even proffered that the Indians attempted "to poison the Director or to enchant him by their devilry."¹⁴⁹

As winter arrived tension and paranoia increased, leading to deeper distrust and disunity. United under their representative body, many in the "Commonalty" increasingly felt that their

¹⁴⁸ David Pieterszen de Vries, "Korte Historiae," in *NNN*, 215-216. See also, E. B. O'Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 183.

¹⁴⁹ E. B. O'Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 183.

interests and opinions about the best means of dealing with the Indians diverged from that of Director-General Kieft's; they "seriously distrusting the Director." As a result of his inaction, some of the inhabitants began to suspect and accuse him "of conniving with the Indians," arguing "that an attempt was [made] to sell Christian blood." Consequently, they resolved that although "the will of the entire Commonalty was surrendered to" Director-General Kieft, "inasmuch as he would not avenge blood, they would do it, be the consequence what it may." Hoping to satisfy the settlers, Kieft informed Pacham, the sachem of the Haverstraws, another Munsee group, "who interested himself in this matter, warning him that [the Dutch] should wait no longer inasmuch as no satisfaction had been given."¹⁵⁰ But Kieft continued to wait for a sign.

For many, including Kieft, the events that unfolded in February 1643 seem to satisfy the requirements of the *Twelve Select Men* who had decided that "friendly intercourse" be maintained with the Indians "until the opportunity presents itself and the will of God be made manifest."¹⁵¹ In February when the Mohawks and Mahicans attacked the Wieckquaeskeck, causing them to flee to the houses of the "Christians" on Manhattan Island, the Dutch initially "humanely received" them. The Wieckquaeskecks were "half dead of cold and hunger," and the Dutch settlers supported them "for fourteen days; even some of the Director's corn was sent to them." Although not mentioned in the known extant records, it is possible that some of the colonists considered whether the time was right to strike them, even as they "humanely received" the Wieckquaeskecks. But no action was taken, and it even appears that the Indians might have returned to their villages, because the records state that "a short time after, another panic seized" the Wieckquaeskeck, which caused them to fly to divers places in the vicinity of the Dutch." This time, however, on February 22, 1643 they fled with the Hackensacks to the vicinity of Fort Amsterdam and at Pavonia. Many Dutch settlers viewed it as a gift from God that the tribes that

¹⁵⁰ E. B. O'Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 183.

¹⁵¹ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 124.

had been the source of the past conflicts were helplessly gathered amongst them. Indeed, there were those who felt that “God had wreaked vengeance on those of the Witquescheck,” by allowing their enemies to attack them, causing them to flee. Additionally, they also saw the hand of God in the Indians’ sudden reappearance amongst them; it was the long-awaited sign from God that “the opportunity” was at hand for the colonists “to wreak vengeance” upon their Indian enemies “for the innocent blood” they had shed and their countless other acts of “insolence.”¹⁵²

On that cold night in February 1643, the Indian fugitives at Pavonia and others at Corlaer’s Hook on Manhattan were asleep. Induced by three of the *Twelve*, who had signed the petition for war in the name of all the *Twelve*, Kieft finally received sanction for his desire to “wipe the mouths of the savages.”¹⁵³ He promptly ordered two armed parties out from the Fort. One group went north to butcher the refugees at Corlaer’s Hook. They set upon the unsuspecting Indians and proceeded to indiscriminately kill forty of them. Another group of armed men was sent to Pavonia. Silently crossing the river, the Dutch invaded the encampment and turned the snow red with the blood of men, women and children. It is said that David Pieterszen de Vries watched the fighting and flames from the wall of Fort Amsterdam. He reported that the sky was lit with the fires from their tents. Between 100 and 110 Wieckquaeskeck and Wappinger were murdered that night in what was a prelude to Kieft’s War.¹⁵⁴ De Vries reportedly told Director-General Kieft, who had remained in safety at the fort, that he had commenced the ruin of the colony by ordering the murder of Indians “without warning the inhabitants in the open lands, that each one might take care of himself against the retaliation of the savages,” because while he aimed to exterminate the Indians “he could not kill all.”¹⁵⁵ Kieft ignored de Vries. When the

¹⁵² E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 151, 185.

