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CHAPTER I

THE WILDMAN AS A MARVEL: A LITERARY PROLOGUE

Were I in England now, as once I was, and had but this fish painted, not a holiday fool there but would give a piece of silver ... Any strange beast there makes a man: when they will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar, they will lay out ten to see a dead Indian.

William Shakespeare.
As the sixteenth century closed, England possessed only the dimmest and flimsiest ideas about the new world. Despite Spain's presence there for almost a hundred years and the appearance of books and pamphlets dealing with America, the bulk of Englishmen remained ignorant about the new continent. To them America's outline was vague, filled with inexplicable miracles and stupefying terrors. But the little that was known fed an intense and growing curiosity, especially about the native Americans. Nor is this surprising, for an absorbing preoccupation with primitive man can be traced to the beginnings of western thought. England inherited many of these ideas. Its conception of the American Indian would be shaped by them.

English colonists of the seventeenth century did not approach the American Indian with an open mind. Instead, attitudes to the natives were molded by the culture to which the colonists belonged. As heir to the Renaissance, the seventeenth century looked back to the classics hard and studiously. There it found a tradition of primitivism which emerged as the classical world looked at those men outside of its civilization. The nature of such men, their attributes and their significance remained unsolved questions. Even so, the debate had assumed a certain form, and some of these conventions for approaching primitive "savage" peoples were adopted by England as it began colonizing America.

Two main ideas controlled classical thinking about primitive man, the first normally being called chronological primitivism. Every society has looked back to its origins and been aware that its ancestors were less developed culturally. Greece looked back to its forbears
respectfully, their simple unrestrained life became more attractive as social conventions and controls multiplied. A nostalgia for the beginnings of society linked itself to the belief that these early times were somehow better. The dream of a lost paradise haunted the imagination of the Greeks and a yearning for past halcyon days can be traced back to the folk culture which antedated their literature. Hesiod subscribed to these conventions and gave the first literary expression to the idea of the Golden Age. Homer, too, recalled a past that was simpler and more virtuous. Similar myths were carried into Roman literature. Virgil and Livy allude to an early time before envy, greed and corruption existed. However, chronological primitivism had its darker side. The feeling that life had once been less secure, peaceful and comfortable was also widespread. Lucretius, looking back to the origins of Roman society, found no ideal state of nature. Instead, there was a cruel environment against which man had to struggle — squalid, without society or even the basis of morality.

As the classical world expanded, it encountered peoples who appeared less civilized. Cultural or geographical primitivism describes how scholars dealt with these confrontations. Primitive man was met by at least three different kinds of response. First, there was a willingness to view him in mythical terms. Herodotus in his travels located a wild savage people in far distant western Libya. Alexander's Indian campaign gave rise to accounts of primitive men far away to the East. Such distance encouraged literary license in describing primitives. Ctesias, a Greek who for seventeen years lived in the Persian court, left a rather untrustworthy account of his stay.
He included fanciful and exotic tales of strange animals and monstrous men. In his *Natural History*, Pliny compiled many fanciful and absurd accounts of primitive men. The classical world was intrigued rather than appalled by wild men and its writers satisfied this thirst for the exotic.

From at least the fourth century, the Scythians and later the Ethiopians were to the ancients very much what the North American Indian was to the Primitivists of the seventeenth century. Viewed in real rather than mythical terms, primitive man was held up as an example by social reformers. In the German tribes, Tacitus found the example of a simple, virile and virtuous people to hold up to a Rome newly fallen to decadence. The *Germania* is not just a description of Teutonic life but a contrast drawn with didactic intent.

Finally, there was an outlook which was frankly critical of primitive man. In the confident flush of the Greek renaissance, there seemed little that could be learned from the primitive peoples. Indeed to be beyond the pale of civilization implied cultural inferiority. This is what Aristotle meant when he said that barbarians were "natural outcasts" who were "tribeless, lawless, heartless". As they were inferior in every sense, Aristotle agreed with Homer that such primitive peoples should be ruled over by the Greeks. Cultures, peoples, things could be graded and fit into an ontological scale. These same ideas found their echo in Roman literature. Cicero, among the first to celebrate Greek culture, was well pleased with the evolving civilization of which he was part. His cultural egocentrism found expression in an unfavorable view of primitive man.
This strain of classical anti-primitivism found support within medieval thought. Classical primitivism conflicted with certain parts of Christian doctrine. The ideal of man's first, simple life did not have the same appeal it had for the ancients. To Christian tradition, the ideal state of nature was epitomized in the life of Adam and Eve in paradise. Adam's fall into Original Sin ended this period of primeval innocence. Any attempt to argue that other men had known this first innocence was denied by the doctrine of the Fall of Man. The Scriptures imply that all men issued from Adam's seed, the inference being that all men were tainted with Original Sin and that no Golden Age existed after the expulsion from paradise. None the less, Medieval Christianity celebrated man's simple life close to nature. It had this much in common with Cynic and Stoic philosophy. The legendary friendship of Seneca and St. Paul supported this sharing of ideas. But the Middle Ages could not totally agree with the ancients. It was noticed that such men as the primitivists looked back to lived simply and beyond the temptations of complex society, but they lived in ignorance of the Scriptures. Even the Brahmins, that simple Hindu tribe whom Alexander was supposed to have met as he campaigned in India, and who exemplified the asceticism so much admired by the Middle Ages, were not Christians. The Brahmins, though good people, were still wanting of God's word.

A new answer to the question of social origins had been provided by the Scriptures. Chronological primitivism, so compelling for the classical world, became less important for the Middle Ages. But other problems remained and one of the most persistent was that explaining man's ethnic diversity. The legend of the Flood told of an evil world
destroyed by God's wrath and then repopulated by the progeny of the sons of Noah. Ham, the youngest, was associated with Africa, Sham with Asia and Japheth with Europe. Noah's youngest was cursed for his impetuous passion. In punishment, Ham's descendents became a breed of wild men of dark complexion. They were outcasts who lived in the desert or wilderness. As hunters, they were simple, rude men whose simple, rude life was part of their curse.

The myth of the Three Kings dealt with ethnic diversity more favorably. In Matthew II of the Bible, foreign visitors to the newly born Christ are described in rather vague terms as an unspecified number of Magi. Over a period of time, these kings became a colorful and intimately described trio. From the thirteenth century, the racial difference among the kings received attention. From then on, they became closely related to the non-European races. This view elevated the primitive peoples by representing them as elaborately dressed kings.

Quite another line of thought followed the implication of mankind having descended from Adam. If all men came from the same sire, this meant that they were all, in some general sense, equal. To claim that some men were outcasts ran counter to this argument and also conflicted with the Gospels which offered salvation to anyone who possessed a human soul. If wildmen were fundamentally inferior, this could only mean that they were possessed of an animal and not a human soul. Christians found it difficult to envisage the notion of man with an animal soul for it suggested a misfire of God's creative powers. It was this position that Augustine found himself in when he argued that
ail men, even the creature of Medieval travel mythology, were equal on the basis of having souls.

The final tendency which shows Medieval support for anti-primitivism was its view of primitive man as monster. Man living beyond society was not bound by the conventions which restrained basic human impulses. Wildmen were beyond such controls; they were conjured up by the Medieval imagination to describe what life would be like if man gave direct expression to his animal impulses. The sexual and cultural anarchy which this view anticipated represent only the gloomy view of primitive man. Juxtaposed to this view was that of a free, uninhibited man, un fettered by the rigid social controls of the Middle Ages. From this vantage, nature came to be seen as a garden in which lived the wildman — spontaneous, happy and fulfilled. This picture was vividly drawn by medieval folklore whilst an increasingly benign view of nature was accepted by the high culture of the same period.

Overriding the unflattering view of primitive man was an inclination to see him favorably. This development came out of the press of at least three different forces. Wildmen had long been representatives of faraway countries. During the Middle Ages, this exotic view of primitive man became more prevalent. One simple explanation for this would point to how little geography was known by the Middle Ages. Europe's parameters were closed tight as Islam laid siege to the continent. Lacking direct contact with distant countries, the Middle Ages looked back to the classics. The accounts of Alexander's Indian campaign were consulted, though more popular were the
Roman historians Pliny and especially Solinas. Such texts had already wandered from what might be called "facts", and as such tales were made to accommodate Biblical and Gothic myths, they became even more distorted. Unchecked because of the profound provincialism of the Middle Ages, these tales knew no bounds. Medieval pantologists such as Isidore of Seville and Honorius of Autun accepted accounts of the fabulous men of the East and their improbable attributes without a flicker of doubt. In the _Travels of Sir John Mandeville_, such literature reached its quintessence. This work of fiction related tales of men with eyes in their chests, pygmies who fought with stalks, and, oddest of all, men with a single huge foot which they used as a parasol to shade themselves when the sun became too hot. Until well into the early modern period, travel literature carried a heavy freight of legend and pure foible. Even a man like Roger Bacon, normally so careful about his sources, fell prey to such tales. They found their way into Petrarch and _Imago Mundi_ by Pierre d'Ailly, one of the books which influenced Columbus.

Ignorance alone does not explain why the Middle Ages viewed the wildmen so fondly. It has been shown that the Medieval mind had an antic quality which forced its thinking off the lines of straight rationality. An authority on the subject has this to say:

> Inexactitude, credulity, levity, inconsistency, are all common features of medieval reasoning... A mentality, dominated like that of the declining Middle Ages, by a lively imagination, by naive idealism and by strong feeling, easily believes in the reality of every concept which presents itself to the mind.15

It is not surprising that the reality which Medieval literature furnished seems to a modern view fabricated and contrived.
Such an outlook has been explained in terms of a cultural breakdown during the Middle Ages. The nobility was slowly losing its power as nascent capitalism transformed traditional society. Seeking to stall such changes, the aristocracy preempted the official culture which it imbued with the archaic chivalric code. Under this placid surface, a yearning for a simpler, more virtuous life sought a voice. Writers and artists who gave cultural expression to this struggle put their desire for liberation in the form of a gentle wildman, innocent and content within a bucolic state of nature.

Beyond Europe, other factors help explain this favorable view emerging toward primitive man. The Middle Ages was powerfully affected by the military powers which challenged its borders. Islam's military threat was very real and was feared. In 1164, Prester John wrote a letter to the Emperor in Constantinople. He described himself as a ruler over a fabulous realm in the East, a region of unimaginable wealth and military prowess. A professing Christian, he loomed to a beleaguered Europe as a potential ally. The presence of King John lingered in Europe. As late as the fourteenth century, it was rumored that his ambassadors were visiting. As the outside threat increased, many official envoys carried letters addressed to John. Even as late as DaGama's voyage, such letters were being written. As king of a legendary Ethiopia, Prester John encouraged speculation about the riches and peoples of such distant lands.

And so Europe brought to the Age of Exploration an extensive body of myth, reality and legend which dealt with primitive man. This body of thought was in no real way cohesive. Many of its lines
were crossed. Nor was a consistent attitude toward primitive man maintained. The wildman was variously the embodiment of prehistoric man, a fearful monster, and, a rather fanciful creature who evoked faraway lands. Each of these conceptions accomplished different functions within European culture. Primitive man was used as a bridge over ignorance, as a means of social control and as a device for bringing social change. As primitive man became a conceptual device for European culture, so he was viewed in a figurative rather than in a literal way. By the end of the Middle Ages there had consolidated a conception of the primitive man that was both mythical and favorable.

The Middle Ages, drawing upon classical allusions and the vague fantastic accounts of its travellers, kept alive the idea of the wildman as myth and fable. As the New World was discovered, real wildmen were encountered. Such meetings prompted a more accommodating view of primitive man than the one inherited from the previous age. The native Americans did not quite fit into the mold of the orthodox wildman. As more and more information accumulated, the wildman evolved from an imaginary phenomenon into a real one. Travellers to Africa and Asia had their outlook formed by the tales and legends which described these lands. America, apart from the notions of a Lost Atlantis or the Earthly Paradise, was unknown to such legends. The approach to the American aborigine was thus made less complicated.

The change in outlook to primitive man pivoted on the year 1600. With the new century, preconceptions drawn from mythology began to yield to observations drawn from actual contact. It might be supposed that this change would have occurred sooner; America, after all, had
been known for over a hundred years. Thomas More's *Utopia* which appeared as early as 1516 was one of the earliest works of English literature to be inspired by the New World. The book has been pointed to as a harbinger of the changing view of the Indian. Certainly, More found many of the details for his book listening to the reports about Brazilian natives, told him by sailors in Antwerp. His *Utopia* was an island supporting an ideal society. More placed it vaguely in the west as though to describe the new lands which so fired his imagination. But no actual description was undertaken, for *Utopia* means "no place" and the places and people mentioned in the book are purely imaginary. More followed an older tradition which put faraway people and places in the realm of the unreal. His objective was not to idealize a transatlantic society but to launch an attack on European wickedness. By couching this attack in the language of fable, More sought to spare himself the official recrimination usual for such social criticism.

Curiosity about wildmen grew apace of New World exploration. So long as England's role in this process remained small, hard information about America remained limited, and speculative, imaginative works could go unchallenged. What geographical interest was generated was often repressed by jealous mariners. At least until half a century after Columbus, England gained most of its intelligence of America and its people from the reports of other nations. The historians of New Spain captured first attention because of Spain's leadership in exploration. Translations of such works were not available until the middle of the sixteenth century. Eden's edition of the *Decades of the newe world of West India* by Peter Martyr did not appear until 1555.
There were a few accounts of the English voyagers; Edward Hayes and John Dee chronicled these pioneer explorations. It was not until her closer contact with America, however, that the English contribution to the literature dealing with the New World became substantial.

Popular interest was turned toward America by the concurrent forces of an increasing interest in the voyages of exploration, rising expectations for trade and a flush of nationalism as England defied Spain and became a colonizer of the New World.

In 1588, a quite remarkable book displayed a wholly new perspective on the North Carolina Indians, in particular, and on primitive man, in general. Thomas Hariot, a professor of mathematics at Oxford, was chosen by Raleigh to go with the expedition of 1585 and keep the official record. A brief and true report of the newly found land of Virginia is an accurate and readable statement by a clear and precise thinker. Hariot's careful, scientific observations did much to deflate the fanciful speculation which for so long had dominated thinking about primitive man. If the work of one man was seminal in affecting an English tradition of primitivism, that man must be Richard Hakluyt. He made his life's work the collection and publication of materials left by English travellers and explorers. The first part of this work to reach the press, the *Divers Voyages Touching the Discoverie of America*, appeared in 1582. This mighty compilation drew together the writings of more than forty travellers and geographers. As many of these accounts described the native American, the Indian emerged as a real entity. These accounts, quite influential, were known by many who ventured to the New World. Virtually every ship that came to the colonies in the seventeenth century carried a copy of the *Voyages.*
Even though some of the older myths concerning the wildman were being displaced by the new information collected by the explorers, the older myths were slow to die. The Renaissance outlook was taken to the frontier of discovery and an empirical tradition helped form a rational response to the people of the new found land. But Elizabethan England also had strong ties to the Middle Ages and many ideas, primitivism included, flowed from the past. A clearer, more scientific view of the wildman did not emerge fresh-minted in 1600. A conflict between myth and reality would continue through the seventeenth century.

Elizabethan England saw the Indian as he was depicted in the many tracts and broadsheets which celebrated the exploits of England's explorers. The native American was also portrayed on the stage, appearing more frequently as the New World captured the literary imagination of the day. Of more telling effect were the many Indians who were brought to court and country. These visitors stirred great interest. They were feted at court and scholars and clerics sought converse with them whilst speculators displayed them on public exhibition.

Contact with the wildman in the flesh revealed a creature whose many facets were difficult to assemble into a composite picture. For most, a collection of stereotypes sufficed. On the one hand were the hospitable, gentle people who had sweetened Europe's first contact with the Indies. Hakluyt, following Columbus and Martyr, had them "most gentle loving and faithful voide of all guile and treason". But an unfavorable view lurked beneath this generally favorable
impression. Indians were, after all, wildmen who ate raw flesh and whose unpredictable savagery marked them off from Europeans. This demarcation was further recommended by their racial difference. Although the Elizabethans did not differentiate between the various Indian races, the realization that the Indian was racially quite different from the Englishman went unchallenged. This racial distinction ultimately worked to the Indians' disadvantage. Cannibalism among some Indian tribes contributed to a nascent disapproval and censure. Interlacing the favorable and unfavorable views was that of the Indian as exotic. The possession of a strange, unintelligible tongue, of elaborate clothing and strange and ingenious boats, of weapons and other artifacts all appealed to a sixteenth century imagination. The Indian became a figure of pantomime. A fanciful personage, he became well known on the popular stage. This view of the Indian should not be dismissed as ephemeral. It echoed earlier traditions which acknowledged the mystery surrounding faraway peoples.

It is typical that the imagination which dominated the age should have sought to resolve the dilemma of conceptualizing the Indian. The Tempest, inspired by the famous shipwreck on Bermuda in 1609, gave to England a composite picture of the Indian in the character of Caliban. Shakespeare drew together what was known of the American savage and created much more than merely a stereotype. For Caliban was a human being with senses and appetites. In his seeing Trinculo as a god and in his knowledge of how to live from nature, Caliban steps straight out of Hakluyt. By giving Caliban a distorted appearance, Shakespeare took license with his character. The "disproportioned"
body of that "poor credulous monster" bespeak his moral shortcomings. Shakespeare put aside the noble savage of Montaigne and gave his age a being who groped his way from savagery to civilization.

An exotic and fanciful view of America remained intact until English colonization got seriously underway. America was reflected in the literary imagination of the age which presented a favorable image of primitive man. This view was reinforced by actual accounts of English explorers. According to Arthur Barlow who steered England's first colonizing voyage to the shores of America in 1589, the Indians were "most gentle, loving and faithfull, void of all guile, and treason, and such as lived after the manner of the golden age..." David Ingram, stranded for years in America, wrote upon his return to England of the generous nature of the natives who were "naturally very courteous". At the center of such accounts is the fable of utopia, an unspoiled land where men lived in the golden age. Such observations were not lost on the writers who incorporated such descriptions directly into their literature. Ideas of an Earthly Paradise and Golden Age appealed to the imagination of the time.

Before he became either a threat or an impediment to settlement, the Indian was most important as a literary fiction. Viewed in vague, glowing, sanguine terms, the Indian was a product of fanciful escapism. By the first decade of the seventeenth century, a powerful colonial impulse was beginning to sharpen the focus on this picture. Those men who interested themselves in this quest for empire were most decidedly of a practical frame of mind. Hakluyt, Peckham and Smith had quite a different outlook from Spencer, Sidney, Chapman and Shakespeare. But
these men who looked to America in terms of its colonial potential still brought the past with them as they translated the language of empire into Christian terms. This was to have a profound effect upon the conception of the Indian.
Notes to Chapter I:


3. Ibid., 222-242.


24. Cawley, *The Voyagers and Elizabethan Drama*, 344-95 for a discussion and documentation of Indian stereotypes as they appeared on the English stage and in other writings of the period.

25. Sidney Lee, "The American Indian in Elizabethan England", in *Elizabethan and Other Essays*, ed., Frederick S. Boas, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1929), takes a position in opposition to Cawley by arguing that the dramatic conception of the Indian was frivolous and insignificant. Lee maintains that the one notable exception was Shakespeare.


CHAPTER II

AN IMPERIAL VIEW OF THE INDIAN

Anthropology is not a dispassionate science like astronomy which springs from the contemplation of things at a distance. It is the outcome of a historical process which has made the larger part of mankind subservient to the other, and during which millions of human beings have had their resources plundered and their institutions and beliefs destroyed, whilst they themselves were ruthlessly killed, thrown into bondage, and contaminated by diseases which they were unable to resist. Anthropology is daughter to this era of violence: its capacity to assess more objectively the facts pertaining to the human condition reflects, on the epistemological level, a state of affairs in which one part of mankind treated the other as an object.

Claude Lévi-Strauss.
Nothing opened England's eyes to the new world and its inhabitants more than the great promotional campaign launched by the Virginia Company in 1609. Founded barely three years earlier, the enterprise was already in trouble. The easy profits which it had promised its investors had not materialized. Gold had not been found nor was trade with the natives viable. In fact, the colonists were starving; they had fallen to bickering and were unwilling or unable to grow even enough food to sustain themselves. England was alive with stories of great hardships suffered by the settlers, of the hard life Virginia offered and of the great financial losses taken by the company. Such talk bred criticism. Investors feared for their stock and clamored for reassurance or reimbursement. Even worse, the charter won from James I at the beginning of his reign seemed in danger of being revoked. Spain regarded Virginia, perched on the northern boundary of its American empire, as an impertinence. James I, eager for the success of the Spanish match, was in no mood to offend Spain. He gave ear to Gondomas, the Spanish ambassador, and it was rumored that he had considered abandoning the struggling colony. Other critics challenged the activities of the company on legal grounds, arguing that the colony had no rights to Indian territory.

So, the friends of the company rallied. In 1609, due in large part to the efforts of Sir Thomas Smythe, who held the confidence of the King, a new charter was granted. This new arrangement gave the investors much more authority. Under the first charter, ultimate executive authority lay with the King; now the company council dictated a vigorous new policy. The company would launch a campaign
to collect further stock subscriptions. Nothing was new about such a promotion. Virginia had been planted by a private enterprise which was obliged to advertise for its capital and settlers. But since the future of the company rested upon the success of this particular campaign, all efforts were directed to make it the widest and most forceful appeal so far.

It seemed natural to the promoters that they should look to the clergy to advertise their schemes for settlement and investment. The pulpit was actively used for disseminating new ideas and much social and political comment was put abroad by the preachers. In an age when religion held central importance, nothing seemed more natural than that big events should assume a religious import and meaning. The pulpit was in any event the only mass medium and the company was in a good position to recruit its use. Sir Thomas Smythe, the first treasurer of the company, was besides being a very busy merchant, a pious man. He believed that the Gospel and trade went well together and he convinced the clergy who held him in high regard. The company's cause could thus benefit from the very considerable prestige of the clergy. Among its battery of apologists was no less a man than John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's and one of the leading spirits of his age. But the clergy did not need to be persuaded of the Virginia Company's case. The attempt thus far to establish a colony in the new world had met with the clergy's widespread support. Many Anglican preachers, especially among the puritans, were convinced expansionists. A puritan faction, guided by Sir Francis Walsingham, had from the 1570's urged that Spain's ambitions in the new world be curbed. Nothing
seemed as desirable as a protestant settlement to counter-balance Spain's catholic empire in America. Richard Hakluyt cast his lot with this same group. It was the strong churchmen of a puritan persuasion who were the prime movers in the earliest colonial activities. Men like John Pym, Sir Edwin Sandys and Thomas Gates brought more than a mercantile interest to their plans for overseas settlement. Even at this early date, they saw the possibilities of religious settlement. Sandys was long suspected of harboring designs to establish a republican and puritan state in America. The English puritans, closeknit like a large family, looked to the churchmen of their persuasion to sound common cause.

The sermons, quickly printed, came off the press in rapid succession from 1609. They held profound interest for those puritans who would shortly become the settlers of New England. Any information of that faraway and dimly known place was, of course, welcome. But facts ordered by a puritan outlook had the stamp of added authority. These tracts show a puritan mentality grappling with the reality of the new world and its inhabitants. It is no surprise that this body of literature molded the preconceptions which the puritans took to New England.

Virginia rose to public attention at a critical juncture in the history of England's colonial enterprise. As the seventeenth century opened, Britain's career as a planter of colonies got off to a slow beginning. This is explained, in part, by a gradual unfolding of developments in international trade. Since the Middle Ages, English commerce had been dominated by two commodities -- fish and, more
importantly, wool. English wool bought naval supplies from the Baltic and spices and luxury goods from the Far East. Bristol was the focal point in a north-south route which linked Iceland and the Mediterranean through commerce in fish, grain, cloth and wine. From the second half of the sixteenth century, as the specie which Spain exported from the New World flooded into Europe, a general price rise occurred. English prices spiraled higher as Tudor monarchs debased the currency to pay for state expenses. In order to hold a sharply unfavorable balance of trade, English merchants had to increase the export of cloth, their main foreign currency earner. To do so meant putting more land to sheep-grazing. Sheep pushed the arable farmers off the land. The roads thronged with the unemployed and the country echoed with their complaints. But the traditional markets for English exports were not buoyant; the demand at Antwerp was declining and during the 1580's the ports of the Low Countries were closed, making the export problem temporarily worse.