¹⁵³ David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiae,” in *NNN*, 226. The three who signed the petition are Jan Jansen Damen, Maryn Adriaensen, and Abraham Planck. See E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 193.

¹⁵⁴ David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiae,” in *NNN*, 227.

¹⁵⁵ David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiae,” in *NNN*, 227. For a discussion of some of the events of Kieft’s War see Henry C. Murphy, “Broad Advice,” 254-259.

Dutch troops returned to the fort with 30 prisoners and the heads of a number of Indians on their pikes, he shook their bloody hands delightedly, praised them and gave them presents. The soldiers, it was reported, also used the severed heads to play kickball.¹⁵⁶

Any celebration on the part of some Dutch settlers was short-lived. The massacres had the effect of bringing the Munsee tribes together in common cause against the Dutch. Kieft had seriously underestimated the strength of the Indians. He had reasoned that in order to permanently “restore peace and quiet throughout the land, the Indians who had waged war” against the Dutch “should be wholly destroyed and exterminated.” However, estimating that the numbers of their Indian enemies were “not above three hundred strong,” Kieft concluded that their extermination could be accomplished with “one hundred and fifty soldiers, armed with muskets and coats of mail, and provided with sufficient munitions of war.”¹⁵⁷ More than seven different tribes formed an alliance to assist the Hackensacks, Wieckquaeskecks and Tappans in attacking outlying Dutch farms and settlements.¹⁵⁸ The settlers on Manhattan were forced to withdraw into Fort Amsterdam. The settlers on Long Island, then, petitioned for permission to attack and slay the Indians living near their settlement, but Kieft denied them their request since those Indians had done the Dutch “no harm and showed” them “every friendship. (Yea, had even voluntarily killed some of the Raritans,” who were enemies of the Dutch. Against Kieft’s orders, the settlers attacked the village of the Long Island Indians, killed two Indians, and stole their maize.¹⁵⁹ This served to spread the war to the Munsees on western Long Island. By the end of winter, twenty tribes had consolidated in battle against the Dutch.

¹⁵⁶ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 412-413.

¹⁵⁷ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 151.

¹⁵⁸ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 190.

¹⁵⁹ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 184. See E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 416-417 for a copy of the “Petition of the Inhabitants of Long Island” and Kieft’s response. The petition was signed by “Gerrit Wolffersen, Jacob Wolfersen, Hans Hansen, Lambert Huybertsen Mol, and Dirck Wolffersen.”

The colonists must have been shocked at the maelstrom that had been unleashed. However, David Pieterszen de Vries believed the situation might still be salvaged. That spring, De Vries convinced sixteen Munsee sachems to sit down in a meeting with Governor Kieft. Still denouncing the Dutch as “corn thieves,” they agreed to a truce and sent envoys to the Tappans and Hackensacks urging them to do the same.¹⁶⁰ The Wappingers were not satisfied, however, and the fighting resumed during the fall of 1643.¹⁶¹ Ironically led by Pacham, the Tantikete sachem and erstwhile Dutch ally, the Indians’ attack became more strategic, aimed at decimating the entire colony.¹⁶² They seized boats sailing from Fort Orange with beavers, killed several other settlers under the pretense of coming to trade, and attacked and burned several boweries, “not by open violence, but by stealthily creeping through the bush with fire in hand, and in this way igniting the roofs.” The settlers lamented that “nothing was...heard but murders; most of which were committed under pretense of coming to put Christians on their guard.”¹⁶³ Kieft may have become aware he had unleashed a whirlwind of terror.¹⁶⁴ On September 13, 1643, he again asked the heads of the prominent families to create a new counsel, calling the group *the Council of Eight Men*. Instead of sanctioning Kieft’s actions, however, the *Eight* sought an expanded role in New Amsterdam’s government and, ultimately, petitioning the States General for relief or independence from Director-General Kieft and the authority of the Dutch West India Company.¹⁶⁵