The search for new markets became more determined. English trade ships crept around the coast of Africa in search of the eastern trade which for a century had been under Portugal's stern control. Now with Portugal swallowed by Spain and Spain itself weakening, it became possible for others to share in the benefits of the eastern trade. To the west Spain's dominion was unchecked but not unchallenged. The death of Mary Tudor released Britain from an unhappy relationship with Spain. With Elizabeth's accession in 1588, Mary's unpopular marriage to Philip and catholicism could be forgotten. With tacit consent from the new queen, English privateers harried the Spanish galleons and,
when they were not at war, risked capture and traded with their traditional enemy by supplying slaves taken from Africa. As Spain's grip on the New World weakened, Englishmen overlooked and ultimately denounced the sole territorial rights which Spain claimed to America. Paying little attention to Spanish pretensions, England planted its first colonies on American soil.

Although trade went well in the East, in the West the story was dispiriting. The American wilderness was not the trade haven of the East Indies and the attempt to settle Englishmen with their families, institutions and religion in an empty country was beset with frustrations. All efforts to settle colonists on Roanoke Island, Guinea and the West Indies had been abandoned. Nor was Ireland, long proposed as an overspill area for a crowded England, any more inviting. The plantation system floundered, and colonization underwent a crisis in confidence. But the tracts and sermons commissioned by the Virginia Company had a more immediate objective -- the success of a fresh stock issue. Not only did the apologists have to answer the queries and criticisms of those who feared for their investments, they also had to make a vigorous case for more money. The company literature had to answer three difficult questions. Firstly, why had the Virginia settlement failed to turn a profit so far? Then, was there any chance of future profitability? Finally, why should Englishmen support such a risky undertaking? The simplest response was to ignore such questions altogether and have lofty appeals to conscience, duty and patriotism take the place of calculated designs for money-making.
All were agreed that the English presence in Virginia should not only be Christian but Protestant. To persuade James to grant the charter of 1606, the patentees were careful to give clear expression of their intention to convert the Indians to Christianity. In the preamble to the charter, James held them to this promise:

We greatly commending and graciously accepting their desires for the furtherance of so noble a work, which may, by the providence of Almighty God, hereafter tend to the glory of his divine Majesty, in propagating of Christian religion to such people.  

John Smith's *A True Relation...*, hurried together during the troubled circumstances of Virginia's settlement, transcended such distractions to acknowledge the same guiding purpose. The colony would be dedicated "to the high glory of God, to the erection of true religion among infidells". William Symonds, preaching on behalf of the company even before the second charter had been issued, professed the same goal: "What blessing any Nation had by Christ, must be communicated to all nations: the office of his Profecie to teach the ignorant." In the second charter James granted to the company, he insisted that "the principal effect, which we can desire or expect of this action, is the conversion and reduction of the people of those parts unto the true worship of God and Christian religion." Nor was this goal eschewed by later proponents of the company's position. William Johnson, a London alderman who was later to be official of the company, urged support for this "high and acceptable worke, tending to advance and spread the kingdome of God, and the knowledge of his truth." The Reverend Daniel Price, preaching from St. Paul's Cross on May 28th, 1609, urged that England take the opportunity to make "a Savage
country become a sanctified country."

The company's professed objective of saving souls made a good first argument against those who complained about the lack of profits. To Robert Gray, who followed Symonds and preached the second official sermon, such pecuniary quibbles were small considerations: "happy is that man and blest of God, whom God hath endued, either with means or will to attempt this business." Such missionary talk successfully dispatched an expedition in the summer of 1609 to relieve the colony. But the company's troubles were not over. The command vessel was wrecked off Bermuda, leaving the troubled colony without a leader. As for profits, they were as faraway as ever. William Crashaw, a puritan of advanced if not extreme views, expressed himself harshly against the profit-hungry investors: "Tell them of getting XX in the C. oh how they bite at it, oh how it stirres them! But tell them of planting a church, of converting 1000. soules to God, they are as senseless as stones." He then quieted such complaints with the invocation "to forget our affections and to neglect our own private profit in respect of God's glories..." and followed this with the promise that "he that seeks only or principally spirituall things, God will reward him both with those spirituall and temporal things."

Although much ink was spilled proclaiming Virginia's commitment to missionary work among the Indians, surprisingly few were converted to christianity. Apart from the work of Alexander Whitaker and the Reverend Thorpe, little progress was made. The difficulties of planting a settlement were almost overwhelming and that any proselytizing was done at all is surprising. The missionary stance was much more
important as it affected the way in which the Indian was conceptualized. If he was not readily invited into a community of Christians, the Indian was viewed in relief against this religion.

The religious conviction which prompted the talk about missionary activity was real enough. So great was this religious preoccupation that the Indian was seen almost exclusively in spiritual terms. James I, whose missionary ambitions were expressed so fully in the 1606 charter, went on to describe the Indians as living "in darkness and miserable ignorance of the true knowledge and worship of God, conversion ... may in time bring the infidels and savages, living in those parts, to human civility and to a settled and quiet life." The Indians, beyond the bounds of religion, were also beyond civilization. John Smith's description of the Indians was influenced by his conviction of their spiritual deficiencies: "they gave such horrible shouts and screeches as many infernal hell hounds could not have been made more terrible." On another occasion, this same bias described an Indian "disguised with a great Skinner, his head hung round with little Skinnes of Weasels and other vermine with a Crownet of feathers on his head, painted as ugly as the divell." Exotic perhaps, picturesque even, but the spiritual connotation presents a much more sinister picture. Nothing was more damaging to the image of the Indian than the assumptions which were made about his religion. The Virginia Indians kept their religion secret from the English. Priests and conjurers had no intention of giving up the mystery of their profession to these pale-faced foreigners. The English did not go beyond their first impression that the Indians had an idolatrous religion whose observances were wild and barbarous. There was almost universal agreement that the Indians
worshipped the Devil himself. Smith claimed, "They say that they have conference with him, and fashion themselves as near to his shape as they can imagine." The belief that the Indians sacrificed their children to the Devil also had wide currency. Robert Gray, the rector of St. Benet Sherehog who was called to put his pen to work for the company, wrote: "in Virginia the people are savage and incredibly rude, they worship the diuill, offer their young children in sacrifice unto him, wander up and down like beasts..." Symonds was sure that the Indians knew "no God but the diuill, nor sacrifice, but to offer their men and children unto Moloch." Alexander Whitaker, who gave up a comfortable living in Yorkshire to take the Gospel to the Virginia natives, described his congregation as "naked slaves of the diuill".

The Indians, then, stood opposed to the religious conviction used to marshal English colonization. The very terms in which the Indian was described opposed him to the English. Nor should the natives be allowed to persist in their idolatry. This would be against God's desires. Hakluyt suggested that if the Indians resisted conversion, force might be used "to square and prepare them to our Preachers hands." But, more ominously, if the Indians did not freely meet with the word of God, this must mean they were implacable in their savagery. It was a small step from here to argue that if the Indians did not possess God, neither did they possess humanity. In fact, Robert Gray made this point: the Indians "by reason of their godless ignorance, & blasphemous Idolatrie, are worse than those beasts which are of most wilde and savage nature."
If the Indian was in league with the Devil, he was necessarily an adversary. Therefore, he was to be approached with caution.

Native Americans were regarded with a considerable amount of distrust. John Smith rumination that the Indians' behavior "...caused me to suspect some mischief". He felt Powhatan to be artful in deceit:

"...experience had well taught me to believe his friendship till opportunity suffered him to betray us." Johnson warned, "their strongest forces are flyights and trecherie, more to be warily prevented..." Even Whitaker cautioned, "let vs not thinke that these men are so simple as some have supposed them...they are a very understanding generation, quick of apprehension, subtile in their dealings, exquisit in their inventions..." Colonists who saw the Devil's hand behind all setbacks and difficulties would inevitably approach the Indians, widely thought to worship Satan, with some hesitation. Indian plots were thought to be undoing English colonization. Characteristic of his time, William Crashaw placed the blame on the Devil when mishaps blighted the company's much vaunted expedition of 1609 leaving the colony in disarray. He referred to the Indians as "the Savages, which since hath cost many a man his blood" and as the "deadly enemies" of the English. This opposition formed part of a bigger cosmic struggle: "And though Satan visibly and palpably reignes there, more then in any known place of the world: yet be of courage (blessed breatheren) God will treade Satan under your feet shortly,..."

According to Symonds, "The poeple, blessed be God, doe swarne in the land...insomuch that there is hardly room for one man to live by another." The poor abounded "...the rich shop-keeper hath the good
honest laborer at such advantage that he can grind his face—when he pleaseth." The solution, why, "stronge olde bees doe beat out the younger to swarme and hive themselves elsewhere." Robert Gray's A Good Speed to Virginia appeared in the bookshops soon after. It made the same argument, "Our multitudes, like too much bloud in the body, do infect our countrey with plague and poverty..." England should "send its overflowing multitudes abroad into other countreyes and provinces". This utilitarian theme carried with it a strong assumption concerning the nature of the Indian. Symonds asks what could be wrong with "the planting of a peaceable colony, in a waste country, where the people doe live but like Deere in herds." After all, Virginia before the English came was, according to Johnson, but "a wilderness, subject (for the most part) but to wilde beasts and fowles of the ayre, and to savage people, which have no Christian, nor ciuill view of anything." The Indians did not bring order to the land. Under their hands it remained a "waste country" or "wilderness". This, of course, was commensurate with their being primitives beyond the bounds of civilization. Symonds was among the first of a long line of expansionists to find justification in this well-worn phrase from Genesis, "Bring forth fruit and multiplie, and fill the earth, and subdue it." The implication was that the Indians, in ignoring this injunction, lost their title to the land.

It has already been argued that the literature prompted by the Virginia Company's promotional activities occupies a crucial position within the sweep of English colonial history. If Englishmen in defining themselves as imperialists had to find that assertive patriotism,
so much taken for granted in the nineteenth century, then such a quest was most damaging to the Indian's image. As might be expected of the churchmen so numerous among the company's apologists, the stiffening for English nationalism was found in the Bible. Symonds chose as the text for his sermon the promise made to Abraham in Genesis 12:1-3:

For the Lord had said vnto Abram, Get thee out of thy Countrey, and from thy Kindred, and from thy fathers house, vnto the land that I will show thee. And I will make thee a great nation, and will blesse thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing. I will blesse them also that blesse thee, and curse them that curse thee, and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.

Since "whatsoever was promised to Abram; is also promised to all that are of his faith and obedience", so the English became heirs to this promise. They became another chosen people destined to establish themselves in the New World -- the promised land. In the text used by Robert Gray's tract, a potential threat to the Indians is blinking clear. Gray took his passage from Joshua:

The children of Ioseph spake vnto Ioshua, saying, why hast thou giue me but one lot, and one portion to inherite, seeing I am a great people? Ioshua then answered, if thou beest much people, get thee up to the wood, and cut trees for thyself in the land of the Perizzites, & of the Giants, if mount Ephraim be too narrow for thee. Then the children of Ioseph said, the mountains will not be inough for vs, and all the Canaanites that dwell in the low countrey, haue Charets of Iron as well as they in Bethshean, and in the townes of the same, as they in the valley of Israel. And Ioshua spake vnto the house of Ioseph, to Ephraim, and Manasses, saying, Thou art a great people, and hast great power, and shalt not haue one lot. Therefore the Mountain shal be thine, for it is a wood, and thou shalt cut it downe, and the ends of it shal be thine, & thou shalt cast out the Canaanites thogh they have Iron Charets, and though they be strong.
He chose carefully. His was an argument for aggressive expansion. No one could doubt that the Canaanites and the Indians were synonymous.

If Symonds had argued the plausibility of peaceful coexistence, Gray chose a tougher line. Although he claimed that "there is no intend-
ment to take away from them (the Indians) by force that rightfull inheritance which they have in that Countrey", the force of Gray's argument took him to another position:

...All Polititians doe with one content, holde and mainaine, that a Christian King may lawfullie make warre uppon barbarous and Savage people, and such as live under no lawfull or warrantable gouernment, and may make a conquest of them, so that the warre bee undertaken to this ende, to reclaime and reduce those Savages from their barbarous kinde of life, and from their brutish and serving manners, to humanitie, pietie, and honestie.

Gray listed a battery of authorities to bolster his argument and went on to clinch his point with:

Amongst the true worshippers of God, even that warre is lawfull which is undertaken, not for couetousnesse and crueltie, but for peace and unitie's sake: so that lewe and wicked men may thereby be suppressed, and good men maintained and relieved: whereby we see, that both the opinions of Politicians, and also by the judgement of Augustine himselfe, we might lawfully make warre uppon the Savages of Virginia our project, having the endes aforesaid.

Alexander Johnson strengthened many of the points he made by alluding to history. In defending the aggressive assumption by the English of Indian territory, he claimed the Indians would benefit from being conquered as had the English on an earlier occasion: "Wee had continued brutish, pore and naked Britains to this day. If Julius Caesar with his Romaine legions, (or some other) had not laid the ground to make us tame and civill." He attempted to strengthen
England's resolve to stay with the struggle in Virginia by quoting a
snippet of the speech which he had Henry V giving to his army in the
fields at Agincourt. "Be cheered my hearts (said he) and let us fight
like Englishmen." Virginia became part of the inevitable progression
of English history.

The English, as they began their imperial career in America,
developed a much stronger definition of their nationalism. The
expansionists had to build up a head of steam to overcome the inertia
bred by skeptics. Whitaker, the good-hearted Indian missionary, urged
his countrymen to aid with these words:

Yea, shall we be a scorne among Princes, and a
laughing stocke among our neighbour Nations, for
basely leaving what we honorably began; yea, for
beginning a Discouerie, whose riches other men
shall gather, so soone as wee haue forsaken it?
Awake you true-hearted English men, you servants
of Jesus Christ, remember that the Plantation is
God's, and the reward your Countries.

There is a fine irony in these words. Whitaker was sincerely committed
to missionary work among a native people he had come to respect. He
stiffened his argument for the support of missionary work by an appeal
to English patriotism. Yet the hubris contained within this emerging
nationalism did most to blacken the image of the Indian. Promotional
writers injected confidence into Virginia's failing purpose by mag-
nifying and idealizing England's quest in a new land. If events in
Virginia were interpreted as the unfolding destiny of a "great nation",
God and history were urging the English forward. A great motivational
force had been recruited. With such forces on one's side, there was no
need to worry about justification.
This tough, confident ethnocentrism had been slow in hardening. From the time of Elizabeth, English soldiery had held sway against the native population in Ireland. Englishmen developed a patronizing attitude toward this conquered people, looking down upon the Irish, who, after all, did not speak English and whose system of land ownership was primitive and savage. Subjugated since the sixteenth century, the Irish were a familiar example of a savage people. It is hardly surprising that English writers turned to the "wild Irish" as a standard with which to approach other primitive peoples. Out of England's colonizing experience in Ireland, grew the idea that segregation from the indigenous population was essential to the success of any plantation. Ralph Lane, sometime governor, blamed the early failure of the Roanoke colony on the colonists' trust and easy fraternization with the Indians. A policy of segregation had been recommended for Ireland by Lord Mountjoy, who had the New World in mind as he wrote:

great care was though fit to be taken that these new colonies should consist of such men as were most unlike to fall to the barbarous customs of the Irish, or the Popish superstition of the Irish and English-Irish, so as no less cautions were to be observed for uniting them and keeping them from mixing other than if the new colonies were to be led to inhabit among the barbarous Indians.

Symonds was also convinced that the colonists should not mix with the Indians:

Then must Abrams posteritie keepe them to themselves. They may not marry nor give in marriage to the heathen,...The braking of this rule, may break the necke of all good successe of this voyage, whereas by keeping the fears of God, the Planters in shorte time, by the blessing of God, may grow into a nation formidable to the enemies of Christ.
This position of racial exclusiveness seems to have been abandoned by Johnson when in *New Life of Virginia* he argued that the best way to convert the Indians was to "take their children and traine them vp with gentlenesse, teach them our English tongue, and the principles of religion; winne the elder sort by wisdom and discretion, make them equal with your English in case of protection wealth and habitation."

But until the Indians were christianized, they were "intollerable wicked and rooted in mischief", of a "crooked nature" and "inferiors". It would appear that the only good Indian was a Christian Indian, but, until he made that league, he was fundamentally inferior. Since the vast majority of Indians remained beyond the pale of Christianity, the assumption of their deficiency and therefore inferiority was commonly asserted. In any case, the gentleness advocated by Johnson seems to have been lost on the Virginia Company. Sir Thomas Gates headed an expedition which sailed to Virginia in June of 1609. That the fleet had been assembled and equipped at all spoke of the success of the promotional campaign launched earlier that spring. With him Gates carried his instructions from the company. The advice was to take a tough attitude to the Indians. First their priests: "we pronounce it not crueltie nor breach of Charity to deale more shapilly with them and to preede even to dache with these murtherers of Soules and sacrificers of gods images to the Divill." The Indians were to be cowed, "they will never feeds you but for feare." And if allies were to be made, "Chose to doe it with those that are fartherest from you and enemies unto those amongst whom you dwell." This was a vindication of the policy that John Smith had already been conducting. He frankly
terrorized the Indians into supplying corn for the colony, corn the Indians could ill afford. Once having subjugated them, Smith intended that the Indians would be forced to work for the colony as slaves.

But the Indians did not wait for this to happen. In March of 1622 they exploded in retaliation against English encroachment. Hundreds of the colonists were killed. The psychological effect of this blow left the colony stunned. Colonists, left in desperate straits by the attack, wrote pitiful appeals to kinsmen and friends in England. Writing soon after the massacre, one colonist pleaded for provisions, "by reason of the murder done all over the land... they could not plant any thinge at all... through theyr Rogery the land is ruina ted and spoyle." Virginians went in mortal fear of the Indians. Another correspondent wished that "they were in England without their lymbes and would not care to loose any lymbe to be in England againe, yea though they beg from doore to doore, for wee live in feare of the enimy eurie how er." Such news soon got around. It had, as we might expect, a chastening effect on the way in which the Indian was viewed. In writing the first official explanation of the tragedy, the council at Jamestown appeared stoical enough. They humbly admitted,
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But it was not long before the colony regained its composure, took stock of the situation and decided to act. Edward Waterhouse, sometime secretary to the company, pieced the story together in England and published it as *A Declaration of the State of the Colony and... A Relation of the Barbarous Massacre*. This widely read pamphlet gave complete expression to the ethnocentric view of the Indian which had been slowly emerging. Waterhouse had to quieten unrest about the massacre (a disaster for investors) and convince prospective settlers that the situation was not as grim as many in England had come to believe. He set out to show "so the world may see that it was not the strength of a professed enemy that brought this slaughter on them, but that it was contrived by the perfidious treachery of a false-hearted people, that know not God nor faith." The massacre was unquestionable evidence of what many already acknowledged -- the Indian's treachery.

The Indians, according to Waterhouse, had been used well by the English. Their "houses generally set open to the Savages, who were always friendly entertained at the tables of the English, and commonly lodged in their bed chambers." The colonists were "effecting their conversion by peaceable and fayre means". On the fateful morning, a group of Indians sate down at breakfast with our people at their table, whom immediately with their owne tooles and weapons, eyther laid downe, or standing in their houses, they basely and barbarously murthered, not sparing eyther age or sexe, man woman or childe; so sodaine in their cruell execution, that few or more discerned the weapon or blow that brought them to destruction.

They even killed the Indian missionary George Thorpe for whom they professed much love and respect. Such an act "contrary to all lawes of God and men, of Nature and Nations" cried for revenge. The blow
which brought the colony to its knees was prevented, by God's mercy, from being fatal. Some of the colonists were warned,

thousands of ours were saved by the means of one of them alone which was made a Christian; Blessed be God forever, whose mercy endureth for ever; Blessed be God whose mercy alone his justice, and far above all his workes; who wrought this deliverance whereby their soules escaped even as a Bird out of the snare of the Fowler.53

It is typical that this warning instead of showing that not all the Indians were treacherous became evidence for God's love for the English in Virginia. "These miscreants, who have thus disised Gods great mercies so freely offered to them, must needs in time therefore be corrected by his justice." That the English should quickly overcome this setback seemed obvious to Waterhouse, safe in England:

What growing state was ever in the world which had not the like? Rome grew by opposition, and rose upon the backs of her enemies. Marks but the Spaniard who is in the same continent with VIRGINIA, and hath now perfected his worke; Marke and tell mee, if he hath not had more counterbuffes farre then wee, as out of their owne histories at large may be proved.55

Waterhouse, with grim satisfaction, calculated the benefits of the attack in quietening those arguments which questioned the settlers' claims upon Indian lands:

Because our hands which before were tied with gentlenesse and faire vsage, are now at liberty by the treacherous violence of the Sauages, notvitneying the Knot, but cutting it: So that we, who hitherto have had possession of no more ground than their waste, and our purchase at a valuable consideration to their owne contentment, gained; may now by right of Warre, and law of Nations. inuade the Country, and destroy them who sought to destroy vs: whereby wee shall enjoy their cultivated places, turning the laborious Mattocke into the victorious Sword (wherin there is more ease, benifit, and glory)
and possessing the fruits of other labours. Now their cleared grounds in all their villages (which are situate in the fruit fullest places in the land) shall be inhabited by vs, whereas heretofore the grubbing of woods was the greatest labour ...the way of conquering them is much more easie then of civilizing them by faire meanes, for they are a rude, barbarous, and naked people... the Indians, who before were used as friends may now most justly be compelled to servitude and drudgery.56

This is the language of full-blow expansionism. By claiming right of conquest, niggling arguments about the Indians' title to the land were put to sleep.

Waterhouse was not alone in clamoring for a war of attrition against the Indians. In the same month that this tract appeared, the Virginia Company instructed that just such a war be conducted. In August, 1622, an official account of the massacre appeared. Already, attitudes to the Indian had hardened considerably. There were harsh words for the Council in Virginia "to fall by the hands of men so contemptible; to be surprised by treacherie in a time of known danger" was almost inexcusable. The colonists were "almost guiltie of the destrucon by a blindfold and stupid entertaininge of it." What was recommended was nothing less than a full scale war of revenge. The council was instructed

proceed to the condemnation of their bodies, the saving of whom Soules, we haue so zealously affected: ...we must advise you to roote out from being any longer a people, so cursed a nation, vngrateful to all benifitte, vncapable of all goodness."59

The colonists hardly had to be told all of this. They had on their own initiative begun a bloody war of reprisal against the local Indian tribes. Now, more confident, the Virginia Council wrote back, "We
have anticipated your desires, by setting upon the Indyans in all places..." This war continued. After a year of fighting, the London company sued for moderation, but the colonists would have none of that. On January 30th, 1624, the council retorted, "Whereas we are advised by you to observe rules of Justice with these barbarous and pfidious enemys, we hold nothinge iniuste, that may tend to their ruine..." By this time the tide had begun to turn against the Indian. Those, who a generation earlier had been so effusive about wooing the Indians to Christianity, had now grown cold toward them. The Kings' Privy Council wrote on October 24th, 1625,

Now wheras it highly concerneth both the safety and benefit of the Collonie, that the Savages who cannot be woone by faire meanes, be subdued by force, as likewise that the country be discovered...if his Majestie shall finde such dilligence in the Planters, that they use their best endevors, for the perfecting of so good an Action, he doth in like sorte graciosely intend to send over Soldiers with Armes and Munition, and to take order that nothing shalbe wanting whereby a full discouerie may be made, and will also be at same charge, for the fortifying of the Country against a forraine Enimie.62

It would appear that by this time the economic and national ambitions represented in the colonization of Virginia had come to be freely admitted. No longer was it necessary for all Englishmen to claim that colonization was pursuing the higher aims of Christianity.

But the open acknowledgement that economic motive lay behind colonization was not the most important development as far as the Indian was concerned. The bulk of the literature which dealt with the New World at the beginning of the seventeenth century was of a promotional nature. England had not only to encourage emigration and investment, but it also had to justify its presence in Virginia. The force
of these arguments generated a profound sense of ethnic unity among Englishmen. Colonists who came to America believing they carried the true religion and inspired by the part they were playing in realizing the destiny of a great nation held a strongly ethnocentric point of view. This meant that Indians were regarded as something fundamentally different from Englishmen. When the interests of the two peoples produced open conflict, the first really prejudiced view of the Indians emerged. As this change of mind was coming about, plans were being made to establish a plantation in New England.
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CHAPTER III

FEAR IN THE WILDERNESS

The place they had thoughts on was some of those vast and unpeopled countries of America, which are fruitfull and fitt for habitation, being devoyd of all civill inhabitants, wher ther are only salvage and brutish men, which range up and downe, litle otherwise then the wild beasts of the same. This proposition being made publice and coming to the scaning of all, it raised many variable opinions amongst men, and caused many fears and doubts amongst them selves.

William Bradford.
As Virginia suffered through its crisis, a small group of English Separatists struggled to settle themselves in Holland. Free-thinking and congregationalist, this sect had openly split from the Anglican Church. As self-styled dissenters, the Pilgrims were afforded little peace by the English bishops. One group from the Midlands and Yorkshire had fled England for Amsterdam in 1608. Holland offered these Pilgrims the religious freedom they desired and, under the leadership of William Brewster, they set about building a permanent community in the university town of Leyden. By 1611, the exiles had purchased property in the heart of the city. Since they owned a place of worship, it seemed their migration had proved successful. But problems nagged the congregation. Making a bare living proved for many an intolerable strain. Under such a burden, the fear grew that they would disappear as a distinctive Christian sect. The Pilgrims were concerned for their children. William Bradford recalled "the great licentiousness of youth in that countrie, and the manifold temptations of the place." Some young people, to the great anguish of all, courted "dissoluteness, and the danger of their soules." Parents "saw their posteritie would be in danger to degenerate and be corrupted." Almost as precious to these Pilgrims was their English heritage. A grim Edward Winslow wrote "how grievous [it was for them] to live from under the protection of the State of England, how like we were to lose our language and our name of English." Only under extreme duress, then, did the Pilgrims begin to look for another place to remove to. It was the danger of losing their heritage, both religious and national, that drove the Separatists from Holland.
Publicity given to the Virginia settlement did much to suggest America as a haven for the Pilgrims. Word of the Virginia Company's promotion was carried to Holland by the busy commercial traffic out of London. Separatist clergy, ever sensitive to shifts in opinion within the Anglican Church, would have been well aware of the active sermonizing about American colonization. All of England was talking about America and such talk was bruited about by the English garrisons stationed in Holland. As Robinson and Brewster opened their careful negotiations with the Virginia Company to secure a patent for settlement, they would have read the company's publications. The picture of Virginia which emerged from this popular discussion was far from idyllic. This was a wild land with savage and barbarous inhabitants. But a decision to voyage to America was not quickly arrived at -- some looked to the West Indies, others chose to stay in Leyden. Finally, the choice was made. The only remaining question, as Winslow put it, was whether "God would be pleased to discover some place unto us, (though in America) and give us so much favour with the King and State of England as to have their protection there." Negotiations to secure a title for settlement moved ahead slowly. Agents were sent to England to negotiate with the Virginia Company for the right to plant a new settlement to the north of Jamestown. Due to the friendship of Edwin Sandys, the Separatists by 1620 had secured a patent for settlement from the Virginia Company. Even with the way cleared for an American settlement, the Pilgrims hesitated -- it was neither God nor the King who deterred them from America.
A proposal to settle America "raised many variable opinions amongst men and caused many fears and doubts amongst themselves. Some, from their reasons and hope conceived, laboured to stirr up and in­
courage the rest to undertake and prosecute the same; others, againe, out of their fears, objected against it." But the reasons for an American emigration were impelling: Resumed hostilities between Holland and Spain seemed imminent, and Leydon might not continue to be so peaceful a haven. Even in peacetime, making a living was a constant hardship. Then, too, the Pilgrims feared the effects of becoming absorbed into the Dutch community. Finally, one of the Church leaders became embroiled in a dispute with King James. Brewster had set up a printing press in his Leydon home and in 1619 published Calderwood's Perth Assembly. The book denounced James' attempt to force episcopacy upon the Scottish church. In printing such a work Brewster was liable to a charge of sedition; he had to go into hiding. This was not time for the Separatists to await further developments in the negotiations, and the incident impressed the need for removal to preserve religious scruples. In another pamphlet printed by Brewster in the same year, the Separatists' purpose in leaving for America was defined: "That they might make way for and unite in others what in them lieth, whose conscience are grieved with the state of the Church of England." These were the "weighty and solid" reasons for emigration endorsed by Bradford.

But such reasons could not quiet earnest objections. "The place they had thoughts on was some of those vast and unpeopled countries of America." This empty land was a wilderness, a chilling idea for the
seventeenth century which instinctively understood it as something alien to man. Knowing first the tidy fields of Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, the Pilgrims looked upon an uncultivated land as a desert. Their folklore pictured the uninhabited forest as a gloomy and foreboding place. A wild land was mysterious and fearful, filled with demons, wild beasts, and worse, wild men. To an imagination formed by the Bible, the idea of a wilderness was only too close to the Pilgrim's own dilemma. Forced to Holland from an England they loved, the Pilgrims were obliged to remove to a place even more foreign. The journey itself -- a great voyage across an unimaginably wide sea -- promised its own dangers. "The casualties of the seas (which none can be freed from) the length of the voyage was such, as the weak bodies and other persons worn out with age and travail (as many of them were) could never be able to endure." Comparing themselves to the exiled Israelites, the Pilgrims looked to America both literally and figuratively as a moral waste and place of testing. Deep within Christian thought was the notion that nature existed merely as an instrument within the hands of Providence.

A wild land, America threatened hardships even more grueling than those suffered in Holland:

the miseries of the land which they should be espoused to, would be hard to be borne; ...For they should be liable to famine, and nakedness and the want, in a manner, of all things. The chang of aire, diate, and drinking water, would infecte their bodies with sore sicknes, and greevous diseases.

The idea of an American wilderness became a composite of such fears, a metaphor for the great anxiety which haunted the Pilgrims on the eve of their journey. Bound up with the idea of a wild land was the
spectre of "wild and brutish men, which range up and downe, little otherwise then the wild beasts of the same." The Pilgrims expected continuall danger of the salvage people, who are cruell, barbarous, and most treacherous, being most furious in their rage, and merciles where they overcome; not being contente only to kill, but delight to torment men in the most bloodie manner that may be; fleasing some alive with the shells of fishes, cutting the members and joynts of others peasmeal, and brioling on the coles, eat the collops of their flesh in their sight whilst they live; with other cruelties too hor-rible to be related.

Bradford spoke for all when he added, rather unnecessarily, "the very hearing of these things could not but move the very bowels of men to grate within them." Small wonder that the departure from Holland was riven with anxiety and anguish.

They wente aborde, and their friends with them, where truly dolfull was the sight of that sade and mournfull parting; to see what sighs and sobbs and praieres did sound amongst them, what tears did gush from every eye, and pithy speeches peirst each harte; ... their Reverend pastor falling downe on his knees, (and they all with him,) with waterie cheeks commended them with most fervente praieres to the Lord and his blessing.

Nor were their worries ungrounded. The Speedwell having proved unseaworthy, it was decided, most unwillingly, that the Mayflower should go on alone with as many as could be crowded into its decks. After "longe beating at sea", Cape Cod was sighted toward the middle of November. From here it had been anticipated that the journey should continue south to Virginia, but coastal shoals and inadequate wind forced the Pilgrim leaders to change their plan -- they dropped anchor in Cape Cod Bay. Looking at the endless sand dunes, many felt their worst fears realized -- this was indeed a barren and forbidding land. 'They had now no friends to wellcome them, nor inns to entertaine
or refresh their weatherbeaten bodies, no houses much less townes to repaire too, to seeke for succoure." Some found the ordeal too
great. It has been argued that Dorothy Bradford, staring at the barren sand dunes, went made and took her own life. Others looking
for the first time on this bleak wild land grew faint with despair.

Unlike the Puritans, the Pilgrims did not cross the Atlantic exultant at the prospect of entering their promised land. Bradford,
standing on the dunes of Cape Cod, contrasted his view with that which Moses enjoyed from Mount Pisgah:

Neither could they, as it were goe up to the tope of Pisgah, to vew from this wilderness a more goodly countrie to feed their hops; for which way soever they turned their eys (save upwards to the heavens) they could have little solace or content in respect of any outward objects. For summer being done, all things stand upon them with a weatherbeaten face; and the whole countrie, full of woods and thickets, represented a wild and savage heiw.

Robert Cushman, preaching to his fellows and trying to inspire courage in the face of great difficulties America presented, spoke of how the land would "be translated from this wandering wilderness unto that joy-
ful and heavenly Canaan." As the several exploring parties tried out this land, the view from the ship of a "naked and barren place" became an almost impenetrable thicket, "we marched through boughs and bushes, and under hills and valleys, which tore our very armour in peices."

Away from the coast they found the country so "encompassed with woods, that we should be in much danger of the salvages", who "were readier to fill their sides full of arrows then otherwise." A fearful anticipation of meeting a savage adversary haunted these expeditions.
To everyone's surprise, the Indians proved elusive. Not until four days after landing on the Cape, did they catch even a distant glimpse of its native inhabitants. "They espied five or six people who were savages, who, when they saw them, ran into the wood." Perhaps, then, the Indians were not so ferocious; but this the Pilgrims could not believe. The party followed the Indians as they fled "lest other of the Indians should like in ambush."

Ten days later, a second exploring party was organized, Indians in mind, it consisted this time of thirty-four armed men. Although the party found an Indian camp which it ransacked for food, no Indians were seen. With December on them and still no decision on where they would settle, the Pilgrims organized a third party. Using the shallop which had been shipped over in the *Mayflower,* this expedition coasted along the Cape. The boat disturbed ten or twelve Indians who were busy about a dead whale that had been washed up on the beach. But no sooner had the Pilgrims approached than the Indians again fled. Landing for the night, the party barricaded themselves and prepared for what might befall. After being disturbed by a "hideous cry" in the night, the party's worst anticipations were realized at daybreak. "One of the company, being abroad, came running in, and cried, 'they are men! Indians! Indians!' and withall their arrows came flying amongst us." The "encounter" was soon over, the Indians being put to flight by a few rounds of musket fire. But much more was to be made of this. "Thus it pleased God to vanquish our enemies and give us deliverance." In the telling, this skirmish became a major conflict, "by their noise we could not guess that they were less than thirty or foury, though some thought that they were
many more." The arrows were plucked from the barricade and sent to England as souvenirs of the wild Indians.

With their first victory secured, the great fear which formed the Pilgrim's first view of the Indians abated, but only slightly. When the expedition returned, the decision was reached to build a settlement at Plymouth. Through a cold, wet winter, the work of clearing the sight, cutting timber and building shelters went painfully ahead. Progress was slowed as the whole colony was overtaken by infirmity. Almost as soon as the company landed at Provincetown, a "general sickness" disabled a growing number of the colonists. The effects of a long, cramped sea voyage and the inadequacies of a seaboard diet had begun to tell. Although the winter of 1620-21 was not extremely severe, the constant wading out to the small boats used to ferry the Pilgrims out to the Mayflower, anchored far out in the shallow harbor, helped to undermine the health of the whole group. Through the winter, the little colony was wracked with disease and struggled to complete the shelters, whilst without, the Indians waited. The war of nerves went on. "Our people on shore heared a cry of some savages, as they thought, which caused an alarm and to stand on their guard, expecting an assault; but all was quiet." A profound sense of unease still stalked through the tiny settlement. One of the group out fowling came across a band of twelve Indians. "He lay close till they were passed, and then with what he could, he went home and gave the alarm." Two Indians were seen on a hill distant and were beckoned to come toward the settlement. "But the savages would not tarry their coming. A noise of a great many more was heared behind the hill; but
no more came in sight. This caused us to plant our great ordnances in places most convenient." Well might the colony have feared for its safety. So dire was their distress that during these winter months, no more than six or seven at a time were well. With difficulties multiplying, the Pilgrims projected onto the Indian their sense of helplessness, "How few, weak and raw we were at our first beginning, and there settling, in the midst of barbarous enemies!"

The Indian personified the setbacks the colony suffered. By March, the worst of the ordeal was over, but the toll had been devastating. In all, forty-six died, which left only fifty-six of the original company alive. At full strength the colony had a muster of twenty-three men and six boys.

With the first hopes of spring and the worst of the disease past, a meeting gathered at the common house to decide how to deal with the Indian threat. As they talked, an Indian joined them and in broken English bid them welcome. His name, they were to find, was Samoset. A chief of the Monhegan in Maine, he learned his English from the sailors and fishermen who regularly visited those shores. He talked on into the night, relating information of vital concern to the Pilgrims, who were beleaguered by their ignorance of the people surrounding them. Fears were once again assuaged as this Indian told of a great plague which had destroyed most of the Indian population a few years earlier. But even this guileless and helpful man was not to be given their trust too easily. "We would gladly have gotten rid of him, but he was not willing to go... We lodged him that night at Steven Hopkins's house, and watched him." Two weeks later, he returned
with five tall savages, whom the Pilgrims entertained as best they could. But again, the Englishmen were wary of the Indians: "They made semblance unto us of friendship and amity." Through these meetings the Pilgrims came to know Squanto who became invaluable as a guide, translator and consultant on everything from corn culture to hunting and fishing. Subsequently, they met with Massasoit, chief of the Wampanoag and the dominant sachem of the area. Through their translators, the Pilgrims expressed their desire for peace and trade. By the spring of 1621, this desire had been realized. A meeting between Edward Winslow and the chief produced a formal understanding of peace between the young colony and the Wampanoags. But many colonists were quick to see that Massasoit talked peace only to gain the English as an ally against his powerful adversaries, the Narragansetts. The following summer, Winslow and Stephen Hopkins travelled to Massasoit's village and there strengthened the friendship with his tribe.

The treaty of 1621 represented a healthier psychological approach to the natives, it brought Indian phobia under some control. But more than a change in attitude the treaty reflected the all important need to strike a peaceful accord with the natives. Survival for the colony depended upon a peaceful intercourse with the Indians. A lucrative fur trade provided the best chance of relinquishing the heavy debt which the colony had incurred from its London backers. Since these merchants had not provided the colonists with foodstuffs, as was originally arranged in the contract, the Pilgrims had from the start to look to their own subsistence. A trade in Indian corn saved the colony from starvation, whilst it was from the neighboring tribes and their Indian
friends that the settlers learned to feed themselves in the New World. To argue that the treaty saw the removal of all apprehension and fear of the Indian is probably to go too far. Yet at least one historian has drawn the inference that the peaceful policy which the 1621 agreement initiated displayed an absence of racial antipathy by the Pilgrims toward the Indians. However, there is evidence to suggest that the policy represented no fundamental change in the Pilgrim's outlook. Even with such cooperation from the Indians, the Pilgrims remained convinced of their vulnerability, their Indian policy was an attempt to compensate for the small strength they had. Robert Cushman put a good face on things when he wrote that the Pilgrims did not tame the Indians "by threats and blows or shaking of the sword and sound of trumpet; for as our faculty that way is small, and our strength less, so our warring with them is after another manner, namely, by friendly usage, love, peace, honest and just councils, good counsel, &c." This was not an argument against the use of force but a realization that the Pilgrims, lacking military strength, could not coerce the Indians. It appears that this show of friendship was the best defense against an Indian threat which the Pilgrims were constantly aware of. The great fear of the Indians which traumatized the early settlement was never completely relinquished, instead it was replaced by a pervasive distrust. Edward Winslow, author of the 1621 treaty and not a man to dwell upon ungrounded fears, spoke of the "many dangerous plots and treacheries as to have been intended against us." The tiny settlement overcame such dangers only with the help of God, who possessed "the hearts of the salvages with astonishment and fear of us; whereas if
God had let them loose, they might easily have swallowed us up, scarce being a handful in comparison of those forces they might have gathered together against us.

No sooner had the Pilgrims sent an embassy to consolidate their friendship with Massasoit than the peace was threatened. Later in the summer it became apparent that the Narragansetts, desiring to upset the harmony established between the Pilgrims and the Wampanoags, had gained the ear of Corbitant, sachem of a small tribe in Massasoit's confederacy. While the Narragansetts moved against Massasoit's village, Corbitant seized Squanto and two other friends of the English. But one of these, Hobamock, escaped, bringing the news to Plymouth. "This struck fear in us, because the colony was so weakly guarded, the strength thereof being abroad." Fearing Massasoit routed and Squanto surely dead, Governor Bradford sent Miles Standish and fourteen men to rescue the survivors. But the Pilgrims' interpreter was found alive and the Indians at the root of the conspiracy frightened and demoralized. Peace was not won this easily, early in 1622, a rattlesnake skin stuffed with arrows was brought into Plymouth by a messenger sent by Canonicus, chief of the Narragansetts. This, Squanto explained, was a challenge to war. After some debate, Bradford stuffed the skin with powder and bullets and sent it back with the messenger. The Indians seemed to have been afraid of this and it passed from village to village, finally arriving back in Plymouth unbroken. Even so, the settlers realized the danger of attack and completed their defense works, enclosing Plymouth in a stockage which could be defended by muskets and a small canon which the town had received from the captain of the Mayflower.
In the summer of 1622, a fishing vessel sailed into the harbor at Plymouth bearing a letter from Virginia. The news it contained was devastating:

I will so far informe you that my selfe, with many good freinds in the south-colonie of Virginia, have received shuch a blow, that 400. persons large will not make good our losses. Therefore I doe intreat you (allthough not knowing you) that the old rule which I learned when I went to schoole, may be sufficente. That is, Hapie is he whom other mens harms doth make to beware.29

The colony, weakened as it struggled against the clear possibility of starvation, had the more reason to look carefully to its Indian neighbors. This news seemed to have had the effect of drawing ethnic lines between Englishmen and Indians a little more clearly. Winslow, hearing of the massacre, called it "that bloody slaughter committed by the Indians upon our friends and countrymen." As the Pilgrims struggled with their adversity, "the Indians began again to cast forth many insulting speeches, glorying in our weakness, and giving out how easily it would be ere long to cut us off." The colony had reason to fear for the loyalty of their Indian ally Massasoit, who avoid the settlement, seeming to frown on the English.

By the spring of 1623, it was feared that another Indian plot was afoot. Massasoit, whose life had probably been saved by the ministrations of Winslow, confided that a conspiracy had been hatched to destroy the settlement which Weston and his group had established to the north of Plymouth. Since the Indians involved had talked of destroying the whole English settlement, the Pilgrims took it upon themselves to act. A small armed group was to accompany Miles Standish and, making their
way to the Weston settlement, were to organize a resistance to avert the possible disaster. Swift action by Standish and his men, who tackled and killed the Indian ringleaders prevented this conflict from spreading any further. John Robinson, still in Leydon, found that this victory over the Indians did not lie well with his conscience. "Concerning the killing of those poor Indeans ... Oh! how happy a thing it had been, if you had converted some, before you had killed any." In drawing attention to their lack of missionary work, Robinson rather embarrassed his fellow Separatists. The Pilgrims, like many other colonists, had committed themselves to missionary work among the natives. Bradford had spoken hopefully of "propagating and advancing the gospell of the kingdom of Christ in those remote parts of the world." Cushman was sure that the emigration was fired in part by the "desire to further the Gospel among those poor heathens." Winslow committed the Pilgrims to action and not just to words:

> there is no less hope of convincing the heathen of his evil ways, and converting them to the true worship and knowledge of the living God, and so consequently the salvation of their souls by the merits of Jesus Christ than elsewhere, though it be much talked on and lightly or lamely prosecuted.

But the Pilgrims fell far short of these aspirations, very little was accomplished in converting the Indians to Christianity. True, the Wampanoags put up a determined resistance to conversion and Massasoit's friendship did not extend to matters of religion. But the Pilgrims were not determined missionaries, their spiritual energy went toward preserving their own religion and culture.

John White, writing in 1630, attempted to defend the Pilgrims against those who pointed out that in their ten-year stay no Indian
converts had been brought into their church, and that Pilgrim support for missionary work was a "meere fantasie". White's arguments are interesting in showing how wide a cultural gap separated Pilgrim from Indian. "Neither can it be expected that worke should take effect untill we may be more perfectly acquainted with their language." Even White however had to admit that a language barrier did not prevent a profitable trade with the Indians. He went on, the Indians could not be won for Christianity until they had been civilized: "Wee hardly have found a brutish people wonne before they had beene taught civility. So wee must endevour to worke that in them first, and Religion afterwards." That so little had been accomplished indicates that the Pilgrims were far more interested in defending their own cultural integrity than in bringing the Indians to civility. The Indians' resistance to conversion was seen as spiritual recalcitrance. Although little was known about the religious practices of the neighboring tribes, it was widely presumed that they worshipped the devil. "Another power they worship, whom they call Hobbamock, and to the northward of us, Hobbamoqui; this as far as we can conceive, is the devil." The implications were enormous. Seen in this light, the Indians threatened the very basis of the Pilgrim's existence. White drew the dichotomy in this way:

They are beasts wee say... wee have the light of grace, they have scarce the dim light of nature, we have the fellowship with God, they have scarce heard of him: wee are translated into the glorious libertie of the Sonnes of God, they are bond slaves of Satan.

The struggle to preserve culture and society against the depre-
dations of a wild land and its barbarous inhabitants heightened the
Pilgrims awareness of social order. Cushman proudly asserted: "though we be in a heathen country, yet the grace of Christ is not quenched in us, but we still hold and teach the same points of faith, ... which we have heared and learned, in a most ample and large maner in our own country." Though the Pilgrims were forced to "fly into a wilderness", they were not demoralized by it. The Indians, as part of the wild environment against which the Pilgrims had to prevail, tended to contradict the culture which defined the Pilgrims. A sense of order, finely drawn among the Pilgrims, was challenged by the anarchy which early observers thought they saw among the Indians who "brutishly and cruelly do eat and consume one another, through their emulations, wars and contentions."

Certainly by the mid 1620's the Pilgrims found themselves secure from the possibility of extermination by the Indians. In fact, the English gained ascendancy. They grew at home in their adopted country and boasted they could "walk as peacably in the wood as in the highways of England." As they became masters of the peace, the Pilgrim's earlier fears of being overrun by the Indians became less urgent than the threat of white settlers gradually slipping into savagery. The sharp rebuke which was leveled against the settlers whom James Weston had brought over centered not on their unruliness, though this and their stealing corn much grieved the Pilgrims. Nor did this settlement's improvidence in squandering their supplies draw the venom of Winslow's attack. Their "lamentable and weak estate" had encouraged the Indians to insolence and prompted hope in 1623 that all the English could be wiped out. Rather, the Weston settlement had, and this was almost unforgivable, forsaken their own civilization. The company had
hung one of their own to appease the Indians, "another of their company was turned salvage; ... their people had most forsaken the town ... they had sold their clothes for corn." "Others (so base were they) became servants to the Indians," this for Bradford described the depth of their depravity.

The Pilgrims dealt out harsh censure for any of the English under their domain who entered into sexual liaisons with Indian women. Bradford's complaints against Thomas Morton, who came to be a dominant voice in the settlement on Mount Wallaston, reveal the Governor's preoccupations. Of course, it must not be forgotten that Morton and his crew had initiated a gun-running business with the Indians. The threat that such guns posed to the Pilgrim hegemony was real enough. But the Indians were gradually being armed by the French and the Dutch and, in any case, "Mine Host" of Merry Mount seemed to be establishing convivial relations with the Indians and this is what seems to have stuck in the Governor's throat. For in this little piece of invective, Bradford mentioned neither guns nor Indian relations:

After this they fell to great licentiousness, and led a dissolute life, powering out themselves into all profanenes. And Morton became lord of misrule, and maintained (as it were) a schoole of Athiene. And after they had got some good into their hands, and gott much by trading with the Indians, they spent it was vainly, in quaffing and drinking both wine and strong waters in great excess, and as some reported, 10 li. worth in a morning. They also set up a May-pole, drinking and dancing aboute it many days together, inviting the Indean women, for their consorts, dancing and frisking together, (like so many fairies, or furies rather,) and worse practises.

This was not merely an outburst of offended Pilgrim morality, it was a strenuous criticism of what they understood as a threat to their
social order. Morton and his crew had succumbed to the temptations of a wild land. Whilst moral lassitude was one thing, sexual relations with Indian women was quite another. Pilgrims felt interracial sex to be a complete denial of their civilization. At the basis of this belief was the idea that Indians and whites were fundamentally different. A Dutchman who visited the colony in 1627 seemed rather surprised by such a prohibition on sexual relations between the races.

They have made stringent laws and ordinances upon the subject of fornication and adultery, which laws they maintain and enforce very strictly indeed, even amongst the tribes...

Edward Ashley was another Indian trader who incurred the Pilgrims' censure. He had obtained from the Council for New England a license to trade in the area. Again accusations for trading powder and shot were handed out, but other issues were at stake. For Ashley "had for some time lived amongst the Indians as a savage, and wente naked amongst them, and used their manners (in which time he got their language), so they feared he might still run into evill courses." It was "charged against him that he had committed uncleanness with Indian women, (things that they feared at his first imployment, which made them take this strict course with him at the beginning)". So Ashley was put out of business and run out of the colony for "going native". Bradford recorded with some satisfaction that he met his end at sea whilst engaged in a trading venture to Russia. By fraternizing with the Indians, he was, the colonists felt, inviting social disintegration. The troubles of the Weston settlement were, after all, related to "keeping Indean women". Besides, the spiritual threat, there were practical considerations. Despite the help which the struggling colony had
received from the Indians, a successful settlement looked upon them as:

a helpless and idle people ... which cannot, in any comely or comfortable manner, help themselves much less us. ...They are not industrious, neither have they art, science, skill or faculty to use either land or the commodities of it.48

But such considerations were unlikely to count for much by those whose intent it was to flee beyond the constraints of Pilgrim society. One reads such passages as "some of their seamen were run away amongst the Indeans" and "he fled away from authority and got amongst the Indeans of those parts". Indian society constituted a haven to outlaws but also, by implication, a lawless place.