The *Eight Men* assembled on October 6, 1643 and drafted a proposal demanding that Kieft send delegates to the English colony in New England “to request an auxiliary force of one hundred and fifty men, for whose pay a bill of Exchange should be given for twenty-five thousand

¹⁶⁰ For a discussion of the peace negotiations with the Long Island tribes, see David Pieterszen de Vries, “Korte Historiæ,” in *NNN*, 229-232.

¹⁶¹ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 185.

¹⁶² It is interesting that Pacham had only recently declared himself the “friend” of the “Swannekens,” and points to the shifting and fragile nature of alliances in New Netherland.

¹⁶³ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 185.

¹⁶⁴ However, Kieft consistently argued that the colonists were primarily responsible for the onset of war, since their own representatives forced his hands to order the attack on the Wicckquaeskecks. He further argued that it was the responsibility of the *Twelve* men to warn the settlers of their impending attack.

¹⁶⁵ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 153-155, 190-203.

guilders; that N. Netherland should be mortgaged to the English as security for the payment thereof.”¹⁶⁶ With this payment, John Underhill, a key strategist and veteran of the recent Pequot War, was hired and the Dutch offensive was renewed in the spring of 1644. After an unsuccessful expedition against the Raritans on Staten Island, the English and Dutch combined strategically to decimate the Canarsee, Massapequa and other Indians living on the western end of Long Island. Captain Underhill brought with him two companies of 120 to 150 volunteers and Mohegan scouts. Underhill’s company proceeded to kill over 500 Indian men, women and children on Long Island. Kieft then declared a day of thanksgiving. Other attacks were mounted against the Indians. Underhill’s army also attacked Indian encampments north of Stamford, Connecticut, killing some 700 people before sunrise on a single day. During Kieft’s War, Captain Underhill again fulfilled his reputation as the “scourge of the Indians” and exercised his unusual Christian belief that “Scripture declareth women and children must perish with their parents.”¹⁶⁷ By the time the Indian sachems came to make peace at Fort Amsterdam, they and their allies had purportedly lost at least 1,600 of their people in the fighting. The Dutch still had their hands bound, however, because the various Munsee bands, that had suffered more than 1,000 dead, refused to stop fighting.¹⁶⁸

By the summer of the following year, the Dutch and Wappingers used the Mahicans’ influence to establish a tenuous peace. The remaining Munsees, realizing their tribe was threatened with extinction, finally agreed to terms. A treaty, brokered by the Mohawks and Mahicans, was signed on August 30, 1645.¹⁶⁹ It made the Wappingers and western Munsees subjects of the Mahicans, forcing them to pay an enormous annual tribute of wampum to the

¹⁶⁶ E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 185.

¹⁶⁷ For a discussion of John Underhill and his activities during the Pequot War see, Michael LeRoy Oberg, *Uncas: First of the Mohegans* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 67-68.

¹⁶⁸ For a discussion of the number of Indians killed see E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 186-187.

¹⁶⁹ For the full details of the treaty see Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 278-280.

Mahicans. This agreement effectively put the Mahicans (and indirectly the Mohawks, to whom the Mahicans paid tribute according to the treaty of 1628) in control of the wampum trade on Long Island. The Mahicans, however, did not collect the tribute personally, but used the Wappingers as collection agents.¹⁷⁰

2.6

By August 30, 1645, Kieft's War had ended and on August 31, 1645 a day of general thanksgiving was planned for September 6.¹⁷¹ Peace was celebrated, but it was a bitter-sweet celebration. Many of those who did not leave to return to the Fatherland had succumbed during the war. Manhattan was left with only 100 white male settlers. Much about the war had shocked the settlers: the surprising strength of the Indians; the rampant acts of brutality, especially by the settlers who were supposed to be civilized Christians; and the devastation and destruction it left behind. During the celebration of peace, the cannons were fired; one of the cannons, a six-pounder, exploded killing Jacobsen Roy, a gunner. Many in the community wondered what this mis-firing meant – was it a sign from God, of his displeasure with them; was He signifying His unwillingness to grant them peace unless they cleansed themselves from the sins of the war?