Antipathy toward the Indians grew under the placid surface of peaceful coexistence. The Pilgrims could not afford to rupture peace, nor did they have to. Since the plague of 1617 had decimated the local tribes, Plymouth Plantation could expand without forcing a confrontation with the Indians. Nothing impressed the various visitors to the colony more than a sense of unease which belied the general peace. John Pory, who visited the settlement on his way back to England from Virginia, remarked how the Pilgrims "stand day and night precisely on their guard." This same tension was noticed by Emmanuel Altham, who as captain of the Little James, visited the plantation a year later in 1623. Isaac de Rasierers, a Dutchman, travelled down from New Netherland in 1627 to discuss the fur trade with Governor Bradford. The good order of the colony impressed the foreigner who also noticed the Pilgrims' vigilance, "they are constantly on their guard night and day." The Pilgrims legislated for the Indians, they kept the peace, generally they were fair in their dealings with the tribes among whom
they lived. But they did not integrate with the Indians. Ultimately, they did not trust them. Out of this failure of trust and this sense of cultural distance which the Pilgrims perceived between themselves and the Indians, a racial prejudice grew.
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CHAPTER IV

THE CHOSEN PEOPLE

Pride in their port, defiance in their eye,
I see the lords of human kind pass by.

Oliver Goldsmith.
By the end of the 1620's events at Plymouth had been overshadowed by developments further north. Throughout the decade, numerous small fishing settlements had been planted on New England's shores and some of these had grown into flourishing plantations. A major wave of immigration organized by the Massachusetts Bay Company changes the focus of attention. In 1630 a fleet sailing from Southampton transported some seven hundred passengers who landed at Salem. This first large contingent of the Puritan migration, settled along the shore north of Plymouth and founded what became Boston. Like the Pilgrims, the Puritans were forced from England by adverse circumstances. Charles Stuart's dissolution of Parliament on March 10, 1629 loomed as a direct threat to the Puritans, becoming powerful in the House of Commons. The growing influence of William Laud, who became Bishop of London in 1628, placed a vigorous defender of conformity in the path of Puritan hopes for the reform of the Anglican Church. Strong in the textile centers of East Anglia, Puritans bore the brunt of a severe depression in the cloth trade, a casualty of the Thirty Years War.

But it would be wrong to think that the Puritans ventured forth into a new land as a small group oppressed by their vulnerability. Unlike the Pilgrims, who made the same decision ten years before, the Puritans were not oppressed with a great fear of removing to this land. Of course Puritans had the reassurance of a thriving settlement already established. Also, the Puritans' exodus was on a much grander scale. The resources of the Massachusetts Bay Company were considerable. Many who would emigrate were men of substance and such
investors deeply committed themselves to founding a society con-
sonent with their religious principles. As they discussed and
planned their departure the Puritans rehearsed many of the same
arguments drummed up by the Virginia Company a generation earlier.
Englishmen would carry the gospel to the Indians. America would be
a panacea for England's pressing social and economic travails. The
lure of profit is there too. Behind all of this reasoning is a quiet
confidence which expressed itself in two ways. America, it was be-
lieved, would be a hospitable and bountiful land, and, its inhabitants
would not pose any serious threat.

Nothing is further from the wilderness which Bradford anticipated
than the "good land" which Winthrop was confident of finding. To
critics who "speake ill of this Countrey, of the barrennesse etc. of
it", Winthrop retorted: "so did the Spyes of the lande of Canaan".
America, the promised land, was part of "the Lords garden" which "he
hath given to the sonsnes of men; ...a whole Continent fruitful and convenient for the vse of man." Encouraged in this
opinion by Biblical exegesis, John Cotton boldly asserted "God's
people take the land by Promise: and therefore the land of Canaan
is called the land of Promise." Puritans were not venturing into a
little known and uninhabited place; their countrymen had been there
before them and were prospering.

Nor did the Puritans harbour the same fear of the Indians which
the Pilgrims brought with them to America. It was known that the
Indian population was small, "there are not so many of them in 20:
miles compasse as wilbe of vs." Puritan leaders had received news
of the devastating plague which ravaged New England in 1616 and 1617. To them it seemed that Providence had prepared the way, "God hath consumed the Natives with a great Plague in those partes, soe as there be few inhabitants lefte." Those that remained did not appear to pose a serious threat, "ten of ours, (in regard of the advantage of our weapons) to overmatch 100: of them." Cotton had every confidence that the "People of God's Plantation shall enjoy their own place with Safety and Peace." Infact the emigrants believed they would "come in with the good leaue of the natives."

Confident that they would succeed, the Puritans brought to their colonial endeavor a compelling sense of mission. Earlier plantations "vsed vnfitte instrumentes, a multitude of rude and misgouerned persons the very scumme of the Land", who failed because "they did not establisht the right form of gournement." Nor were the objectives of such settlements any more elevated, "their mayne end was Carnall and not Religious." By comparison the Puritans felt their venture not only just but of cosmic importance. Firstly, the Puritans were acting on the expressed will of God who "hath determined the times before appointed and the bounds of our habitation." God's will, sometimes inscrutable, was in this instance clear, for England was a "sinfull land" beset by the "evill of the tymes". Not only would they escape the "discouragements of these declininge tymes" the Puritans would also be a model for future colonization; their new society would be the example to regenerate Europe. With all of this Winthrop inspired his listeners. Preaching on the deck of the Arbella as it was
Early Puritan governments in America would strive to uphold this social cohesion. Their success helps explain the strong sense of ethnic unity which the Puritans preserved in the New World. The basis of such cultural integrity lay with those animating forces harnessed by the leaders of the first migration. John Cotton travelled to Southampton to give his blessing to the fleet. He preached on the text: "Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Isreall, and I will plant them, and they may dwell in a place of their owne, and move no more." God's chosen people fulfilling their destiny would receive their patrimony in the New World.

After a "longe and troublesome passage ... more tedious than formally hath been in this season," the Puritans were heartened by the country they found. Even Winthrop, careful and sober, admitted that the "Countrey is exceeding good". Francis Higginson, who followed in the Talbot, described his first glimpse of Cape Ann: "As we sailed along the coasts, we saw every hill and dale every island full of gay
woods and high trees."

All of this was but a prelude to what Higginson called "our new paradise of New England". John White, first involved in the Dorchester Company and then a prime mover in its successor the Massachusetts Bay Company, was similarly enthusiastic about his new home. "No Countrey yeelds a more propitious ayre for our temper, then New-England, as experience hath made manifest, by all relations: manie of our people have found themselves weal and sickly at home, have become strong and healthy there".

Even before the Puritans planted themselves in New England they were careful to establish their right to the land. In a meticulously argued case which forms a prologue to Puritan settlement the claim that they might displace the Indians was anticipated. Initially, it was argued that the Indians had no valid title to the land at all, "these savage people ramble over much land without title or property". Cotton was little troubled by this question, he saw no case against the Puritans' "firme and durable possession" of New England. A more enduring argument was that which explained that title depended upon utilizing the land. Indians had no proof of land ownership because, as Winthrop put it, "they inclose no ground, neither have they cattle to maintain it." Cotton backed this up arguing "in a vacant soyle, hee that taketh possession of it, and bestoweth culture and husbandry upon it, his Right it is." New England's tribes cultivated only a small fraction of their lands. Higginson reported, "The Indians are not able to make use of one fourth part of the land; nor any ground which they challenge for their own possession". As it was elaborated the Puritans' claim to New
England came to rest on two main tenets. The first, a legal justification, was set forth by Winthrop as follows:

God hath given to the sons of men a two fold right to the earth; there is a natural and a civil right; The first right was natural when men held the earth in common, every man sowing and feeding where he pleased: Then, as men and cattell increased, they appropriated some parcelles of ground by enclosing and peculiar manurance, and this in tyme got them a civil right.27

Naturally, this argument was bolstered with the familiar dispensation drawn from Genesis. To White the call to "replenish the earth and subdue it" was far more than merely a justification for settling America. These "words include and have the force of Precept" which remained as impelling in the 1630's as in the time of Abraham. God's will in this respect became a "perpetual law", to disregard a providential command was to "neglect our duty, and crosse his will ... and withal doe little less than despise his blessing."29

As the Puritans contended their right to New England they made a tightly ordered case, virtually a legal brief based upon a series of contractual relationships. Conceived to persuade a reluctant King to make a grant of land, such a case had to be air-tight: Able to prevail against those suspicious of Puritan ambitions at home and strong enough to convince a by no means pro-Puritan King. Not only were these arguments aimed at those outside of the Puritan camp, they served a vital function within it. Puritan leaders could only act in good conscience. They had to convince themselves that what they were doing was above reproach. In other words, they had to accord to the terms of their contract. Such obligations are significant because they controlled
the Puritan view of America and its inhabitants.

According to the Puritans' covenant they were to obey God's command to settle uncultivated land. Winthrop was careful when he declared "christians have liberty to go and dwell among them the Indians in their waste lands and woods". Initially, there seemed little of a problem since "in the place where they plant, there are few Natives." The Massachusetts and Wampanoag tribes had been all but wiped out by the great smallpox epidemic. Even where Indians were encountered they did not, as Higginson was quick to point out, distinguish themselves by the amount of land they brought under tillage. If the Indians did not cultivate the land, they must, thought the Puritans, be something less than civilized. "The men, for the most part, live idly; they do nothing but hunt and fish ... They go naked, save only they are covered with beasts skins." This "idle" life drew censure, "it being their fashion to eate all at some times, and sometimes nothing at all in two or three dayes, wise Providence being a stranger to their wilder wayes: they be right Infidels, neither caring for the morrow, or providing for their owne families". Unhappily this led to the popular assumption that the Indians were "ignorante and simple". In cataloguing the advantages which would accrue to the Indians from an English presence, the newcomers displayed what can only be called a superior attitude.

The greatest advantage must needs come to the Natives themselves, whom we shall teach providence and industry, for want thereof they perish often times ... Withall, commerce and example of our course of living, cannot but in time breed civility among them, and that by Gods blessing may make way for religion consequently.
The Puritans, convinced of the superiority of their culture and confident of their prowess, would deal with the Indians on their own terms.

It has been argued that these terms were fair and just; that the Puritans, in their early dealings with the Indians, left little to be desired. Puritan governments, so this argument runs, protected the Indians from the incursions of western settlers, whilst the bulk of white society used the Indian evenly and fairly. Certainly the objective of friendly co-existence was strenuously insisted upon by the early governments. Captain John Endicott, agent for the New England Company, was enjoined to maintain friendly relations with the Indians. "And, above all, we pray you to be careful that there be none in our precincts permitted to do injury, in the least kind, to the heathen people; and if any offend in that way, let them receive due correction." Nor did the Massachusetts Bay Company change this policy. Among the first instructions which the newly chartered company sent out were these: that "no wrong or injury be offered by any of our people to the natives there." It would appear that such instructions held sway. Higginson told of how "We use them kindly. They will come into our houses sometimes by half a dozen or half a score at a time when we are at victuals". Such kind usage was not left up to chance for the General Court acted to restrain settlers from exploiting the Indians. Thomas Morton was "adjudged to be imprisoned, till he were sent into England, and his house burnt down, for his many injuries offered to the Indians." The company consistently maintained the Indians' right to compensation for damages
inflicted upon their property. Inhabitants of one settlement were held liable for "what hurt the swyne of Charlton hath done against the Indian barnes of corn". Even after the colony had suffered the ravages of the Pequot War "it was ordered, care should be taken to prevent damage to the Indians, & procure them satisfaction for any damage done to them." This was made general policy when it was decreed

that in all places the English shall keep their cattle from destroying the Indian corne in any ground where they have right to plant; & if any corne be destroyed for want of fencing or herding, the town shall be liable to make satisfaction.

This scrupulous show of concern for Indian land rights could have been an attempt by the General Court to prevent its own title to the land being faulted. In gaining control of New England the Puritans had made many enemies, Sir Ferdinando Gorges perhaps chief among them. Joined by such as Thomas Morton and Sir Christopher Gardiner, Gorges sought to undermine the Puritan claim to New England.

Puritan courts also exercised jurisdiction over land transfers giving the Indian legal protection for his patrimony. This too had been one of the earliest dictates of company policy. "If any of the salvages pretend right of inheritance to all or part of the land granted in our patent, we pray you endeavour to purchase their title, that we may avoid the least scruple of intrusion." Although Indian land rights were acknowledged, this did not prevent the steady acquisition of Indian land by white settlers. Land transfers were brought under control of the General Court which decreed that "noe person whatsoever
shall buy any land of any Indian without leave from the Court."

But the Court was less interested in protecting Indian land titles than in bringing western settlements under the control of central government.

Government also supervised all trading activities with the Indians. A proclamation forbidding unregulated trade was issued by James I as early as 1622. A meeting of the General Court in July 1629 complained of "irregular trading with the Indian contrary to his late Majesty's proclamation", it was resolved that the company "use some speedy means here for reformation thereof." Careful regulations were made to govern: the licensing of traders, the establishment of an official trucking house in each plantation, and, the elimination of certain goods, notably liquor and guns, from the Indian trade. Certainly, this government monopoly was lucrative. The standing council reserved the right "to farme out all trading with the Indians ... to such persons as they shall thinke meete, for the terme of three yeeres, & for such yearly rent, to be paid to the Treasurer as in their discretion they judge equall." Such revenues were a vital concern to a government burdened with a heavy debt. To argue therefore that Puritan's Indian policy down to 1635 was prompted mainly by the desire to do right by the Indian is at best an oversimplification. Moreover such legislation does not register the absence of prejudice against the Indian.

For instance, regulations to prevent the sale of guns show how completely Puritans distrusted the Indians. The General Court treated such offenses with the utmost gravity. Richard Hopkins was "seuerly
wipt, and branded on one of his cheekes, for selling peeces & powder & shot to the Indians." Subsequently the court considered even harsher punishment for such offenders, debating if this "offence should not be punished hereafter by death." None of the English were to show the Indians how to use firearms or to repair guns which the Indians had acquired. Again punishment in such cases was unyieldingly harsh. The fact was that the Puritans, unlike the Pilgrims, did not make quite the same pretence of winning the Indians with "friendly usage". Instead they sought to cow the neighbouring tribes by demonstrating their military superiority. Initially the Indians went in great fear of English guns, they took "the discharging of Ordinance for lightening and Thunder, which did much trouble them." By denying the Indians any access to their firearms, the English hoped to hold this fear over them. In maintaining stringent controls on the sale of guns, the Puritans sought to preserve their strategic superiority. Although Higginson claimed "we neither fear them nor trust them", the Puritans sense of security from Indian attack was derived from their confidence in the English monopoly of firearms: "forty of our musketeers will drive five hundred of them out of the field." When the colony inaugurated a training day for the militia it was made clear that such maneuvers should be held "att a convenient place aboute the Indian wigwams". A show of force on this scale would, it was hoped, discourage an Indian uprising.

That plots were being hatched against them, the Puritans had no doubt. Frontier towns were established in the face of what seemed imminent attack. Dudley, in a letter describing the settlement of
Dorchester, shows how preoccupied such pioneers were with their security. "The best counsel we could find was to build a fort to retire to, in some convenient place, if any enemy and here he was thinking of the Indians pressed us thereunto, after we should have fortified ourselves against the injuries of wet and cold." Away from the protection of the coastal towns a reassuring security soon evaporated: "had they come upon us, how soon they might have destroyed us!" In March of 1631 a shot fired by a Waterton settler to frighten wolves from a lost calf created a general alert. "The wind serving fit to carry the report of the muskets to Roxbury, three miles off, the inhabitants there took an alarm, beat up their drum, armed themselves, and sent in post to us at Boston, to raise us also." Not until morning, after a cold night's wait, was the false alarm discovered. To guard against such false calls the court ordered nightly watches in the frontier towns and set stiff penalties for shooting after dark. Later that summer, a large group of Indians assembled at the Muddy River. Governor Winthrop suspected the worst and sent a company of men under Captain Underhill to break up what was presumed to be an uprising.

Met by a generally cordial Indian reception, the English were distrustful of the natives. William Wood chastised those who thought the Indians "envious, and of such rankerous and inhumane dispositions, that they will one day make an end of their English inmates. The worst indeed may be surmised, but the English hitherto have had little cause to suspect them, but rather to be convinced of their trustiness". But the skeptics prevailed and the colony organized for its
defense. Supplies of powder and shot were put under official supervision and each town was given the responsibility of providing itself with ordinance and a fully armed militia. As the company was guided by the experience of the Virginia Company so its instructions became circumspect. The settlers were warned

not to be too confident of the fidelity of the salvages. It is a proverb trite as true, "the burnt child dreads the fire". Our countrymen have suffered too much confidence in Virginia. Let us by their harms learn to beware; and as we are commanded to be as innocent as doves, so with all was are enjoined to be as wise as serpents.

It is hardly surprising that this should have encouraged a popular view of the Indians as "a crafty people" who, "cussen and cheat".

At basis, Puritan distrust of the Indian was a product of the bridgeless culture gap which separated the two societies. Puritan and Indian culture stood diametrically opposed. In everything from land tenure to government the two societies were widely different, their social mores, value systems and mythologies were likewise far removed. But other European settlers were as alien to the Indian and not all ostracized the natives among whom they came to live.

The difference lies in the degree to which these various white societies felt they had to preserve their own cultural values. Puritans, believing they were a chosen people, were highly aware of their mission in the New World. Since their society would be the basis of a Bible commonwealth, Puritans had a highly developed sense of the completeness of their own culture. After all they had come to America to preserve their social and religious values and for the Puritans to
succeed in their mission it became essential that they uphold these values and the social cohesion that would make them work. This ruling principle behind early legislation explains the direction of the Puritan's Indian policy.

It is ironic that the firm hand of early government seeking in part to defuse armed conflict between the races sharpened the cultural distance which produced it. Such legal controls rested on the assumption that inter-racial strife would be stifled if contact was kept to a minimum and where unavoidable, regulated. In policing early race relations, Puritan leaders created what can only be called a policy of segregation. As far as possible, the two races were to be kept apart. This had been the objective of government policy from first settlement. "We conceive it fit that they be not permitted to come to your Plantation but at certain times and places, to be appointed them." Puritans, like Pilgrims, regarded Indian society to be the boundary at which civilization ended. Outlaws from the Puritans seeking haven with the Indians added to this impression. One, Christopher Gardiner, "accused to leave two wives in England, was sent for; but he had intelligence, and escaped, and travelled up and down among the Indians". A meeting of the General Court decided "to send some English to them the Indians to demand the run awayes." The story told of Jack Straw "an Indian, who had lived in England and had served Sir Walter Raleigh, and was now turned Indian again", carries the strong inference of a man relinquishing civilization and returning to wildness. The Indians' sexual freedom appalled the
Puritans who placed stringent controls on sexual behavior within their own society. Governor Winthrop related an occasion upon which he wandered out at twilight to bag some game. Becoming lost he "spent the night, sometimes walking by the fire, sometimes singing psalms, and sometimes getting wood, but he could not sleep". As dawn approached it started to rain, after he gained shelter in an abandoned hut "there came thither an Indian squaw, but perceiving her before she had opened the door, he barred her out; yet stayed there a great while essaying to get in". Now what Winthrop, a man armed, had to fear from one squaw is curious. An otherwise amusing incident takes on a darker aspect if it is assumed that what the Governor feared was being compromised by a woman alone in a wild place. Liaison with an Indian was a very serious matter. A court of assistants meeting at Boston in 1631 sentenced John Dawe to be "severely whipped for intiseing an Indian woman to lye with him." Winthrop reported the punishment executed, "a young fellow was whipped forsoliciting an Indian squaw to incontinency." Apparently the man was lucky since the court considered the death penalty for the same offense. As to the question of inter-racial marriages -- "marriage betwixte English & Indians is re-ferred to after consideration." But the court never made any ruling preferring perhaps to leave the matter up to the strong social pressure against such unions.

Puritans, unable to see beyond their own great task of settling America, were unable to view Indian society on its own terms. Adamant that God ordered all events, the Puritans thought of the Indian as part of God's design for his chosen people. Although the Indians
received the first settlers hospitably, Puritans were less impressed with this than with the power of Providence temporarily imbuing the Indians with kindness. Dudley's comment that "God caused the Indians to help us with fish at very cheap rates", is indicative of a more general conception of the Indian. It is important because it shows that Puritan thought approached the Indians indirectly, when he aided the Puritans he was an instrument of God when he opposed them he was reviled as an agent of the Devil. This idea, at the core of Puritan historiography, is crucial to an understanding of how the Puritans interpreted their first major war with the Indians. The conflict was not long in coming, after barely five years of living among the Indians the Puritans resolved their differences with them by force of arms. With a rapidly growing population to be settled, the colony expanded, forcing greater contact with the Indians. Pushing further into the interior, Englishmen confronted the Pequot: proud, warlike, and relatively unscathed by the plague.
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Prejudice is a pattern of hostility in interpersonal relations which is directed against an entire group, or against its individual members.

Gordon W. Allport.

Of these nations there were none more fierce, more warlike, more potent, or of a greater terror unto their neighbours, than that of the PEQUOTS.

Cotton Mather.

The Pequots, seated on a brave river beyond the Narragansetts, a more fierce and warlike people than any of their neighbors, and therefore make then all stand in awe.

William Hubbard.

Their quarrell being as antient as Adams time, propagated from that old enmity betweene the Seede of the Woman, and the Seede of the Serpent, who was the grand signor of this war in hand ...

Edward Johnson.
Dominant in south-eastern Connecticut, the Pequots commanded the allegiance of the tribes further west and so held away over the whole region. Connecticut had been explored as early as 1632 by Edward Winslow, and within three years settlers from the Bay Colony had established the towns of Windsor, Hartford and Westerfield. John Winthrop Jr., already appointed governor, had arrived to assume jurisdiction over this area which Lords Saye, Sele and others had claimed under the so-called Warwick Patent. As the white population of the region increased friction between English and Indian society intensified. Squabbles over land rights, havoc played by English livestock on Indian crops, and reprisals against such animals all reflected a deterioration in relations. By the spring of 1636 the new governor was being urged to take action against "the Indians killing two of our men". It was feared that the Pequots were plotting against the English. In June Jonathan Brewster, head of a trading house, received intelligence that the Pequots at Munhicke "there present abode in great secret ... held consultation one day and most of one night, about cutting off our Plymouth Barke, being then in their harbour weakly manned". In July John Oldham, a trader among the Pequots, was found on the deck of his plundered vessel, "under an old seine, stark naked, his head cleft to the brains, and his hands and legs cut as if they had been cutting them off". The clamor which had followed the death of Captain Stone and several other traders who disappeared while travelling within the Pequot nation just three years before grew to new heights. Infuriated by such beligerance, the Governor and Council in Boston commissioned John Endicott to lead
an expedition of ninety men
to put to death the men of Block Island, but to
spare women and children, and to bring them away,
and make possession of the island; and from thence
to go to the Pequods to demand the murderers of
Capt. Stone and other English, and one thousand
fathoms of wampam for damages etc., and some of
their children as hostages, which if they should
refuse, they were to obtain by force.  

What ensued was a clash which left several Pequot dead, more
wounded and considerable Indian property pillaged or destroyed. The
tribe retaliated, laying siege to Fort Saybrook and raiding white
settlements in the area. By November Lion Gardiner, commander of the
fort, spoke of being "at warrs with the Indians". John Underhill
with a score of men arrived early in 1637 to relieve the beleaguered
fort. Pequot braves moved north up the Connecticut river and in late
April launched a devastating attack on Westerfield. By the beginning
of May the General Court had declared "that there shall bee an offensive
warr against the Pequott". It became clear that the court had some­
ting more in mind than merely reprimanding the supposed murderers of
Stone and Oldham. The war "should bee seriously prosecuted; & for this
end there shallbee 160 men provided to be chosen out of the several
townes." Such a force of men suggested a cause more sinister. Of
course the court may not have been thinking in terms of a bellum
internecinum, but Roger Clap's words increase suspicion that they were.
Soldiers were sent out, wrote Clap, "once and again, whom God prospered
in their enterprises until the Pequot people were destroyed". Those
in power were urged to take an aggressive war policy. Unless the
Pequots were brought to submission in Connecticut it was feared that a
general Indian uprising would ensue.
All may be assumed of this, that if some serious and verie speedie course be not taken to tame the pride and take down the insolencie of these now insulting Pequots though with charge and loss and damage for the present, we are like to have all the Indians in the countrey about our ears, and then there will be work enough etc.9

In Boston a note passed to John Winthrop put the matter even more forcefully, "tis much desired that our countrymens blood might not rest unsatisfied for". Phillip Vincent, a young English clergyman travelling in New England to forget the recent death of his wife, drew on his impressions to write A True Relation of the Late Battle. He was quick to remind his readers to beware the folly of 1622. Even though the Indians may appear friendly, New England should avoid the long forbearance and too much levity of the English towards the Virginian salvages, had like to have been the destruction of the whole planation. These barbarians, ever treacherous, abuse the goodness of those that condescend to their rudeness and imperfections.11

The decision to carry war against the Pequots was a popular one. John Winthrop mentions that the soldiers who under Endicott carried the first punitive expedition against the Pequots were not "impressed for this service, but all went voluntaries ... and had only their victuals provided but demanded no pay". John Mason, commander of the first official expedition, recalled the decision to declare a full-scale war: "it pleased God so to stir up the Hearts of all Men in general, and the Court in special, that they concluded some Forces should forthwith be sent out against the Pequots."