It seems that there were many who felt the need to be cleansed. Although the writer of the anti-Kieft pamphlet entitled *Broad Advice to the United Netherland Provinces* is unknown, it is apparent that it was written not only to condemn Willem Kieft but also to alleviate a sense of wrongdoing. It begins and ends with biblical admonitions. Opening with the Biblical verse in Isaiah Chapter 1, it admonishes the Netherlanders that “your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil; Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.” For

¹⁷⁰ For a discussion of the August 1645 treaty see Allen W. Trelease, *Indian Affairs in Colonial New York: The Seventeenth Century* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 82-84.

¹⁷¹ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 280-281.

the writer, God was beckoning to the Dutch settlers: “Come now...saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” How the colonists decided to deal with the events of Kieft’s War, the writer felt, held significance not only for the “fatherless,” “the widow,” or the “oppressed,” but it could determine much about the colony’s future, even its very existence: “if you be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land’ But if you refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.”¹⁷²

What would the colonists do? How would they respond to the admonition that came from “the mouth of the Lord?” The *Counsel of Eight*, upon whom the settlers now relied, had no legal executive power that Director-General Kieft felt compelled to recognize. The war had brought them together as a people and a community. Those who stayed behind and did not flee, those who did not retreat to the safety of Holland, felt a closeness, a connection and affinity that is probably similar to that shared by men in battle. More than ever, they had concluded that their futures, their hopes and vision for Manhattan, their new home, were not the same as those of the Company and its representative Director-General Kieft. Their plans were often frustrated by Governor Kieft. When *the Eight* protested his methods of taxation, Kieft declared, “in this

¹⁷² Henry C. Murphy, trans., “Broad Advice,” 239. Quoted from Isaiah 1: 12-20. Although the writer of the “Broad Advice” is unknown, Henry Murphy proffers the opinion that “judging from the work itself, we may reasonably attribute it to Cornelis Melyn himself, whose cause it so zealously espouses; or to his dictation, as he had returned to Holland, on his banishment from New Netherland, at the time of the publication, and was a native of Antwerp, where it was printed.” However, the heavy emphasis on religious arguments, suggests that the writer was a devout Christian. If so, then Joachim Pietersen Kuyter seems like a more likely candidate for its authorship, as his contemporaries often described him as a devout Christian and he was in Holland at the same time traveling with Melyn. Furthermore, the particular care that is taken in defending Reverend Everardus Bogardus, suggests also that a devout member of New Amsterdam’s Dutch Reformed Church wrote it. Since Kuyter was an Elder of the Church and one of the members of New Amsterdam’s consistory, he seems like a more apt candidate for the pamphlet’s authorship. Finally, the manner in which the verses from Isaiah seem to imply a personal admonition from God, a sense of personal guilt, indicating that perhaps the writer took part in some of the massacres, again points to Joachim Pietersen Kuyter, who accompanied Captain Underhill as the captain of the forces of burghers during the massacre of the Long Island, Staten Island and New England Indians. These were some of the most bloodiest battles, with the greatest amount of Native American casualties. One can understand why he would want to “cleanse” his hands or why he would feel that he had blood on his hands and needed to be washed as white as snow.

country, I am my own master and may do as I please.”¹⁷³ In response to the will of the people *the Eight* sent a petition to the authorities in Holland, but not to the Directors of the DWIC; it was sent to the States General advising them of the critical situation and asking for Kieft’s recall. One year later, on July 28, 1646, Governor Kieft was ordered to return to Holland and respond to charges against him, and to explain his actions during the War.

Reverend Everardus Bogardus was one of the enraged colonists, calling the Director-General “a child of the devil” from the pulpit.¹⁷⁴ On one occasion, Bogardus said that if Kieft would not behave himself he would give him such a “shake from the pulpit the next Sabbath as would make him tremble like a bowl of jelly.”¹⁷⁵ This tongue-lashing resulted in Kieft refusing to attend services and set into motion a feud between the colony’s civil and religious authority at a time when unity was sorely needed.¹⁷⁶ At issue, once again, was Willem Kieft and Everardus Bogardus’ divergent views on church-state authority. Director-General Kieft and his “Council” took the Remonstrant position that the civic authorities were sovereign, exercising final authority in both civil and ecclesiastical affairs. On the other hand, Reverend Bogardus espoused the views of the Counter-Remonstrants that while the Dutch Reformed Church must remain autonomous from the State in the areas of doctrine and ecclesiastical polity, the civil and ecclesiastical realms of the society were inextricably linked and that state authorities should be open to advice from the ecclesiastical authorities even on the most purely civil matters.¹⁷⁷ Ideally, Bogardus envisioned a harmonious society where the civil authorities would support the sovereignty of the Dutch Reformed Church and faith above all others and would also obey the advice of the religious authorities in order to preserve society’s order. Kieft, however, held to the opinion that since the

¹⁷³ Henry C. Murphy, trans., “Broad Advice,” 262. See also E. B. O’Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 212.

¹⁷⁴ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 291.

¹⁷⁵ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 291.

¹⁷⁶ Henry C. Murphy, trans., “Broad Advice,” 260-261.

¹⁷⁷ George Smith, *Religion and Trade in New Netherland: Dutch Origins and American Development* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1973), 131.

civil authorities were sovereign, it was the duty of the religious authorities to support the agenda, policies and authority of the civil authorities unequivocally from the pulpit.

The brutality of the war and the subsequent devastation it wrought upon the colony had incensed Bogardus. Like the other colonists, Bogardus had a vested interest in the future of the colony. He was a landowner, he was married in the colony, he sired several children, and for all intents and purposes he had cast his lot with the future and well-being of the colony. Now, the colony was decimated, and like the leading burghers of the community, he held Director-General Kieft responsible.¹⁷⁸ His opinions and decisions were as much influenced by his views on church-state authority as it was by the fact that he was a settler. Unlike Kieft, Bogardus did not intend to return to Holland. He had made his wealth in the colony; he gained prestige, wealth, and power, beyond what he could have possessed in Holland. And like the leading burghers, Bogardus sought Kieft's recall. The leading burghers were fairly unanimous in placing the responsibility for the war squarely on Kieft's shoulders; they argued that it was his war, that it was engendered by him without the approval of the community, and the responsibility for its failure was therefore his to bear.

However, when Kieft was later recalled, it did not satisfy the settlers nor silence the discussions about the war. Instead the end of the war signaled the beginning of a contest for meaning. There were those who felt that Kieft had to be punished in order for the colony to flourish. Many others were outraged; many settlers felt that the Natives got the best of them in decimating the colony, and some spoke of the shame and lowered perception that others (English, Swedes and Indians) had of the Dutch after the war.¹⁷⁹ However, the vast majority of people felt that the barbarity and savagery of the war had to be explained. Yet, when one considers that after the massacre during the night of February 25, several of the settlers had petitioned Kieft to attack

¹⁷⁸ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 291-298.