An official force of ninety men under Captain John Mason was joined by a party of Mohegans under Uncas. Making their way down river to
Saybrook, the expedition was swelled by a company of Massachusetts men under Captain Underhill. Travelling to Narragansett country, the army received further reinforcements from Miantonomo with whom Roger Williams had interceded on the colony's behalf. Marching overland, the army completely surprised the main Pequot force encamped in their fort on the Mystic river. The fort was surrounded and set alight, its occupants left to their fate; only seven Indians escaped the slaughter. Some three hundred braves and their families from the other Pequot towns fled south for the Hudson river. But the English forces, now in marked superiority as they were joined by additional soldiers under Captain Patrick and Isreal Stoughton, resolved to pursue and destroy the Pequots. The final confrontation in Sasqua Swamp, near present Southport, Connecticut, saw the destruction of this once proud tribe.

With an English victory secured, the whole of Connecticut could safely be colonized. The country won from the Pequots was a rich and fertile one. "Pequots and naantucke is rich lande full of good Corne". For settlement and cultivation the land stood ready, it had "an excellent harbour, and abundance of corne, and the same ground ready for English grayne forthwith, which is a great help to planters". But such wartime correspondence was not made public; the Puritans did not want to be accused of making a war of conquest against the Pequots. Only one of the war tracts raised this subject. John Underhill subtilted his Newes from America: a New and Experimental Discoverie of New England. He publicised the Pequot nation as "aplace of good accomodation ... a place worthy to be inhabited, a soil that bears good corn, all sorts
of grain, flax, hemp, the country generally will afford". This account did not reflect the official version of the war; Underhill was out of favour with the Bay Colony. His war record might have made him a hero had he not become embroiled in the fierce theological dispute of Antinomianism. Even as the struggle with the Pequots came to fighting, Ann Hutchinson and her followers shook the very foundations of Puritanism in America. A dispute over the covenant of grace and who was eligible for salvation was seen as a direct threat to the Puritan church. Underhill had allied himself to the Antinomians, signing a petition on behalf of Reverend John Wheelright and, worse still, committing his views to paper. Stories were circulated imputing to Underhill cowardice in the face of the enemy. Humiliated, he spent the winter of 1637-38 in London where he wrote and published his account of the war.

It was of great importance that the colony exonerate itself from charges that it had mistreated the Indians. Stories were being circulated that it was the Puritans who had started this war. In 1614 John Smith, after exploring the New England coast, embarked for England leaving his vessel under Thomas Hunt. Hunt, under pretence of making trade, enticed twenty-seven inoffensive Pequots onto his boat; these he seized and later sold into slavery. Such English treachery rankled with Sassacus and the Pequots who later charged the English with usurping their lands. Gorges, who had inaugurated Quo Warranto proceedings against the Massachusetts Bay Company not long before the war began, gave circulation to these complaints. The situation merited the Puritans' serious attention. After all, Virginia
had lost its charter ten years before and it was suspected that the
New England Council had surrendered to royal prerogatives as part of
a scheme to re-establish the King's control over an area in which
the Puritans were gaining hegemony. So, the Puritan version was that
they had been forced into war by the conduct of the Pequots. Vincent
accused the tribe of treachery, rudeness and "cruel insolency".
Bradford too noted "how much wrong they [the colonists] had received
from the Pequents", and how "revenge was so sweet unto them". John
Winthrop layed the blame for the war squarely with the Pequots who
"grew to an excess of violence and outrage and proudly turned aside
from all ways of Justice and peace before the sword was drawn or any
hostile attempts made against them". This picture of unprovoked
Pequot beligerence was inherited by the next generation. The same
point of view has been accepted by at least one contemporary historian
who has laid the blame for the Pequot War upon this tribe.

But disclaimers to the contrary, the interpretation of the Pequot
War was controlled by a belief in Puritan Messianism. Even before the
Great Migration was underway John Cotton had argued

> Indeed no Nation is to drive out another without
special Commission from Heaven, such as the Is-
realites had; unless the Natives do unjustly wrong
them, and will recompence the wrongs done in
peaceable sort, and then they might right them-
selves by lawful war, and subdue the Countrey
into themselves.22

Cotton broached two ideas which go far to explain Puritan accounts
of the conflict. The first of these, mentioned in passing, was a
providential view of history; the second was the myth of the just war.
Puritanism acknowledged an omnipresent and all powerful God who
directly controlled all events. Constantly striving to divine the will of this inscrutable deity, Puritans scrutinized every event for signs or special providencies. Since God regulated New England's affairs, whatever happened that was deemed good was a token of God's grace, whilst affliction was regarded as God's anger, the loss of his grace and the work of the Devil. Convinced of the universal importance of their experiment in New England, Puritans recorded their history with great care. They were, after all, heirs to the Children of Israel charged with the mission of establishing a New Zion. They used their history to assay the word of their God and map their progress towards their goal. New England had been settled

for that noble Cause of Pure Scriptural Religion, and Religious Liberty, which were the chief original Design and Interest of the Fathers of these Plantations; and who were acted with such eminent Degrees of Faith and Piety, as excited them to the most daring Enterprizes in the Cause of God and of his People, and went a great way to their wonderful Successes.  

The Pequot War became part of the advancement of God's people, and the outcome of the War

so as their country is fully subdued and fallen into the hands of the English. Had to the end that God's name might have the glory, and his people see his power, and magnify his honor for his great goodness ...

The state of war served to unify the English in the face of a common enemy. John Winthrop was grateful for "the lords greate mercies towards vs, in our prevailing against his, and our enimies". It was believed that God intervened directly on the side of the Puritans. That "God led his People through many Difficulties and Turnings; yet
by more than an ordinary hand of Providence he brought them to Canaan at last". To reassure themselves that God was indeed on their side, the Puritans devoted great care to recording what were understood as special providences. The story is told of two men who were saved "both of them shot in the knots of their Handkerchiefs". Underhill told of

Captain Mason and myself entering into the wigwams, he was shot, and received many arrows against his headpiece. God preserved him from many wounds. Myself received a shot in the left hip, though a sufficient buff coat, that if I had not been supplied with such a garment, the arrow would have pierced through me.

Another soldier gave thanks for a narrow escape from death, "blessed be god who hath not left mee but hath giuen my life". To Puritan readers such escapes were not merely fortuitous, they were devised by God. The army that surrounded the Pequots at Mystic Fort retired from the engagement in some want of food and supplies, "as we were consulting what Course to take, it pleased God to discover our Vessels to us before a fair Gale of Wind, sailing into Pequot Harbour, to our great Rejoycing." The distance between a godly and ungodly people was defined by the outcome of this war.

Although the English finally prevailed over the Pequots, losses had been devastating. All of the frontier towns had suffered Indian attacks, some were virtually wiped out. This had been an atrocious war with women and children absorbing much of the violence. Many of the Pequots' prisoners were tortured; poor John Tilley was slowly cut to pieces and roasted alive. The sexual abuse of white women though apparently not that widespread released deepseated hostilities.
fear of the Indian as a sexual threat had been present from first arrival. In 1625 one woman about to move to the frontier expressed a general anxiety, "she feared to fall into the Indeans hands, and to 33 be defiled by them, as he had defiled other women". With the captivity of English women by the Indians, the inevitable occurred. Demanding of her how they had used her, she told us that they did solicit her to uncleaness; but her heart being much broken, and afflicted under the bondage she was cast in had brought to her consideration these thoughts — How shall I commit this great evil and sin against my God?34

This uncovered the Puritans' darkest fear: that of being possessed by the savages and overwhelmed by an ungodly wilderness. This threat would continue to haunt early colonial society and found fuller expression in the captivity narratives which followed King Philip's War.

Puritan accounts of the demise of the Pequots did not hide the relish of vengeance. Such absolute hatred of the Indians was made into the dictates of a stern God.

Thus was God seen in the Mount, Crushing his proud Enemies and the Enemies of his People ... burning them up in the fire of his Wrath, and dunging the ground with their Flesh: It was the Lord's Doing, and it is marvellous in our Eyes.35

Bradford described this defeat of the Pequots at the Mystic Fort in terms of a sacrifice.

It was a fearful sight to see them thus frying in the fyer, and the streams of blood quenching the same, and horrible was the stink and sente thereof, but the victory seemed sweet sacrifice, and they gave the prayers thereof to God.36

In meeting the Indians with the utmost violence the Puritans gave ultimate expression to their prejudice against this Indian group. The massacre of the Pequot army at the Mystic Fort and the subsequent
decision to destroy the vastly outnumbered remnants of this tribe hardly fall short of genocide. Following the remnants of the Pequot tribe Isreal Stoughton wrote, "I earnestly desire the work may be thoroughly done, and see we and our friends will suffer much by scattered wretches, if they be not closely followed." The clear intention was to destroy this Indian nation in its entirety. "There by many Pequids yet living, and such as will do much mischief." Even those Pequots that had survived the war were not to be left in peace. John Winthrop received this advice: "Sir my desire is that it would therefore please the Lord to guide you all to make a prudent disposall and dispersion of the Pequots". Some were troubled by this extreme decision.

Great and doleful was the bloody sight to the view of young soldiers that never has been in war, to see so many souls lie gasping on the ground, so thick in some places, that you could hardly pass along. It may be demanded, Why you be so furious? (as some have said). Should not christians have more mercy and compassion?

But any weakening in the face of such a task was stiffened by the extreme antagonism expressed against the Pequots. According to one old soldier "if God had not fitted the hearts of men for the service, it would have bred in them a commisseration towards them the Pequots. But every man being bereaved of pity, fell upon the work without compassion." Such unqualified racial prejudice had rapidly hardened during the war.

Pity had hindered further hostile proceedings, had not the remembrance of the bloodshed, the captive maids, and cruel insolency of these Pequents, hardened the hearts of the English, and stopped their ears unto their cries. Mercy mars all sometimes; severe justice must now and then take place.
As they met the Pequots the Puritans by their own admission became "fierce, injurious, revengeful, and ingenious in the device of means for the offence of those we take to be our enemies."

War mania colored the Puritan view of the Pequots in the blackest hues. Chroniclers describing this tribe saw a people "treacherous and perfidious," deceitful and conspiratorial, "insolent and Barbarous". As the tribe stood ready for war, they were "strongly fortified, cruel, warlike, munitioned", they fought with "great Pride and insolency and constant pursuit in their malicious Courses".

These Indians were "the barbarians to rise against us" and the belief was that they were an inately inferior people.

If wee carry away the greatest glory of these poore barbarous people in our triumph over them, the loss of three men more (if we should not exceed) may not be paralleld with so many hundreds more of theirs ...

The animus against the Pequots extended to Indians in general. Winthrop urging Plymouth's help against the Pequots wrote, "we conceive that you looke at the pequents, and all other Indeans, as a common enemie".

Although the English fought alongside Indian allies, there was a constant distrust "of the fidelity of these Indians towards us that now pretend friendship and service." The great fear and hatred of the Indians generated during this war did not soon disipate. Even as the passions of war slowly cooled, Winthrop insisted that the Narrohiggansets and especially the Nyanticks their confederates have many wyases injuriously broken and violated the same /peace/ by enter-tayneing and keeping amongst them, not onely many of the Pecott nation, but such of them as have has their hands in the blood & murder of the English ...
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CHAPTER VI

A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY NOBLE SAVAGE

We weare no Clothes, have many Gods,
And yet our sinnes are lesse:
You are the Barbarians, Pagans wild,
Your Land's the Wildernesse.

"A Narragansett" addressing the English.

During the time that men live without a common power to keep them all in awe, they are in that condition which is called war ... In such condition, there is no place for industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain: and consequently no culture of the earth; no navigation; nor use of the commodities that may be imported by sea; no commodious building; no instrument of moving, and removing, such things as require much force; no knowledge of the face of the earth; no account of time; no arts; no letters; no society; and which is worst of all, continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.

Thomas Hobbes.
War unified thinking about the Indian. Through the eyes of its historians New England saw the natives in terms of a stereotype. All Indians were wild, barbarous and beyond civilizing. Highly imimical, this outlook was formed by the great antagonism kindled by the Pequot War. Yet, atrocious as this war was it did not force a consensus of opinion. Even as the Bay Colony reeled from the effects of war mania there was emerging a view of the Indian which only later would find expression in the concept of the noble savage. The Puritans were not without their enemies and from among these came strong criticism of existing Indian policy and a favorable view of the Indian.

In New-English Canaan ... Thomas Morton expressed himself with a view of the Indian rebuking that which was common place among the Puritans. Morton first arrived in New England in 1622 or 23, shipping out with a Captain Wollaston who came to establish a plantation not far from Plymouth. Born a gentleman, Morton had some education, his training was in law which he practiced out of Cliffords Inn. Well equipped and with thirty servants in his employ Morton was not bashful about his pretensions. When Wollaston, growing weary of life in New England, departed for Virginia, Morton was quick to assume the prerogatives of leader. Fond of hunting and the outdoors, he led a licentious and convivial life which soon drew censure. Without much ceremony the Pilgrims returned him to England in 1628, but Morton was soon back, returning a year and a half later. The presence of such a man could not long be tolerated, and by September of 1630 Morton was in trouble again, this time with the Puritans. He was deported a second time and upon reaching England was detained in Exeter jail.
Thanks to the influence of Gorges and the weakness of the Puritan's case against him, Morton soon gained his liberty. Gorges brought him to London to act as witness in the case he was making against the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Only too happy to work against the Puritans, Morton stayed in Gorges' employ. It was during this period that Morton's book appeared to play a part in the literary battle being fought against the Puritans. The work was certainly a partisan effort, Christopher Gardiner -- no friend of the Puritans himself -- endorsed his friends work in verse, describing the Puritans government as

Nothing but opposition, against the right,  
Of sacred Majestie men, full of spight,  
Goodnes abusing, turning vertue out.²

Accusing him of selling guns and rum to the savages, the Puritans had summarily arrested, tried and deported their trouble maker. Morton had his goods seized, his house was burned before his eyes. He was, if nothing else, ready to hurl a few epithets. And Morton began by wryly pointing out that the authorities were eager to get rid of him because he had proved too successful a competitor in the beaver trade.

As to the charge that he had plied the Indians with liquor, Morton issued a flat denial: "I never proffered them any such thing; nay I would hardly let any of them have a drame unless hee were a Sachem".

The Puritans acted out of pure malice "envying the prosperity and hope of the Plantation at Ma-re Mount". Their settlements the more powerful, Puritans used their superior strength "like overgrown bears" to force out their competitor.
Morton and his followers had set up a Maypole and invited all to dance and cavort about it. This, more than anything else, forced the Puritans hand -- they were flabbergasted. Morton railed against such prudery. Set up as part of a harmless frolic, the Maypole was damned by the Puritans as an Idol. "Harmles mirth made by young men ... was much distasted, of the precise Separatists: that keep much a doe, about the tyth and Muit and Cummin: troubling their braines more than reason would require about things that are indifferent."

But more important than Morton's denials and remonstrations was the vantage point from which he wrote his "abstract of New England". In spirit and temper Morton was quite different from the Puritans whose voice says most about the Bay Colony. Belonging to an earlier age, Morton had been little affected by the Reformation; he was an Elizabethan inspired by the confident flush of the English Renaissance. Morton rejoiced in New England as a wild land. Employing frankly sexual imagery, he described Massachusetts as a virgin country rich and fertile.

If art & industry should doe as much
As Nature hath for Canaan, not such
Another place, for benifit and rest
In all the universe can be possest,
The more we proove it by discovery,
The more delight each object to the eye
Procures, as if the elements had here
Bin reconcil'd, and pleased it should appeare,
Like a faire virgin, longing to be sped,
And meet her lover in a Nuptiall bed.10

New England was a cornucopia, its effects fructifying, "this Country of New Canaan in seaven yeares time could show more Children living,
that have been borne there, then in 27 yeares could be shoen in
Virginea; yet here are but a handful of weomen landed, to that of
Virginea." Morton urged a conjoining with this rich country, a
joyous union which would make its "fruitfull wombe...become teeming".

With equal enthusiasm, Morton embraced the Indians who "with
their tractable nature and love towards the English" returned his
amity. Puritans however, were consistent in "alleging the mis-
cheivous intent of the Salvages" whom they believed were "a dangerous
people, subtil, secret, and mischeivous". But Morton had no
doubts of "whether they are a dangerous people as Master Bubble and
the rest of his tribe would persuade you". Morton "found the
Massachusets Indian more full of humanity, then the Christians, &
have had much better quarter with them." He labored this point,
arguing on several occasions that of New England's "two sortes of
people, the on Chistians, the other Infidels, these I have found most
full of humanity, and more friendly then the other." And again,
"you may easily perceive the uncivilized people, are more just then
the civilized."

All of this of course was pure anathema to the Puritans, fearful
of the wilderness and distrusting the Indians as the temptation to an
easy lascivious life. As Morton and his crew capered around the
Maypole, freely mingling in dance and love with the Indians, they took
liberties quite beyond what the Puritan government would tolerate.
This jolly group of Englishmen drinking, dancing and sleeping with
their Indian guests had lighted upon the Puritans worst fear. It is
hard to describe this paranoia better than "that the Indian would give
strength to the pagan, the Dionysian elements in the English character and weaken or degenerate the power of order, authority, and Christianity." This fear formed the basis of the Puritans' ethnocentric view of the Indian.

Naturally Morton suffered none of these qualms; in fact he celebrated the Indians' virtues as an ideal from which white society could learn. Far from being a source of disorder and misrule, Indian government had reached a utopian perfection. "Platoes Commonwealth is so much practised by these people." Morton's primitivism was thoroughgoing, not only did the Indians embody much the was noble and admirable, they were also little different racially from the English. "Their infants are born with hair on their heads; and are of complexion white as our nation." He speculated that both Indian and Englishman could look back to the same early origins. "The originall of the Natives of New England may well be conjectured to be from the scattered Trojans, after such time as Brutus departed from Latium." Talking of the echoes of Greek and Latin in the Indians' language Morton became enthusiastic enough to acknowledge "the Natives of New England, to be the gleanings of all Nations". There seemed little genealogical basis then, for keeping the two races separate. Indians were intelligent and "not (as some have thought) a dull, or slender witted people; but very ingenious and very subtile". Nor were they without sensibility; reputation and social standing being important among them. Morton took issue with those who claimed the Indians to be improvident -- "these people are not without providence". Although he spoke of the Indians as a
"salvage" or "uncivilized" people Morton never denied them their humanity -- in this respect they were often more Christian than the Puritans themselves. Morton's point was that the two peoples could learn one from the other. Indians were not at a lower spiritual order than the English. It is typical of the man he should argue "that if anything bring them to civility, it will be the use of Salte, to have food in store, which is a chelfe benifit in a civilized Commonwealth." As to their spiritual degeneracy -- a point made time and again in the war narratives -- Morton begged to differ. He argued that the Indians were not "without the knowledge of God (historically) for they have it amongst them by tradition, that God made one man and one woman, and had them live together and get children". These traditions and their burial ceremonies indicated that the Indians had "some touch of the immortality of the soule".

Roger Williams would certainly seem to have little in common with "Mine Host" of Merry Mount. Curiously they shared a common fate -- both were kicked out of the Bay Colony. More noteworthy, both adopted a similar outlook as they regarded the Indians. There is little in the man's background that explains Williams' primitivism. Born a Londoner into a comfortable mercantile bourgeois household, Williams was noticed and advanced by the great Sir Edward Coke himself. He was sent to Cambridge, alive with the controversies sparked by Puritan scholars. Soon after leaving the university he met John Cotton and Thomas Hooker and by 1629 was active in planning the Puritan Migration. And, by the end of 1630 Williams was in New
England himself. Evidently a man who had been noticed, Williams was highly thought of. Bradford called him "a man godly and zealous, having many precious parts"; Winthrop cherished a warm regard for the man. But Williams -- nothing if not outspoken -- first snubbed the Boston congregation, calling them an "unseparated people" and then turned down the most distinguished pastorship in the colony. Soon he was inveighing the colony's right to Indian land and had advanced even beyond Separatist principles by declaring that civil government had no right to enforce religious doctrine. Puritans, sensitive over anything likely to compromise their charter, and adamant about government prerogatives, soon moved to quench this fire brand. But Williams ignored the court and (perhaps warned by Winthrop) eluded the party sent to make his arrest. Travelling light he made his way through the frozen woods slipping away into Rhode Island. By 1643 others had gathered about him, Provincetown was a permanent settlement. To avoid being swallowed up by its neighbours the settlement would have to be recognized by London. It fell upon Williams to voyage to England and seek a charter. In the time given him on this journey Williams "drew the Materialls in a rude lumpe at Sea"; A Key into the Language of America was printed later that summer in London.

Williams who gained notoriety as the man who lived among the savages, presented the Indian in gentle, almost loving terms. They were natural men trained to hardihood by the demands of the country; men who could "run betweene fourscoure or an hundred miles in a Summers day". These were an agile people, and Williams rejoiced in
the Indians' mental as well as their physical attributes: "Their Braines are quick, their hands, Their feet, their tongues, their eyes". A life close to nature did not leave the Indians devoid of finer human attributes, Williams made such of the Narragansetts' humanity. Affection ran deep with them, almost to a fault: "This extreme affection [for their children], together with want of learning, makes their children sawcie, bold, bold and undutifull". Nor were such feelings soon relinquished, "sometimes in the night they bewaile their lost husbands, wives children, breatheran or sister &c. Sometimes a quarter, halfe, yea, a whole yeere and longer". Holding kin in such esteem the Narragansetts showed "the sociablenesse of the nature of man in the wildest of them, who love societie". These tribes were organized communities provident for their collective needs, "with friendly joyning they breake up their fields, build their Forts, hunt the Woods, stop and kill fish in the Rivers". Puncturing a confident assertion of vacuum domicilium made by Puritan imperialists, Williams observed:

The Natives are very exact and punctuall in the bounds of their lands, belonging to this or that Prince or People, (even to a River, Brook &c) And I have knowne them make bargaine and sale amongst themselves for a small piece, or quantity of Ground: notwithstanding a sinfull opinion amongst many that Christians have right to Heathens Lands ... No less precise was the Indians' "High and Honourable esteeme of the Marriage bed".

This "naturall" people had not only the rudiments of organized social life but something which in Williams' eyes was far more
important: a virtue left unsullied. Though they walked naked the
Indians were not wanton, unlike the English who were, even with
clothes on. The Narragansetts emulated a simple virtue which made
them in many respects superior to the more sophisticated English.

It is a strange truth, that a man shall generally
find more free entertainment and refreshing
amongst these Barbarians, then amongst thousands
that call themselves Christians.

From these courteous Salutations Observe in
generall: There is a savour of civility and
courtesie even amongst these wild Americans,
both amongst themselves and towards strangers.

For Williams such qualities drew the Indians closer to the English.
He remained intrigued with the idea that natives and Englishmen were
linked by common ethnological origins. With a characteristic force-
fulness he chided his countrymen:

Beast not proud English, of thy birth and blood,
Thy brother Indian is by birth as Good.
Of one blood God made Him, and Thee & All,
As wise, as faire, as strong, as personall.

Neighbouring tribes had, in their social practices, much in common
with the Jews, their language had striking similarities to Greek.
Indians are flatteringly compared to the Athenians in their "desire
of, and delight in newes". The idea of ethnic unity that "Nature
knowes no difference between Europe and Americans in blood, birth,
bodies &c." was in stiff opposition to the ethnocentricity loudly
proclaimed in the other colonies.