¹⁷⁹ See Henry C. Murphy, trans., "Broad Advice." The entire pamphlet, it can be argued, was published because of the shame the author felt regarding the events of Kieft's War.

the Munsees living on Long Island, who had remained peaceful towards them during all the tension, it becomes quite difficult to place all the blame for the war on Kieft's shoulders; particularly when one considers that Kieft refused to sanction violence against these Long Island Indians.¹⁸⁰

Considering these points, one cannot help but to wonder whether there would be as great an outrage by the Dutch, both in the colony and in the Fatherland, if Kieft had been successful in his decimation of the Natives – if the Natives had not come so close to eliminating the Dutch settlement at the tip of Manhattan Island and bring to a close the Dutch colonial experimentation in North America? That these *Wilden* – these inferior, “stupid,” “uncivil,” *wilden*, as Reverend Jonas Michaëlius described the Natives – had been so successful in “taking charge of the colony,” had to be explained.¹⁸¹ Did it mean that the Indians were superior to the Dutch, since they mastered them in battle? The Dutch settlers' seventeenth century worldview and epistemology could not allow such an explanation to take firm shape in their minds. Nothing in their past understandings about themselves and about Native Americans, non-Christians and especially non-Europeans, could have provided such a thought with enough force to sustain it, that it might grow to be more than just a fleeting notion of a mere vapor of an idea. No, such a thought it seems likely would have been suffocated, banished and eradicated from the mind before it even took firm root. Instead, the settlers turned to one of the few explanations that allowed them to maintain their sense of superiority: God had selected to use the gross things of the world, these *Wilden*, to punish them for their sinfulness.¹⁸²

¹⁸⁰ “Journal of New Netherland,” in *NNN*, 277.

¹⁸¹ Albert Eekhof, *Jonas Michaëlius, Founder of the Church in New Netherland; His Life and Work; Together with the Facsimile, Transcription and English Translation of an Extensive Unknown Autograph Latin Letter* (Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff's Publishing Company, 1926), 132.

¹⁸² E. B. O'Callaghan, *DRCHNY*, Vol. I: 190. According to the Eight Men, “Almighty God finally, through his righteous judgment, hath in this current year kindled around us the fire of an Indian war in which not only numbers of innocent people, men, women and children, have been murdered in their houses and at their work, and swept into captivity (whereby this place with all its inhabitants is come to the greatest ruin).”

In this, the minister was also culpable; he was to set an example, but the settlers and the DWIC argued that his drinking, arguing, dissolute life was helping to bring God's righteous judgment on the colony.¹⁸³ And although the Councilmen and burghers were no friends of Willem Kieft, the events of the War had made it now very necessary that Reverend Bogardus repent and change his ways. In the past, they had overlooked his drinking and dissolute life, and they had sided with him against Lubbertus van Dincklagen when as schout-fiscal van Dincklagen charged Bogardus with mismanaging the affairs of the church. Now, the war had changed everything. They could no longer ignore such behavior, especially among the leading men of the colony. Their outspoken condemnation of Reverend Bogardus signaled a shift in the larger community's acceptance of certain behavior.

On May 11, 1647, the new Director-General, Peter Stuyvesant, arrived to replace Director-General Kieft. However, so much had changed in the colony – particularly in the minds of the colonists. Stuyvesant was inheriting a colony and a group of inhabitants that were very different from the ones that greeted Kieft when he first arrived in the colony. These settlers had seen the potential of Manhattan – they experienced the benefits of a growing population, they thought they were beginning to experience the security of a more settled colony, they had created roots that were thriving (economic, social, and communal), they experienced a flourishing colony – only to have that prematurely ripped from them. It made them angry. This anger fueled their resolve to see Kieft, whose position as Director-General made him the prime target of their ire, and others they deemed responsible, punished for their actions. But it also underscored their determination to ensure that in the future the people's trust would not be similarly abused, or that the stability of the colony would not be similarly threatened.

¹⁸³ Arnold J. F. Van Laer, trans., and Kenneth Scott and Kenn Styker-Rodda, eds., *NYHM: Dutch*, IV: 291-296.