Williams went even further by endowing the Indian with an innate
dignity. Many among the tribes were "naturally Princes"; Indians were
given the capacity for pathos, Williams felt "their owne naturall
Temper, ... inclines to sadnesse ... the generall, are sober and grave" -- no mean recommendation. But more than this, he defied most of his contempories -- in New England at least -- claiming that the Indians were not without a spiritual aspiration,

1. That God is.
2. That hee is a rewarder of all them that diligently seek him.

He went to the extent of showing that the two peoples harboured the same story of creation. The natives relate how they have it from their Fathers, that Kautanowwit made one man and woman of a stone, which disliking, he broke them in pieces, and made another man and woman of a Tree, which were the Fountaines of all mankind.

In all of this it would appear that Williams echoed the primitivism which Morton expounded ten years earlier. Both writers celebrated the Indians' virtue, their humanity, spiritual aspirations, and the bond which linked native and Englishman. Besides being candid reports upon Indian society these two books made out of the Indian a literary device: a foil to be used against the Bay Colony. Beyond this any similarity between these two writers begins to break down.

In their collective assumptions, in the inspiration which each man brought to his book, Morton and Williams were quite different. These two broadsides represent a literary breakaway from the arid sermonizing of the Puritans. Naturally England was the source of artistic guidance. Mortan excuses his doggerel and embarrasses Ben Johnson with an acknowledgement. He taunted the Separatists with
his daring allusions, defying their dull, frightened, Bible-bred minds to grasp the meaning of the poem he pinned to the Maypole. Morton's richness of scope is Shakespearean -- if in nothing else than its audacity. Williams however, was drawn to what he considered sterner stuff. An acquaintance and then a friend of Milton from the time that the Key was published, Williams became a partisan for the cause of Milton's work.

But speculation about such "influences" and "borrowings" is much less useful than a comparison of the cognitive reach of each man's primitivism. Williams, to a much greater extent than Morton, was careful to check undue inference from his arguments. Although he saluted the Indians' attributes Williams was always aware that these primitive men had their limitations. Blinkered by a providential outlook he could not, like Morton, understand a pagan animus. There was much of the censorious Puritans which stayed with Williams all his life. Frivolous pastimes, idle amusements, and the vain glory of Indians painting themselves, brought a frown of disapproval. But this was not cause enough to put the Indian beyond the pale of civilization. At root his sense of the Indians' limitations lay with his belief that they were spiritually incomplete. This of course was quite a different notion than the argument advanced by many Puritans that the Indians were irrevocably damned. Yet Williams' argument was derived from the same source: its basis lay with his conception -- shared with the Puritans -- of the wilderness as a moral wasteland. New England's "desolate howling Wilderness" was a place "where greedie and furious men persecute and devour this harmlesse and innocent as
the wilde beasts pursue and devour the Hinds and Roes." This is quite different from Morton's allurement with a "virgin land". Williams, knowing and respecting the Narragansetts, was appalled by the barbarousness of the mythical Manquauogs who "make a delicious monstrous dish of the head and brains of their enemies". The crux of Williams' argument is that even the tribes among whom he lived -- peaceful agriculturalists -- had incurred

that Judgement which the Lord Jesus pronounced against the weathervise (but ignorant of the God of the weather) which will fall most justly upon those Natives, and all men who are wise in Naturall things, but willingly blind in spiritual.

Untutored, the Indians would remain subject to "the Divell who drives on their worships". Williams' primitivism then, turned on a real commitment to bringing the Indians to Christianity. It is to this point that a third critic of the Puritans addressed himself.

Almost as soon as he stepped off the boat at Boston harbour in 1638 Thomas Lechford drew suspicion. Forced out of England and a promising legal career in Clements Inn, he was a victim of Laud's oppression. Lechford had the temerity to solicit the cause of William Prynne, one of the many martyres to the cause against episcopacy. It was not the man's religious principles which first drew the court's apprehension but the fact that Lechford was a lawyer. The magistrates did not want "lawyers to direct men in their Causes", and any of that profession were viewed with an immediate misgiving. Lechford, by nature argumentative and contentious, soon gave the court grounds to credit its foreboding. The man was generous about giving
his opinions on religious doctrine: his unorthodoxy created a stir on the boat coming over from England. Arriving, Lechford committed his opinions to paper, and these, when finally they were read by those in power, were his undoing. Such a man could not be trusted with official business, so Lechford was denied professional access to court and company. His law practice did not prosper; he earned "barely enough to keep me in bread". Discouraged he finally sailed from Boston in August 1641, his estate worth little more than six pounds. By November Lechford was once more at Clements Inn, a much stronger supporter of monarchy and episcopacy than when he left. Plain Dealing or News From New England was published the following year. The pamphlet described the polity and church organization of the Bay Colony and went on to develop a case against this establishment. In his indictment Lechford made three main arguments. First, the colony was too independent, both from Crown and Established Church. Then, and Lechford was still smarting, colonial leadership was excluding too many useful men from Church membership and government. Finally, and this is the only argument directly relevent here, the theocracy was was doing nothing to convert the Indians.

It is clear that Lechford was more interested in making a careful and telling case against the Puritans than in celebrating Indian primitivism. Yet Lechford, though more circumscribed even than Williams, all the same stood counter to Puritan opinion on this matter. Like Morton, he found English and Indians much the same in their appearance "their children are born white" and this carried the same implications of the shared origins argument. Along with
Williams Lechford's aspiration for the Indians turned upon their being converted to Christianity, when they will become zealous Christians, then will they labour, get clothes, and subsistence about them. In vaine doe some think of civilizing them, either by the sword, or otherwise ... 62

If missionary work were properly organized then the Indian could quickly become civilized. But post war New England did not share this same vision, it distrusted and feared the Indians whom it kept segregated and "in very good subjection".

These three writers properly belong to a tradition of literary primitivism. For them the Indians of New England were very much what the Scythians and Ethiopians were to the ancients. Whether these men were familiar with such classical writers is not known. Educated and at home with Latin they may have come across Seneca's Epistulae Morales probably the most important source of primitivism in the sixteenth and seventeenth century. At least some of Seneca's enthusiasm for the ideal of man within nature is acknowledged, especially by Morton. To this Roman Stoic the appeal of man hardened by nature living a simple life and so avoiding the moral indigence of idle luxury was highly appealing.

Nature suffices for what she demands. Luxury has abandoned nature ... she has made the mind the servant of the body and bidden it devote itself to satisfying the body's lusts.

Few things were more noble than a society living communally within an unspoiled nature. "What race of men was ever happier than these? They enjoyed all nature in common ... Why indeed should I not call that the richest race of mortals since no poor man could be found
among them." Seneca might almost have been talking about the Narragansetts so admired by Roger Williams. As Tacitus had, Morton, Williams and, to a lesser extent, Lechford held up the virtues of a simple society to act as an example to a civilized one which they felt was moving in the wrong direction. The *Germania* is after all more than a bald description of Teutonic life, it is a contrast drawn with didactic intent. The characteristics ascribed to the *Germani* were the values and attributes which Romans had once prided themselves upon. The Teutons were exceedingly brave and hard; there was not avarice for idle wealth; they were intensely democratic and

greater hospitality and entertainment is nowhere more bountiful than there, it being a cursed deed to bar any from his house ... Matrimony is severely kept among them, the thing most commendable in all their manner of life ... They live therefore in most strict chastity, uncorrupted with the allurements of shows and spectacles, or provocations in banqueting.

In quite the same way are the Puritans censored; their critics show the Indians to be "more Christian" than they. It could be argued that in so using the Indian these writers made of him a literary device, that the noble Indian merely an abstraction formulated for the political purposes behind these books. But this would be forgetting that each of these writers knew the Indians well, Morton and Williams lived among them.

These books are harbingers of a primitivist tradition within American literature. The celebration of a noble savage within an ideal state of nature is usually placed in the eighteenth century.
First to be mentioned in this context is Robert Beverley, a gentleman
farmer of some education, who gave his leisure to writing what was
published as The History and Present State of Virginia. Appearing
in 1705 this book was a plain spoken jubilation of what its author
thought a rich and beautiful country. Beverley admired the Indians,
they lived a simple pure life,

happy I think, in their simple state of nature,
and in their enjoyment of plenty without the
curse of labor. They have on several accounts
reason to lament the arrival of the Europeans,
by whose means they seem to have lost their
felicity, as well as their innocence.  

In all of this Beverley anticipated the scribblings of an obscure
Frenchman who would become famous for an essay he submitted to the
academy of Dijon in 1749. But if Beverley anticipated Rousseau so,
too, did this Virginian follow three New English writers.
Notes to Chapter VI:

1. Ferdinando Gorges dominates the early history of English settlement in North America. His first enterprise was undertaken as early as 1606, a succession of impractical proposals and complete failures followed. Gorges, holding royal title to lands in New England, claimed his prerogatives were being usurped by those successful in settling the region. Much of his energy and not inconsiderable influence went into the fight for these rights in London. See Charles M. Andrews, The Colonial Period of American History, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1934), I, 320-43, 400-29.


3. Ibid., 100.

4. Ibid., 38.

5. Ibid., 93.

6. Ibid., 90.

7. Ibid., 90.

8. Ibid., 91.

9. Ibid., 5.

10. Ibid., 10.

11. Ibid., 82.

12. Ibid., 10, 82.

13. Ibid., 11.

14. Ibid., 77.

15. Ibid., 87. Morton was referring to William Bradford and the Pilgrims.

16. Ibid., 20.

17. Ibid., 15.

18. Ibid., 85.

22. Ibid., 18.
23. Ibid., 17.
24. Ibid., 31.
25. Ibid., 27-29.
26. Ibid., 31. This claim was made by many Puritan chroniclers and promoters (Winslow, Wood, Higginson and a host of others) despite the fact that most early settlements were rescued from starvation by buying or stealing corn from Indian granaries.
28. Ibid., 34.
29. Ibid., 35-36.
32. Ibid., 149.
33. Ibid., 113.
34. Ibid., 116.
35. Ibid., 125.
36. Ibid., 128.
37. Ibid., 170.
38. Ibid., 167.
39. Ibid., 208.
40. Ibid., 188.
41. Ibid., 104, 99.
42. Ibid., 133.
43. Ibid., 86, 134.
44. Ibid., 124, 216, 93.
45. Ibid., 189.
46. Ibid., 197.
47. Morton's book first appeared in London in 1632, and later under the same title as an Amsterdam imprint of 1637.
49. Dripping with derision Morton went on to explicate the same finishing with this affront to Puritan narrow-mindedness, "learning does enable men's minds to converse with climents of a higher nature than is to be found within the habitation of the Mole." Ibid., 92.
51. Williams, after all had difficulty avoiding this sort of patronage. He noted on one occasion "it hath pleased God to make them / the Indians / many times the instruments of my preservation". Key, 178.
52. Williams, Key, 231, 241, see Mauro Calamandrei, "Neglected Aspects of Roger Williams Thought", Church History, 21, (September, 1952), 239-59, for a well put case "that rather than being a man of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment Roger Williams was a Puritan", 239.
53. Williams, Key, 153, 175. It has been argued that by "wilderness" Williams meant not New but old England, made desolate by its spiritual waywardness. The passage in which Williams' Indian spokesman berates the English with "Your Lands the Wilderness", Key, 204, is used to defend this interpretation. Certainly Williams' providential outlook could have intended this wider meaning. But in this passage:

Lost many a time I have had no Guide,
No House, but hollow Tree!
In stormy Winter night no Fire,
No Food, no Company:

In him I have found a House, a Bed,
A Table, Company:
No Cup so bitter, but's made sweet,
When God shall sweet'night be.
it seems clear that Williams was thinking of the trackless forests which surrounded Provincetown. At another point he stresses "the same sun shines on the wildernes that doth on a Garden!" a garden to be clutched from the wilderness by "toyling labour", Key, 153, 172. This conception of a wilderness is not, as is often advanced, a proto-Hobbesian one, for Williams assumes "The wildest of the sonnes of Men have ever found a necessity, (for the preservation of themselves, their Families and Properties) to cast themselves into some Mould or forme of Government", Key, 201. The wilderness condition dictated a spiritual not a social inadequacy.

54. Williams, Key, 130.
55. Ibid., 200.
56. Ibid., 193.
59. Hale, Notebook, 44.
60. Ibid., 44.
62. Ibid., 35.
63. Ibid., 50.
64. Epistulae Morales XC, in Lovejoy, Documentary History of Primitivism, I, 271.
65. Ibid., 273.
66. Quoted in Fairchild, Noble Savage, 4-5.
67. It is reasonable to argue that European primitivism ushered in with the appearance of Montaigne's Essays, in print as early as the 1580's, and brought to fruition with Rousseau's Discourses was based upon an acquaintance with primitive man that was a best imperfect. None of the major contributors to the debate ever studied primitive man within habitat; their speculation on the nature of primitivism was purely philosophical, their noble savage purely an abstraction.
CHAPTER VII

SAINTS AND SINNERS

The danger of man since his fall is more in sinking down then in climbing up, in dejecting then in raising himself to a better condition.

John Bulwer.

Idolaters every Age after other descend lower and lower, and shrinke and slide downwards.

Walter Raleigh.

You (Father Derseau, a catholic missionary) tell us there is but one religion that can save us, and that you have got it. Mr. Cowley, the Protestant minister, tells us that he has got it. Now which of you two white men am I to believe? I will tell you the resolution I and my people have come to; it is this: when you both agree, and travel the same road, we will travel with you; till then, however, we will adhere to our own religion: we thing it is the best.

Indian Chief in the Red River Region.
Nothing is more audible than the Puritans' sustained clamor over missionary work. From first settlement until King Philip's War the subject of converting the Indians was constantly mentioned in promotional literature, Royal Charters, journals, histories, and most notably in a series of pamphlets, the so-called Eliot Tracts. This literature belabored a story that can be simply told since only a handful of Puritans were involved in the work of converting the natives. It is fairly accurate to say that until the 1640's no real missionary work was undertaken at all; that the first generation of settlement ignored this work. Some feeble attempts were made in Plymouth to explain Christianity to those Indians who understood English. Governor Bradford mentioned that Squanto, who befriended and probably saved the early settlement, died "desiring the Govr. to pray for him, that he might goe to the Englishmans heaven". But Massasoit, the powerful leader of Wampanoags, would have none of this and Plymouth was not inclined to change his mind.

The most successful missionary group in New England was the Mayhew family which led a settlement planted on Martha's Vineyard in 1642. Reverend Thomas Mayhew Jr. promptly undertook missionary work on the Indians' behalf. By 1643 he could boast his first convert, Hiacoomes, who helped Mayhew in his ministrations. But in 1657 Mayhew disappeared at sea when the ship taking him to England foundered. Undaunted, Thomas Mayhew Sr., already an old man, began to work in his son's place; subsequently missionary work was undertaken by other members of the family. On the mainland John Eliot, minister at Roxbury,
had been studying the Algonquian dialect. By October 1646 Eliot had begun preaching to a group of Massachusetts Indians in the village of Nonantum. Meanwhile the focus of events had shifted to London. Using a brilliant propaganda campaign, Edward Winslow, sometime Governor of Plymouth, got Parliament to charter a Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England which it did in 1649. This organization solicited funds from the British public to defray the cost of missionary work in New England. But for all of the publicity and money the work went ahead slowly. Supported by Waban, "sachem" of the Massachusetts, Eliot gained a larger audience for his sermons so much so that Nonantum was unable to contain the potential converts. It was decided to establish a new town for these "praying Indians" and by 1651 a tract of land had been secured on the Charles river about eighteen miles from Roxbury. By summer, the site of Natick, first and most prominent of the praying towns, had been laid out. By October Governor Endicott and Rev. Wilson were surprised to find a thriving settlement. Six years later a second praying town, Punkapog, was established, and by the mid 1670's fourteen such towns were in existence. Throughout this period missionary work continued to be funded from England. With the restoration of the monarchy the society received a royal charter from Charles II on February 7, 1662. Due to the new leadership of Robert Boyle, committed, wealthy and not above making generous contributions to the organization, the re-chartered society was an even more fruitful source of funds.

It was at this time that Eliot's major missionary undertaking came to culmination. Eliot had begun translating the Bible into
Algonquian as early as 1647. There can be no underestimating the scale of this endeavor, Eliot found time from his other pressing duties (he remained Minister at Roxbury) to learn the Indians' language, devise its written form, translate the whole Bible and see it through the press. By 1650 the work proper was underway, by 1655 Genesis and Mathew were completed, three years later the translation was in rough draft and finally in 1663 both old and new testament had been printed. But even with the Indian Bible the number of Indian converts remained very small. Only twenty per cent of the native population (estimated at about 15,000) had been touched by Christianity. Most of these were of the Massachusetts tribe or lived on Martha's Vineyard or Nantucket Island; the Wampanoags, Narragansetts, Niantics and Mohegans remained untouched by Christianity. What missionary work was undertaken was largely confined to the Bay Colony and the "Mayhew Islands". Richard Bourne in Plymouth was active in missionary work and was the moving spirit behind the establishment of the praying town of Maktopeg near Sandwich. But in Connecticut, New Haven and Rhode Island virtually no work was done at all. Of the nominally Christian Indians only a tiny proportion were full church members. Only two bona fide Indian churches had been established, these at Natick and Hassawesitt. By the mid 1670's Natick, the oldest and most populous of the praying towns, could muster only fifty communicants.

Although this bare chronology is generally accepted, no consensus unifies interpretation of the Puritan's missionary work in New England.
It is possible to see a dichotomy between two schools of thought. On the one hand is what might be called the "benign interpretation", this has most recently been argued by Ola Winslow and Alden Vaughan. This argument claims that the Puritans' motives in seeking to convert the Indians were altruistic and that in this endeavor they were largely successful. This argument has been challenged on a number of fronts. Francis Jennings has argued that the Puritans were rather unwillingly forced into missionary work by political and economic expediency. To Robert Berkhofer Jr. Protestant missionaries were the harbingers of a cultural assault against Indian society. This has been followed up by Neal Salisbury who makes the case the Puritan missionaries helped subdue and colonize the Indians of New England. This paper, though not intended at at polemic, is intended to continue this debate. Although the Puritans might have claimed success for their missionary work, this statement was by no means accepted by their seventeenth century critics. The "benign interpretation's" celebration of the Puritans as successful missionaries is therefore rather partisan. In fact Puritan writing on missionary work emerged in the face of sustained contemporary criticism of their poor showing in this regard. The residue of this dialectic, most active from the mid 1640's to 1670's, was a set of assumptions about the Indians. These assumptions were the basis of a paradigm which gave logical coherence to the great racial prejudice against the native American.

The Puritans were committed to missionary work by the rhetoric of empire. Such a commitment was sure to convince a monarch by no means sure of his imperial prerogatives. The Puritans first hopes
for settling in New England were buttressed with promises to convert the natives. Hardly had the Pilgrims decided to quit Leyden than the pious hope of "propagating and advancing the gospell" became a justification for settling America. This was the message which sounded through the land as England dared to plant the beginnings of an empire in America. John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's preached: "Onl; let your principal end be the propagation of the glorious Gospel, not gaine, not glory, but to gaine Soules to the glory of God". First on the list of reasons which fired the founders of the Bay Colony was: "The propagation of the gospell to the Indians. Wherin first the importance of the works tending to the inlargement of the kingdome of Jesus Christ and winning them out of the snare of the Divell."

Such a commitment pleased King James who was emboldened by the thought of driving a wedge into Spain's catholic hedgemony. He wrote to Sir Thomas Gates, one of the original Massachusetts Bay patentees:

> We greatly commending, and graciously accepting of their desire for the furtherance of so noble a work, which may by the providence of Almighty God hereafter tend to the glory of his divine Majesty, in propagating of Christian religion ...

The great work of bringing the gospel to the heathens presented an undeniable case for occupying New England. So pervasive was this argument that it dispensed with tedious arguments over "ancient discoveries, contracts and agreements which our Englishmen have long since made in those parts".

So, the first charters stood on the promise of converting the Indians. In its charter the Massachusetts Bay Company was committed
to bring the Indians "to knowledge and obedience of the onlie true
God and Savior of mankinde, and the Christian fayth, which, in our
royal intencon and the adventurers free profession is the principall
ende of this plantacon." The company's seal depicted an Indian,
arms outstretched, appealing "come over and help us". Correspondence
from the company's original headquarters in London reinforced the same
commitment. Wrote Mathew Craddock, first governor of the company, "we
trust you will not be unmindful of the main end of our Plantation, by
endeavoring to bring the Indians to the knowledge of the Gospel".
Again, the first general letter of instructions to the settlement de­
cclared missionary work "above all to be our aim in settling this
Plantation". In his oath of office Endicott, the first Governor,
was bound "do your best to endeavour to draw on the natives of this
country called New-England, to the knowledge of the True God".
Similarly, Samuel Skelton and Francis Higginson, chosen pastor and
teacher for the first Massachusetts congregation, were sworn to do
"their uttermost to further the main end of this Plantation, being,
by the assistance of Almighty God, the conversion of the salvages."
It was generally agreed that the aims of the colony were: "The glory
of God, the propagation of the Gospel of Christ, the conversion of
the Indians".

Yet it hard to escape the impression that all of these effusive
commitments to missionary work were merely rhetoric. This was useful
rhetoric mind, for it gave the Puritans undisputed title to New
England. Robert Cushman, twice sent from Leyden to negotiate for a
Pilgrim settlement in America, made a strong case out of the fact that
the Pilgrim's presence there would give the Indians access to Christianity. In a similar fashion the Massachusetts Bay Puritans justified their presence in terms of bringing Christianity to New England. Yet conspicuously absent from this early discussion of missionary work are concrete proposals. No plan of action was made. Governor Bradford of Plymouth spoke vaguely of "laying some good foundation, or at least to make some way thereunto, for propagating and advancing the gospell." Edward Winslow chastised those who much "talked on and lightly or lamely prosecuted" such work but came up with no plan himself. Nor did the larger resources of the Massachusetts Bay Company promise anything more decisive. "God shall have glory by it [the proposed missionary work] though they [the Indians] refuse it, and there is good hope that Posterity shall by this means be gathered into Christes sheepefould." But after a while even the talking ceased. After a generation of settlement the Puritan's commitment to this work seems to have weakened. In 1646 missionary work was placed a poor seventh on the list of reasons for which the colony had been founded.

Whilst this situation did not seem to bother the authorities in New England, observers in Europe were not quite so sanguine. John Robinson, in Leyden, lamented that the Pilgrims seemed more adept at killing than converting the Indians. "Oh how happy a thing" he chided Governor Bradford, "if you had converted some, before you had killed any." With missionary work the declared objective of English settlement in America, writers echoed Purchas' disappointment of the poor
showing in this endeavor. In 1644 a bellicose Puritan named William Castell issued *A Short Discourse of the Coasts and Continent of America*, a tract which largely served to publicize the need for gospel work. Even worse, Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld, humiliated after the failure of their mission on behalf of the Bay Colony vented their feelings against New England by belittling its missionary effort. Though New England Puritans seemed more annoyed that they were being unfavorably compared to their hated neighbors, the French Catholics to the north. Governor John Winthrop showed his annoyance with this fit of pique: "It is a scandal to our Religion that we showe not as much zeale in seeking the conversion of the heathen as the Papists doe". Puritans evaded this criticism by claiming that their objectives for the Indians were far loftier than those entertained by the Catholics. Even Roger Williams, usually at odds with the Bay Colony, agreed that Protestant conversion was more thorough-going. Answering the claim that he had done little to bring the Narragansetts of Rhode Island to Christianity, Williams retorted: "I could have brought the whole country to observe one day in seven: I add, to have received baptism; to have come to a stated church meeting; to have maintained priests, and forms of prayer ... Woe be me if I call that conversion to God". The main difference was that the Puritans felt that the Indians were incapable of Christianity unless they were first civilized. The first step in any missionary enterprise was to conquer "their infinite distance from Christianity, having never been prepared thereunto by any Civility at all". As John Eliot
put it, "the work of the day is to civilize them", and elsewhere more emphatically, "I find it absolutely necessary to carry on civility with Religion". For the Puritans this meant nothing less than socializing and educating the Indians in the English manner.

As the Puritans faced the Indians over the breach of Christianity, they formed a dim view of the potential converts. Of course the prejudice against the heathen Indian remained unchanged from when King James wrote of converting "such a people as yet live in darkness and miserable ignorance of the true knowledge and worship of God, and may in time bring the infidels and savages living in these parts, to human civility, and to a quiet and settled governance". John Eliot castigated an Indian audience with "we [English] labour and work in building, planting, clothing ourselves, etc. and [you] do not". In the hands of those who were writing to counter criticism of the Puritans' missionary effort, the language was stronger, the view of the Indian even less flattering.

And wonder not that wee mention no more instances at present: but consider; First, their [The Indians] infinite distance from Christianity, having never been prepared thereunto by any Civility at all. Secondly, the difficulty of their language to us and ours to them; there being no rules to learne either by. Thirdly the diversity of their owne language to it selfe; every part of that Countrey having its own Dialect, differing much from the other; all which make their comming into the Gospel the more slow.

The most trenchent criticism of the Puritans neglect of missionary work was made by Thomas Lechford. This man was never popular with the Puritan authorities who saw to it that he had a short stay in New England. Lechford was suspect because he was a lawyer and the
magistrates did not want "lawyers to direct men in their Causes", but also because of his unorthodox religious opinions with which he was generous. Denied professional access to court and company Lechford did not prosper and left New England with a grudge against its government. He vented himself with Plaine Dealing or News From New England which he had published in 1642. This pamphlet described the polity and church organization of the Bay Colony and went on to develop a case against this establishment. In his indictment Lechford made three main arguments. First, the colony was too independent, both from Crown and Established Church. Then, and Lechford was still smarting, colonial leadership was excluding too many useful men from church leadership. Finally the Puritans were doing nothing to convert the Indians. A minister "hath not been sent forth by any Church to learn the Natives language, or to instruct them in Religion". But Lechford raised a far more volatile issue when he asked:

how can the Gospel be propagated to the Indians without an Apostolicaal Bishop? If any Church, or people, by the Kings leave, send forth Ministers to teach and instruct the poore Indians in the Christian Religion, they must leave at least Apostolicaal power to ordain Ministers or Elders.35

Under existing church organization, "the conversion of the Natives shall not be endeavoured, orderly, according to the rule of God". Lechford had at once hit upon the most telling explanation of the Puritans' disregard of missionary work and at the same time brought unwelcome attention to their congregational church organization. The authorities were concerned, and so they should have been. Writing
more in alarm than malice, Thomas Dudley informed Governor John Winthrop:

I have read over Mr. Lechfords booke and find the scope thereof to be erroneous and dangerous, if not hereticall, according to my conception. His tenet being that the office of Apostelship doth still continew and ought so to doe till Christs coming, and that a Church hath now power to make Apostles as our Savior Christ had when he was here. Other things there are, but I pray you consider of this and the inseperable consequence of it: I heare than Mr. Cotton and Mr. Rogers know something of the matter, or man with whom you may if you please confere ...  

Lechford had made it clear that the Puritan church was not an evangelical organization and this truth could prove embarrassing. New England Puritans had organized their church to give a dominant power to the congregation. This association of converted believers unified by a voluntary covenant to gain salvation was bound by no higher ecclesiastical authority. Each congregation chose and ordained its own pastor, teacher and ruling elders. Such an organization was well suited to the need of its members which was to seek their own salvation. Perry Miller draws the inference neatly: "The external church was not primarily an evangelical organization to carry the gospel to the heathen, but a brotherhood for the cultivation and intensification of grace in those who already had it." A loose confederation of independent congregations was in a poor position to coordinate a unified missionary effort. Ministers were ordained and supported by the congregations and no congregation carried the burden of a minister whose sole responsibility was missionary work. So, the Puritans' failure to initiate missionary work was blamed on their
church organization which was itself a bone of contention. Always suspicious of the bishops, Puritans sought to escape their power in America. Such a desire for independence caused the Pilgrims to break entirely with the Anglican church. But this the Puritans were loath to do since the charge was already being driven hard against them that they had become too presumptuous and independent. If the Parliament chose to act on such charges the Puritans stood to lose the independence they had so carefully strived for.

It was precisely this spirit of independence that was coming under fire in London. Samuel Gorton, who becoming embroiled in the Antinomian dispute was banished from New England in 1644, sought redress before the Commission for Foreign Plantations. He was so convincing that the Earl of Warwick guaranteed his safe conduct should he return to the Bay Colony. As part of his case Gorton published Simplicities Defence Against a Seven-Headed Policy, the monster in question being the tyranny of Puritan government. Gorton told a tale of arbitrary and presumptuous power which cruelly abused those who opposed Puritan polity, "these men / The magistrates/ do not only entrench causelessly upon their country-men, but also upon the Indians". Besides abusing them the Puritans took no pains to remedy the spiritual deficiency of the Indians "whom Aaron your Levitticall Sacrificer hath made naked". Another critic of Puritan government, Robert Child, found enough support within the colony to launch a protest to the General Court demanding reforms. In its written form this critique, the so called Remonstrance of 1646, levelled a weighty
indictment against colonial government. In power the Puritans were arbitrary and almost despotic, civil and religious liberties were being threatened. Child, a Presbyterian, reinforced Lechford's arguments against New England's Congregationalism, arguments which fell upon the willing ears of the Presbyterian faction grown powerful with the House of Commons. Arrested on the charge of sedition, Child appealed his case to London. This the Puritans had every reason to fear. Ferdinando Gorges ceaseless in his efforts to overthrow the colony now had numerous and outspoken allies. At the back of any attempt to deny the validity of the Puritans' charter was the charge that they had broken their promise to convert the Indians. As the Presbyterian Baylie put it "of all that ever crossed the American seas [the Puritans] were the most neglectful" of converting the Indians. The claim that the Puritans had systematically neglected missionary work could be made into the case that they had broken an important covenant upon which the charter rested. It was with all of this in mind that John Winthrop persuaded no less a man than Edward Winslow to represent the colony in the Child and Gorton cases then before the Warwick Commission.

As soon as he arrived in London Winslow published Hypocrisie Unmasked which rebuffed the charges that Samuel Gorton, Robert Baylie and others had hurled against the Puritans. But Winslow was too astute a politician to be put on the defensive, realizing that missionary work was a key issue he made this his cause célèbre. First he had to silence those who were arguing that the Puritans were ignoring missionary work. Of course Puritan denials of this claim had
been frequently made. Three years before a tract pleasingly called "New Englands First Fruits" had argued that the Indians were being taught English and that they showed enthusiasm for the Gospel, "some would used to weep and cry when detained by occasion from a sermon". But there was no denying what was commonly known and in "The Day Breaking of the Gospel in New England ...". Winslow had to content himself with the message of great expectations.

If the least beginnings be made by the conversion of two or three, its worth all our time and travailes, and cause of much thankfulnesse for such seedes, although no great harvests should immediately appeare, surely this is evident, first that they never heard heartbreaking prayer and preaching before now in their owne tongue, that we know of, secondly, that there were never such hope of dawning mercy towards them as now.\[45\]

This message was repeated with the publication of "The Clear Sun-Shine of the Gospel Breaking ..." which again promised great things to come. Winslow was broadcasting his anticipation in the hope that it would persuade Parliament to authorize support for missionary work. His first attempt to get a bill passed was killed in the Committee of Foreign Plantations. By the spring of 1649 the indefatigable Winslow was lobbying hard for a second bill which he had helped to draft. To help his cause along he published yet another pamphlet, "The Glorious Progress of the Gospel ..." which continued to argue that the Puritans were not only engaged in missionary work but were now reaping success.

The English were not wholly negligent this way, but had sundry parts of the Countrey long before divers to a pretty competency of right understanding in the mystery of salvation, who lived orderly and died hopefully.\[46\]
Never one to lose an opportunity, Winslow argued that the Indians were being won for Christianity by the Puritans' good example. The natives "had such experience of the justice, prudence, valour, temperence and righteousnesse of the English, as did not only remove their former jealouesies and fears concerning us, and convince them of their owne uneven walking; but begat a good opinion of our persons". Largely due to such efforts, the bill became law on July 27, 1649. Besides providing for the funding of missionary work in New England Winslow saw to it that the Society was also a source of propaganda. A clause in the bill required that when passed into law it should be read in every parish in the realm. The Society also published pamphlets which continued to advertise on-going missionary work.

But Winslow's feverish activities in London did not reflect any great change of heart within New England. The attitude of the authorities to missionary work remained passive. Eliot was certainly not appointed as missionary to the Indians, nor did he receive any remuneration from the colonies. Upon the implementation of the 1649 Act which stipulated that the Commissioners of the United Colonies should oversee the distribution of funds between the colonies, the Massachusetts General Court complained that they were spending too much time on missionary work. In fact Eliot consistently ran into obstructions from the church Elders who seemed determined to retard the admission of Indian converts. Potential converts were turned down in 1652 and 1654 and not until 1660, fourteen years after Eliot
had begun preaching among the Indians was a church established at Natick. Nor did demands for simpler church admission which ended in the concession of the Half-Way Covenant of 1662 ease the process for Indian converts, for the issue in their case remained one of acculturation.

The dictates of the social conversion required that the Indian radically change his mode of living.

If there be any work of Grace amongst them, it would surely bring forth, and be accompanied with the Reformation of their disordered lives, as in other things, so in their neglect of labor, and their living in idleness and pleasure.52

It was a gauge of the progress made at Natick that the Indians were able to build, without assistance, a house "after the English manner"; the town's inhabitants had "fruit trees already planted, and they are building English houses for themselves." In a letter to Robert Boyle, Eliot was pleased to report that the praying Indians followed "The example of the English churches, and the authority of the English laws." Those Indians who were advancing towards Christianity threw off their traditional culture, one of them "would not goe naked like the Indians, but cloathed just as one of our selves; he abhorred to dwell with the Indians any longer." Another wishing to have his children educated among the English, explained "they would grow wicked and rude at home, and would never come to know God, which they hoped they should doe if they were constantly among the English."

Such stories notwithstanding, even the praying Indians did not completely abandon their traditional way of life, which meant that as potential converts they were suspect. One of the difficulties Mayhew
complained of was the Indians proclivity "for their own meetings, wayes and customes". Missionary contact was a cultural conflict and it is hard to miss the strident martial tones sounded throughout the missionary literature. To those who took Mayhew's teaching lightly "the Lord sent an universal sicknes and it was observed by the Indians, that they that did but give the hearing of good counsel, did not taste so deeply of it". By such means was the "Lords displeasure" revealed. On another occasion "it pleased God that this company of wicked Indians, were smitten with the Pox". The English were pleased to convince at least one Indian "that our God was a most dreadful God; and that one English man by the help of his God was able to slay and put to flight an hundred Indians." The idea of an Armageddon was never far from the Puritans' imagination, Eliot saw the conversion of the Indians in such terms.

All those signs preceeding the glorious coming of Christ are accomplished, and a thick black cloud is gathered a cloud of blood, confusion, Heresies and Errors ... But notwithstanding all this black cloud, who seeth not the glorious coming of the Lord Jesus breaking through this cloud and coming with power and great glory?

Thomas Shepherd, an author of one of the Eliot Tracts, saw missionary work in the same terms: "the Lord Jesus will have you see more of his conquests and triumphs".

As it happened this promise was not realized and the blame for the small trickle of Indian converts was laid on the Indians themselves. Those Indian leaders who sought to preserve traditional ways were distrusted, "Sachems opposing any that desire to submit themselves to the
service of the Lord", came in for particular censure. Puritans felt justified in their old suspicion that the Indians would never make adequate Christians. In 1647 William Bradford assumed that "satan will make great opposition to the Indians being converted", and it may be some maye false". Three years later Henry Whitfield, another of the missionary writers, observed "it cannot be expected but that Devil should be like himself ... so as to cause many of them to totter, back slide, and fall away from what they have professed". This was entirely consistent with the prevailing notions about the Indians and their society.

Left to themselves the Indians "ever sate in hellish darnesse, adoring the Divell himselfe for their GOD". They were, according to Whitfield, "under the power of Satan, and going up and downe with the chains of darknesse rattling at their heels." Mayhew saw them as "poor naked sons of Adam, and slaves to the Devil". Without any spiritual enlightenment, and living in what the English considered primitive conditions, Indian society seemed the very nadir of human existence. Shepherd called the Indians "these forlorn and degenerate people", elsewhere they were, "these poore Naitives the dregs of mankind and the saddest spectacles of misery of meere man upon earth".

Daniel Gookin, Commissioner to the Praying towns, and otherwise sympathetic towards the Indians, regarded their customs and manners as "very brutish and barbarous". A lost people, the Indians were "these poor Heathens who seem to be the dregs and refuse of Adams lost posterity". The rhetorical question "what Nation or people ever so deeply degenerated since Adams fall as these Indians" provided
its own answer. Without any guiding principles "these poore
Sonnes of Adam ... proclaim themselves to pursue a Carnall interest;
by which they declare the enlargement of the Dominion of Jesus Christ
is of no Concernment unto them." Indian society lacked direction
and guidelines "these poor Indians have no principles of their own,
nor yet wisdome of their own (I mean as other Nations have)."
Ultimately the Indians had been damned by their heritage, and their
unrepentant attitude invited God to "visit the sins of fathers upon
them". For the "Indians forefathers were a stubborne and rebellious
children, and would not heere the word, did not care to pray nor teach
their children, and hence Indians that now are, do not know God at
all." So it was that "as God delights to convey blessings of mercy to
the posterity of some, in respect to his promise to their fathers, so
are curses entailed and come by naturall descent unto others, for some
great sinnes of their Ancestors, as no doubt it is in respect of
these."

It would appear that the breach between the races was made im-
passable by the issue of religion. Speculation about the Indians
racial prejudice against the Indians. As early as 1634 William Wood
recorded "some have thought that they the Indians might be of the
dispersed Jewes". Another theory had it that the Indians were
"Tartars passing out of Asia into America by the Straits of Arian."
But the Jewish origins theory was the one which received most attention
from the missionary writers. This theory had its merits since it made
the Puritan's attempts to convert the Indians part of the great
commitment of christendom to convert the Jews. The Puritans slow work in this regard could be justified in that nothing had been done to convert the Jews of other nations. John Cotton even tried to make this argument, but failed to convince the likes of Lechford who satirized such causitry: "it is not probable that any nation more can be converted, til the calling of Jews ... and God knows when that will be." Nevertheless it appears that Puritan missionary writers did subscribe to this theory. Eliot knew and corresponded with Thomas Thorowgood, author of the famous Jews in America or, Probabilities that the Indians are of that Race published in 1650. Although Thorowgood was effectively attacked two years later by L'Estrange in Americans no Jewes, the popularity of the Jewish origins theory did not wain among Puritan missionary circles. It served a useful purpose by defining the Indians as a fallen people: "the lost Israelites scattered in the world, principally, if not wholly, amongst the sons of Japhet and Sham". Daniel Gookin gave a fairly complete expression to this theory which described the Indians as of the ten tribes of Israel, that Salmanasser carried captive out of the country, A.M. 3277, of which we read in II Kings, xviii, 9-12; and that God hath, by some means or other, not discovered, brought them into America; and herein fulfilled his just threatening against them, of which we read, II Kings, xvii, from 6 to the 19 verse; and hath reduced them into such woeful blindness and barbarism, as all those American are in.80

Despite this feeling that the Indians were unworthy of Christianity the political significance of missionary work muffled a true expression of feeling. After the passage of the 1649 Act the opportunity
was presented to heal the breach that had opened between Parliament and the Bay Colony. Eliot called the House of Commons "that blessed Assembly whom the Lord Christ hath delighted to make instrumental to begin to set up the longed for, prayed for, and desired Kingdom of the Lord Jesus." By the 1660's it was not Parliament but the Crown that the colony had to look to. With the death of Cromwell the Protectorate had come in pieces and it was with some relief that the country welcomed Charles II from exile and restored the monarchy. Charles was in a position to consolidate power around the throne and as he did New England, because of its close sympathies with the Protectorate, was viewed with suspicion. A solemn declaration of allegiance was required from New England which was also required to grant liberty of worship to Anglicans and open the franchise to those meeting the property qualifications. A slow response to these demands prompted the commission that was sent out to New England in 1644. But relations did not improve and ten years later, just as King Philip's War was reaching its final stages, another commission arrived under Edward Randolph. It certainly was time to mend fences again, and, as before, missionary work leant itself to this purpose. When Gookin presented his "Historical Collections of the Indians in New England" to the Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England in 1674 he was careful to flatter its royal patron. The Collections were dedicated "To the High and Mighty Prince Charles, by the Grace of God, King of Great Britain, France, Ireland, Defender of the Faith". Rather belatedly the colony "through wanting the like seasonable opportunity, they have been till now deprived of the means to
congratulate your Majesty's happy restitution after your years of suffering". Begging "that we may be equal partakers of your royal favour and consideration" Gookin went on to assert that the colony had stood by the conditions of its charter. In Eliot's work

lay the accomplishment and fulfillment the conventant and promise, that New England people had made unto their King, when he granted them their patent or charter, viz that one principal end of their going to plant these countries, was to communicate the gospel unto these native Indians; which in truth is a clause to the charter...

A united effort to bring Protestant religion to the Indians was made into a standing testament of a church unity which many had accused the Puritans of rupturing. Charles was eulogized as "a nursing father to his church; that under your shadow it may rejoice, and every individual person thereof be encouraged in all ways of godliness and honesty."

But the needs of political rhetorical aside, Puritans and Indians were estranged over the matter of religion. Remaining largely beyond Christianity, the natives were damned and reviled as much for their barbarousness as for their paganism. Facing what he considered both a spiritual and military adversary Eliot stressed caution.

But though this trouble and opposition is turned (and shall be more) unto a spiritual gaine, yet it behoveth us not to be secure, and regardless of our safety; for if the Adversity should discerne us naked and weak, and see an opportunity, who knoweth what their rage and Satans malice may stirre them up unto to work us a mischief? Nay it is our duty to be vigilant, and fortifie our selves the best we can, thereby to put the enemy out of hope to hurt us, and to prevent them from attempting any evil against us ...
By the 1680's feelings ran high against all Indians, Christian and pagan alike. In the wake of King Philip's War, as will be shown, Indians were either condemned for ignoring the gospel or despised as being unworthy of it. Efforts to convert the Indian did nothing to encourage amity between the races. Shared religion was never a reality in New England, whilst religious difference was at the core of prejudice against the Indians. Such prejudice was murmured at the outset of New England's missionary effort "we are want to keep them at such a distance, (knowing they serve the Devill and are led by him) as not to embolden them too much, or trust them too farre". It was now felt to be fully justified. Writing at the turn of the century Cotton Mather was hard put "to think of raising a number of these hideous creatures to the elevations of our holy religion".
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CHAPTER VIII

KING PHILIP'S WAR

For a long time red was the color of the vendetta ... Likewise in the sonnet cycle Laura one hears that by wearing a crimson gown Laura is showing outwardly her inward cruelty to her lover. A crimson coat of arms is used in Chapman's Tradegy of Caeser and Pompey, as the tents are used in Marlowe's Tamberlaine, to show a readiness to fight.

Don Cameron Allen.

Our Eliot made a Tender of Everlasting Salvation to that King [Philip]; but the Monster entertain's it with Contempt and Anger, and after the Indian mode of joining Signs with Words, he took a Button upon the Coat of the Reverend Man, adding, that he cared for his Gospel, just as much as he cared for that Button.

Cotton Mather.
By the spring of 1675 the memory of the Pequot War had grown dim. Most of the leaders and veterans of this conflict had long since died. The new men of government had no experience of Indian war, and their policies gave little thought to security from Indian attack. It was popularly believed that the Indians had lost their prowess as fighters, and that one English youth could easily take on ten braves. New England was economically secure; commerce, fishing and a thriving agriculture made it little dependent upon the Indians. Fifty years of colonization had made New England the most populous and wealthy of the English colonies. The Earl of Sandwich, president of the Council for Plantations, called the New English "a numerous and thriving people". The ranting of Puritan clergy against the avowed materialism of the age hardly disturbed a general optimism. As the church lost influence over government and control of its congregation its ministers sought to frighten a backsliding population with talk of God's retribution. But all of this fell upon deaf ears; prosperity and the acquisition of western lands were the dominant concerns. Roger Williams lamented: "(Profit, Preferment, Pleasure) will here be the Tria omnia ... that God Land will be (as now it is) as great a God with us English as God Gold was with the Spaniards".

During the summer the mood of optimism and confidence quickly darkened. Philip of the Wampanoags, strengthened by alliances with neighboring tribes, conducted a war which brought the New England colonies to the brink of destruction. The causes of war are difficult to unravel but seem intricately bound up with New England's territorial ambitions. As population pressure produced the need for a
steady westward expansion, more and more land was acquired from the Indians. Although colonial governments tried to control land purchases, charges of fraudulent land deals piled up. The Indians were outraged and the noise of their protests reached London. In 1665 commissioners sent by Charles II who enquired into the bickering over land boundaries were impressed with the Indians case and quashed one large purchase of tribal lands from the Narragansetts. Governor Berkeley in Virginia saw New England's land hunger as the major cause of King Philip's War. Such an appetite for land had been growing since the Pequots were defeated. Massachusetts had been quick to devour the land it had conquered, Roger Williams deplored its "depraved appetite [for] great portions of land in the wilderness". John Easton, deputy Governor of Rhode Island, sympathized with the Indians position. His "Relation of the Indian Warre" which appeared in 1675 voiced the Indian fear that "they had no hopes to keep any land". New England had conducted this war without any directives from London. King Philip's War was another example of the sort of independence that was beginning to exasperate Charles II. In 1676 with the war in its final stages Edward Randolph arrived in Boston to look about the colonies and report back to the King.

New England wished to keep its friends in England informed and between 1675 and 1677 at least a dozen war tracts were published in London. Not surprisingly Puritan accounts of the war were careful to argue the justice of their dealings with the Indians. Josiah Winslow, Governor of Plymouth, was emphatic.
I think I can clearly say, that before these present troubles broke out, the English did not possess one Foot of Land in the Colony but what was fairly honest Purchase of the Indian Proprietors...9

There was no doubt among the Puritans that the land belonged to them.

A council of war was convened in Boston on September 17, 1675 for the defense of what it called "this good land, which the Lord hath given us". Increase Mather, expressing the church's attitude to the war, completely begged the territorial question.

The Heathen People amongst whom we live, and whose land the Lord God of our Fathers hath given us for rightful Possession, have at sundry times been plotting mischievous device against that part of English Israel.

Mather placed the blame for war squarely upon the Indians.

The enemy did shed the blood of some of ours who never did them (our enemies themselves being judges) the least wrong, before we did at all offend them, or attempt any act of hostility towards them.11

By their account the Puritans had been forced to arms, they fought for the defense of their country. A statement signed by the Commissioners of the United Colonies, declared Philip's War "to be both Just and Necessary, and its first Rise only a defensive War".

Further explanations were required, this time for a New England rather than a London audience. War caught the New England colonies completely off guard. Philip had gained strength and gathered his allies as colonial officials watched. There had been suspicions against the Wampanoags ever since the death of Osamequin. By 1662 Alexander, the sachem's eldest son, was questioned concerning an
alleged plot against the English. After Alexander's death Philip came to power. Within five years he too was suspected of cooperating with a Franco-Dutch campaign against English settlers. In 1669 Ninigret, leader of the Narragansetts, was accused of plotting with the French. By 1671 Philip, again under suspicion, was forced to make a confession and put his name to a peace agreement signed in Taunton. But New England had not organized for its defense. When the first attack did occur the English were thrown into confusion. In June a group of Wampanoag braves were fired upon by settlers at Swansea, there followed swift and devastating raids upon neighboring towns which threw the colonists into panic. Protection for the frontier settlements proved completely inadequate, and Indian warriors went largely unchecked. William Harris of Rhode Island was sharp in his rebuke of such unpreparedness.

During all this the English were slow to send forces, taking much time in counsel with debates over differences of opinion, while the Indians with the greatest alacrity struck heavy blows. And when the English did send troops, they sent so few that some Indians who were friends of the colonists derided in a joking manner the English grudging delay. The gist of their comment was that the English spent much time in counsel, and correspondingly in feasting and drinking wine; when they heard of persons slain, the English would say that they were sorry for them -- they were honest men -- and would send a few more soldiers, who sometimes came to the same end.

Unable to follow and engage Indian raiding parties, the English counter-offensive, when finally it was organized, succeeded in antagonizing other tribes. Philip grew stronger as the colonial conduct of war forced others into his camp. An attack on the Narragansetts
allied them to their traditional enemies the Wampanoags. Nipmuks, Abenaki, and some praying Indians similarly joined Philip as the English slaughtered non-combatants and indiscriminately sold captives into slavery. Refusing to use friendly Indians as scouts, English forces were easily eluded and suffered heavy casualties when they fell into the enemy's ambushes. Two major forces under Beer and Lathrop were routed in this manner.

If the Indians had gained an upper hand at the onset of hostilities this was explained by their betrayal of the English, they had broken the long peace which had stood intact since the days of Massasoit. Philip had hatched a conspiracy in the face of English kindness. With no Cause of Provocation being given by the English; for once before this [King Philip's War] in the year 1671, the Devil, who was a murderer from the beginning, had so filled the Heart of this savage Miscreant with Envy and Malice against the English, that he was ready to break into open war against the Inhabitants of Plimouth, pretending some petite Injuries done to him in planting Land. Philip's plans were carefully laid. According to Harris "Philip intended to begin this war about four years earlier". Arms and ammunition were accumulated and corn was stored in secret granaries. In a similar way was Miantonomo, leader of the Narragansetts, "notoriously treacherous, both Signing renewed Articles of Peace with us since the beginning of the War and breaking the same again." Worst of all was the Indians treatment of the English they knew prior to the war. "It is the usual Custom of such Debtors to use them worst of whom they have taken up much kindness upon trust beforehand."

Saltonstall made the same observation, those Indians who had been
friendly with the English were quite likely to be found armed
against them. So it was that the Indians were described as de-
20
ceitful, subtle, and full of malice. To the Puritans they were
without any moral principles whatsoever. As "faithless and ungrateful
Monsters", Indians were unable to keep trust even among themselves.
"Many of the Indians of this region are most outrageously treacherous
21
and cruel, as recently they have been turning against each other."
Their complete lack of principle meant that the Indians were the
more reviled. One writer exclaimed, "Thus abominable is Treachery
and Violation of ones Faith, even amongst the most barbarous and
22
savage Infidels." Against such complete turpitude criticism of
the English treatment of the Indians could be quickly dismissed.
"Whatever wrong may be pretended by the said Indians, as done them ...
that will no Whit excuse their perfidious Treachery and Falsehood in
23
breaking Covenant with the English."
Violence and anxiety in this war were terrible. The trauma of
the war's catatonic events gave a psychological dimension to the con-
24
flict and the Indian adversary. Philip's War was heralded by omens.
Increase Mather gave much significance to the report of a monstrous
birth by which "God did thus bear witness against the Disorders of
25
some in that place". As hostilities got under way a freak storm
lashed New England's shores. Curious for its vehemence "a tempestuous
Wind, and the violent raging of the Sea, which hath much overflowed
our Banks and incroached upon the Land"; the storm could not be
detected a mere twenty leagues out to sea. Such violence wrecked
windmills and churches, carrying timbers "many yards from their proper station ... Such another Blow will bring Barbadoes near the Horizon." Hubbard was inclined to be skeptical of such omens.

He dispatched one story which Mather took quite seriously.

Divers reports have passed up and down the country of several ominous accidents happening with forementioned time, as of earthquakes in some places, and of several volleys heared in the air in the year 1667 but because many that lived not far off those places, where the sad accidents were supposed to fall out, know nothing thereof, no more notice shall be taken of the same than a bare hint of the report. But at a place called Kennebunk, at the northwest side of Wells, in the Province of Maine, not far from the river side, a piece of clay was thrown by mineral vapor /and was found/ round pellets of clay, like musket balls.28

But the fact remains that the society as a whole was haunted by the spectre of great evil. A week before the attack on Medfield in February 1675, the inhabitants "heard a very hideous Cry of a Kennel of Wolves round the Town, which raised some of the Inhabitants and was looked upon by divers as an ominous Presaging of this following Calamity." A great fear of the Indian haunted the frontier as the enemy carried all before him. In the early part of the war there were great anxieties that Philip's strength would become indomitable should he be joined by the Narragansetts. One correspondent wrote, "the Narragansetts we fear more and more every day, will be perfidious to us". As the Indians struck the frontier at will, a great "Fear and Confusion [gripped] ... all the Inhabitants of those Parts". Colonists feared the "continued Danger of skulking Indians in the Woods".
These fears which stalked the land were understood by spokesmen of an orthodox Puritan order. Pre-war New England had been loosening itself from the bonds of the Puritan church. Increase Mather lamented an "intolerable Pride in clothes and hair: the tolleration of many Taverns, especially in Boston, and suffering house dwellers to lye tipling in them." On September 17, 1675 a day of public humiliation was ordered to make amends for those evils which had brought this war upon New England.

The Governour and Council of this Jurisdiction therefore (being under the Sense of these Evils, and also of the distressed State of the rest of the Colonies Confederate with our selves, and of the Church of Christ in other parts of the Christian World in this Day of Trouble, Rebukes, and Blasphemy; and fearing the sad Issue, unless the Lord help us with our whole Heart and not feignedly, (to turn to himself) Do Appoint, and Order the seventh Day of the next month, to be a Day of Publick Humiliation, with Fasting and Prayer, throughout this whole Colony; that we may set ourselves sincerely to seek the Lord rending our Hearts, and not our Garments before Him, and pursue the same with a thorough Reformation of whatever hath been ...34

To Saltonstall this war, like other Indian wars in the past, was an attempt by God to discipline a wayward society:

as the Lord did deliver us from the Tyranny and barbarous Cruelty of Savage Heathens, and we still remaining obstinate, and refusing to return to him by Repentance; the Lord hath taken us into his own Hand to chastise us ...35

Hubbard saw that war had been brought upon New England by God who "raised up these barbarous Enemies to bring alike Chastisement upon the English in this Side of the Country." First on Daniel Gookin's list of causes behind the war was that it made "a rod of the barbarous
heathen to chastise and punish the English for their sins." As the war went badly for the English, they were aware of God's hand raised against them not only on the field of battle but also in the form of an "Epidemical Sickness that hath swept several worthy Gentlemen amongst us, besides many Others which God hath rebukes." The council explained heavy English casualties as part of the "Warnings and Chastisements whereby the Lord hath been, and still is debating with us". Using this same argument charges made against the incompetence of the colonial conduct of war could be answered. The argument ran that

the mighty Hand of God is lifted up upon us, and he hath given Commission to the Sword to destroy, yet we are still satisfied there is Nothing wanting that lyeth within the reach of their Wisdom or Strength.

It was believed that Indian forces were led and inspired by Satan. Through their Powwows the Indians sought counsel from the Devil whom they worshipped. Though unleashed to chastise the English, Indians represented a force of great evil for they stood in defiance of God. Those Wampanoags who would later carry the attack on Swansea broke the Sabath by grinding their hatchets. When challenged by one of the settlers, they replied that "they knew not who his God was, and that they would do it for all of him, or for his God either". An Indian party came upon a man defenseless but for his Bible which he felt would protect him. These Indians "derided his groundless Apprehension, or Folly therein, ripped him open and put his Bible in his Belly". About to kill a defenseless Englishman, an Indian exclaimed "come Lord
Jesus, save this poor Englishman if thou canst, whom I am now about to kill". This reign of evil could not be allowed to go unchecked for the enemy stood as a threat to religion and piety, they were "devillish Enemies of Religion". Indians derided the Puritans' faith. "Our enemies proudly exult over us, and blaspheme the Name of our Blessed God, saying Where is your O God." Though God chastened the Puritans he surely would not allow the Devil to prevail. The Indians' triumph begged God's intervention. An all powerful God would arise and "scatter our Enemies" and would "Avenge these Blasphemies".

Indian victories which those of sound faith saw as a chastening also threatened to overturn the material achievements of English civilization.

These Parts which were not many Moneths since hardly to be Parrallel'd for Plenty and Security, are now almost destroyed and laid waste by the savage Cruelties of a Bloody (and sometimes Despicable) Enemy.

As agents of destruction and disorder the Indians threatened not just the Puritans but civilization. Hostile Indians gleefully burned a library; they slaughtered and maimed English livestock. Raiding parties always brought destruction in their wake for their objective was to overturn the English way of life. "They burned all the dwellings that belonged to the Farm, Corn, Hay and Cattel, besides the Dwelling house ..."

Organization against the Indian threat had been hampered by differences among the colonies. Since the devastation of Indian warfare put all English settlements in peril, Philip and his horde
became a common enemy. Even those areas spared the purge of war were recruited to fight in defense of culture, "if the Fire of this War were not timely extinguished it would endanger their own Fabric". The Indian foe was imbued with "a Malice and Antipathy against the English Manners and Religion". The lines of battle were clearly drawn. One popular tract was advertised as "A true and Last Account of the present Bloody Wars carried on betwixt the Infidels, Natives and the English Christians". The motif was that of the crusade. On the one hand were an ungodly people committed to undoing civilization, on the other a people striving "to enjoy the liberty of the Gospel in Unity and Peace and to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ".

During the winter of 1675 the Indian offensive began to falter. Their war losses had been heavy and the fighting force considerably diminished. Further weakened by a cold winter, food shortages and disease, the Indians' commitment to war slackened. Leadership was divided by declining morale and the need of Indian groups to look to their sustenance. Thus debilitated, the Indians "never prospered in any Attempt they made against the English, but were continually scattered and broken till they were in a manner all consumed." As the colonies gained the upper hand there was a change in the professed objectives of war. A war for the defense of civilization became one to destroy the Indians. Even as war threatened disaster for the English there was every confidence "that God will find some way to cut off the bloody and deceitful Enemies of his People, and not suffer
them to live out half their Dayes." Now with the enemy weakened and
divided it was believed that God was coming to the aid of his people.
Some thought the split in the Indian camp had arisen from a "Quarel
amongst themselves occasioned by an evil Spirit sent from God upon
them." Success for the Puritan troops was a sign that God's anger
with them had abated. Puritan accounts of these first victories at-
tributed them to God's

gracious dealings towards us, we have lately had
several instances, our Forces being crowned with
Success, and the Enemy put to Flight, or so far
divided and discouraged, that great Numbers have
surrendered themselves when by our own Strength or
outward circumstances we could least expect it. 58

There would be no attempt to make an easy peace with the Indians;
God's chastisement would be followed by atonement.

It appears thus by the Sequel of things, that after
the Lord hath accomplished his work upon his People,
that he is beginning to call his Enemies to an
Account, and punish them for the Pride of their
Hearts, and for all their Treachery and Cruelty
against his Servants. 59

Forces of evil once released could not be appeased, they had to be
destroyed. If now the Indians were weakened it meant that they could
"the more easily be taken and ruined by the English, now that the Time
of Vengeance was come". English troops fought with a zeal for re-
venge; rarely was quarter given to captives even women and children.
Little sympathy was afforded the Indian casualties. The fate of the
Narragansetts burning to death in their own fort was recorded with a
grim humor.

It is reported by then that first entered the
Indians Fort, that our Soldiers came upon them
when they were ready to dress their Dinner; but one sudden and unexpected Assault put them besides that Work making their Cookrooms too hot for them at that time, when they and their Kitchin fryed together ...

With the destruction of the Narragansetts the major Indian threat in the east had been eliminated. By the spring of 1676 the tide had begun to turn against the Indians in the west. Captain Benjamin Church assisted by able scouts harried Philip and his followers into the swamps near Taunton and Bridgewater. Through the spring and summer more and more Indian groups began to surrender. But the war council was in no mood to grant easy amnesty to these bands. "Treach- erous Persons who began the war and those that have been barbarously bloody, must not expect to have their lives spared".

But the war was by no means won. By the winter of 1675 Middle-boro, Brookfield, Deerfield and Northfield were destroyed; New Hamp-shire and Maine were devastated. In all more than a dozen towns were sacked. Deaths and casualties claimed a staggering proportion of population: more than ten per cent of the colonial army died in the field. As the bloody work of retribution went ahead, Indian savagery and cruelty had to be borne in mind. War atrocities committed against the English were presented in full and lurid detail "lest the severity of the English should be thought too great, many people not being aware of the cruelty previously inflicted by the Indians upon the English". The Indians practice of torturing prisoners of war horrified the English.

They tied them to trees, and the Indian women whipped them almost to death, and then cut off some of their flesh, and put hot embers in the wounds in a most cruel and barbarous manner ...
Other captives were pegged spread eagle on the ground, Indians kindled

a fire under each of them, gashing their thighs
and legs with knives, and casting into the gashes
hot embers to torment them. This also somewhat
staunches the blood so that they do not bleed to
death but remain alive in torment longer.65

In their mastery of torture the Indians were hardly human. Mather
was appalled at their "delighting to see the miserable torments of
wretched creatures. Thus are they the perfect children of the
Devill". In their malevolence the Indians were quite without
humanity, Hubbard called them "hellish monsters". In their sense­
less savagery the Indians incurred the enduring hatred of the English.
"An infant which they found dead in the House first surprised, they
cut in Pieces, which afterward they cast to Swine". It was believed
that the Indians were completely barbarous, according to Harris:

The Indians frequently kill their children,
partly because their crying leads the English
to them, and partly because they lack food for
them. Also the Indians give a reward to a
cruel woman among them to kill their children,
she killed a hundred in one day ...69

These enemies of the English were made to mock humanity; "they killed
him upon the Place, and in a barbarous Manner cut off his Head, and
set it upon a Pole in Derision." They cut the head off one English
soldier killed in battle "and carried it away with them (which yet
was soon after recovered) leaving the Trunk of his Body behind, as a
sad Monument of their inhumane Cruelty."

Indians freely broke the most guarded taboos. Sexual abuse of
captured white women was unusual by seventeenth century Indians, but
those transgressions which did take place were made into the commonplace. A Swansea man ventured back to his house with his young wife and child. He was soon set upon and killed "his wife being not far off, heard the Guns go off, went back: They took her, first defiled her, then skinned her Head, so also the Son, and dismissed them both, who immediately died." Nor were Indian women free from such charges. Squaws set upon two Englishmen travelling from Marvury to Sudbury in March 1676. Defenseless the two were attacked, their assailants "beat out their Brains, and cut off their privy Members, which they carried away with them in Triumph". Approbrium that was heaped upon the Indians made no distinction between the sexes. "Vain it is to expect any thing but the most barbarous Usage from such a people amongst whom the most milde and gentle Sex delight in Cruelties and have utterly abandoned at once the two proper virtues of womankinde, Pity and Modesty". Saltonstall assured his readers that the Indians generally tortured and killed their captives, "but if they were women, they first forced them to satisfie their filthy lusts".

Puritans were fighting a war against the powers of darkness. Destruction of the Indians was the exorcism of a great evil. Philip personified these powers of evil that had almost prevailed against English settlement. By late summer Philip and the remains of his army had been surrounded. By August lst his wife and son had been captured. Ten days later Philip, demoralized, was shot as he tried to escape. Benjamin Church, commander of the English force, ordered that the body be brought to him. The dead Indian leader was drawn "through the mud to the upland; and a doleful, great, naked, dirty beast he looked like".
Philip was not distinguished with human attributes, Hutchinson called him "This seasonable Prey". To destroy the monster and extinguish its power, Philip was butchered like a wild animal, "they cut off his Head and Hands, and conveyed them to Rhode-Island, and quartered his Body, and hung it upon four trees." As this grisly work went on the epitaph was read on Philip's aspirations: "he had made many a man afraid of him, but so big as he was, he would chop him in pieces".

The Indians led by Philip were viewed as creatures without compassion capable of inhuman cruelty. In their conduct of war they displayed their lack of civilization, their savagery. No restraints tempered their aggression. Infact the Indians were not seen in human terms at all; they were monsters and miscreants. Nor was this just figurative language. The action of some sailors who cast an Indian into water "to try whether the Children of the Indians as they had heard, could swim as naturally as any other Creature", indicates a literal disbelief in the Indians' humanity. Descriptions of the Indian foe put him at one with the wild animals in the woods. They were wolves "continually yelling and gaping for their Prey". Like wild animals the Indians hunted man and beast alike.

Nor have our Cattle escaped the Cruelty of these worse than Brute and Savage Beasts: For what Cattle they took they seldom killed outright: or if they did, would eat but little of the Flesh, but rather cut their Bellies, and letting them go several days, trailing their Guts after them, putting out their eyes, or cutting off one Leg etc.
Puritans were not immune from charges of torturing Indian captives. Slowly being cut to pieces on captive was asked how he liked the war. "This insensible and hard hearted Monster answered, He liked it very well, and found it as sweet as the English Men did their sugar". It was an easy matter to say that such stoic endurance was inhuman if not supernatural. "Instances of this Nature should be Incentives unto us, to bless the Father of Lights, who hath called us out of the dark Places of the Earth, full of the Habitats of Cruelty."

It was with great difficulty that Puritan commanders were persuaded to fight the Indians in the forest. In part this was due to a realization of the Indians tactical advantage there.

The Plimouth Forces kept a diligent Eye upon the Enemy but were not willing to run into the Mire and Dirt after them in a dark Swamp, being taught by late experience how dangerous it is to fight in such dismal Woods, when their Eyes were muffled with the Leaves, and their Arms pinioned with the thick Boughs of the Trees, as their Feet were continually shackled with the Roots spreading every way in those boggy Woods.

As beasts the Indians naturally inhabited wild places. When confronted by English forces the Indians often melted away into the woods, "espying the English, presently [the Indians] fled away into the woods, like so many wild Deer", another party "ran away into their own Dens, in the neighboring Woods". Certainly the Indians possessed an advantage in these wild places, "it is ill fighting with a wild Beast in his own Den". Indian savagery was implicit in their wilderness condition. They had an inhuman relationship with nature which gave them a demonic power.
These Heathens being like Wolves and other Beasts of Prey, that commonly do their Mischiefs in the Night, or by Stealth, durst not come forth out of the Woods and Swamps, where they lay skulking in Small Companies, being so light of foot that they can run away when they List, and pass Boggs, rocky Mountains and Thickets, where we could by no Means pursue them.90

Philip's War had released those evil powers that lurked in the wilderness. The dangers of succumbing to a wilderness condition had been stressed since first settlement. It had long been feared that those who lived too far away from the centers of settlement would be tempted away from civilization. Experience during the war meant that such a danger had to be guarded against. Hubbard warned against scattering Plantations in our Borders ... /for7 many were contented to live without, yea, de-sirous to shake off all Yoake of Government both sacred and civil, and so transforming themselves as much as well they could into the Manner of the Indians they lived amongst ...91

Cotton Mather condemned settlers in Maine for having grown "too like the Indians ...", and repeated such warnings. The great lesson learned from those captured by the Indians emphasized again the danger of falling into an Indian way of life. Mary Rowlandson, captured during the attack on Lancaster in February 1675 and ultimately ransomed, recorded her experiences in The Soveraignty and Goodness of God ... a Narrative of the Captivity. This enormously popular work, which first appeared in Boston in 1682, went through many editions and is the best known of what became a genre of Indian captivity narratives.
Rowlandson sought to impress upon the English the awful threat of Indian savagery.

Little do many think what the savageness and bruitishness of this barbarous Enemy, I even those that seem to profess more than others among them, when the English have fallen into their hands.\(^{93}\)

In case this message should be missed the preface in the first edition admonished the reader.

As none knows what it is to fight and pursue such an enemy as this, but they that have fought and pursued them; so none can imagine what it is to be captivated, and enslaved to such an atheisticall, proud, wild, cruel, barbarous, bruitish (in a word) diabolicall creatures as these, the worst of the haethen; nor what difficulties, hardships, hazards, sorrows, anxieties and perplexities do unavoidably wait upon such a condition; but those who have tried it.\(^{94}\)

Captured by "hell hounds" and "ravenous beasts", Mrs. Rowlandson was taken "twenty removes" from Christian society. She was taken to a hellish place. As her captors celebrated their victory she recalled "the roaring and singing and dancing, and yelling of those black creatures in the night, which made the place a lively resemblance of hell." Her sense of isolation and desolation was complete. Grieving for her son who was close to death she "could not but think of his mournful looks, and no Christian Friend was near him, to do any office of love for him, either for Soul or Body." As she remembered the comforts of Christian society Rowlandson brought to mind the words of Psalm 137, "By the Rivers of Babylon, there we sate down: yea we wept when we remembered Zion." Indian society was the very denial of religion and civilization.
If Philip's War chastened Puritan society, Rowlandson's captivity had been of her own testing. Brought into the presence of Philip himself she was offered tobacco but refused sensing it "to be a Bait, the Devil lays to make men lose their precious time." She was forced to break the Sabbath, but worse, hunger forced her into the Indians brutish ways. She ate raw meat "with the blood about my mouth, and yet a savoury bit it was to me For to the hungry Soul every bitter thing is sweet." Rowlandson was becoming changed into a creature of the wilderness, "the thoughts that it was Bear, made me trouble but now that was savoury to me that one would think was enough to turn the stomach of a brutish Creature." Ultimately she was reduced to stealing food from a captured English child, lamenting "the Things that my soul refuses to touch, are as my sorrowful meat." Throughout her ordeal Mary Rowlandson was saved from complete despair by the comfort she found in her Bible.

I opened my Bible to read, and the Lord brought that precious Scripture to me, Jer. 31:16. Thus saith the Lord, refrain thy voice from tears, for my work shall be rewarded and they shall come again from the hand of the Enemy.

Upon her release nothing impressed her more than the comparison between Indian and English society. "I was not before so much hem'd in with the merciless and cruel Heathen, but now as much with pittiful, tender-hearted and compassionate Christians." But Rowlandson had been taken beyond the pale of civilization and the experience had marked her. Even after "the Lord brought me and mine out of that horribel pit, and hath set us in the midst of tender-hearted and compassionate Christians" she remained traumatized. "I can remember
the time, when I used to sleep quietly without working my thoughts, whole nights together, but now it is other ways with me." She had "been in the midst of those roaring Lyons, and Salvage Bears, that feared neither God, nor Man, nor the Devil, by night and day alone and in their company." This experience had brought her close to becoming a savage herself.

War had opened an impassable breach between English and Indian. Increase Mather, anticipating that series of conflicts which would become the French and Indian Wars, warned his society.

Our deliverance is not yet perfected; for the Nipmuck Indians are not yet wholly subdued: Moreover it will be a difficult thing either to subdue, or come at the River Indians, who have many of them withdrawn themselves, and are gone far westward, and whilst they and others that have been in hostility against us, remain unconquered, we cannot enjoy such perfect peace as in the years which are past. And there seems to be a dark cloud rising from the East, in respect of Indians in those parts, yea a Cloud which streameth forth blood. But that which is the saddest thought of all, is that of late some unhappy scandals have been, which are enough to stop the current of mercy, which hath been flowing upon us, and to provoke the Lord to let loose more Enemies upon us, so as that the second error shall be worse than the first. 109

Harris too expressed those fears which would form the basis of future Indian relations.

Though God's providence seems to smile upon us in the present success, yet He holds His rod ready over us (I refer to our discerning Indian allies who see and say that it is they who overtake the enemy, otherwise how could the English overcome those they cannot catch or come near to kill, who still outrun them whenever they wish) lest we should forget His goodness, and sin
against His past and present mercies. Thus He holds ready these Indians allies who have seen the slowness and consequent weakness of the English, and their own agility and strength. They are ready and able to do us great harm if only they obtain gunpowder, as they may do, so that we might have great difficulty in holding out if God should let them loose upon us. 110 Saltonstall hoped that the lesson of this war would not be wasted.

If New England had erred it was in being too trusting of the Indians. The post war heritage was an extreme distrust of all Indians. War had released a profound prejudice against the natives, one that extended to enemy and praying Indians alike. Although Daniel Gookin tried to defend the praying Indians, the majority of New Englanders "cast them all into the same lump with the profane and brutish heathen". Friendly Indians had been vital in carrying the war against Philip, but even Indian auxiliaries were eyed with suspicion, "soldiers who (being infected with the spirit of amity against all Indians) murmured greatly against the use of these Indians". The people "generally distrusted those praying Indians and were not willing to have them serve the country". Early in the war friendly Indians had been confined to their villages. But even there, the Indians were not safe. Samuel Moseley marched fifteen Marlboro Indians to Boston on a charge of murder. When Gookin spoke in defense of these Indians he was told "he ought rather be confined among his Indians than sit on his Bench; his taking the Indians part so much hath made him a Byword both among Men and Boys." Though all of the Indians were found innocent and acquitted, passions ran so high that a mob attempted to lynch one of the prisoners. Unable to
ensure their safety the Magistrates were forced to confine the Indians on a bleak island in the Charles river. "The enmity, jealousy and clamore of some people against them put the magistracy upon a kind of necessity to send them all to the island." Even on Deer Island the Indians were not safe from the "fury of the people". News of the burning of Medfield and Lancaster in the winter of 1675 "occasioned many thoughts of hearty and hurrying motions and gave opportunity to the vulgar to cry out, 'Oh come, let us go down to Deer Island and kill all the praying Indians'." Gookin and Eliot who pointed to the appalling conditions on the islands and argued the loyalty and faithfulness of the praying Indians had "many harsh reflections and speeches uttered against" them, Gookin was afraid to go out on the streets of Boston.

Post war policy was guided by an enduring animosity against the Indians. Colonial armies carried through their commitment to extermination. Though northern New England was still harried by Indians, in October 1676 the Massachusetts legislature rejoiced that

of those severall tribes and parties that have hitherto risen up against us, which were not a few, there now scarce remains a name or family of them in their former habitations but are either slayne, captivated, or fled into remote parts of this Wilderness, or lye hid dispayring of their first intentions against us, at least in these parts.120

Those Indians that remained, starving and scattered by war, were hunted down. A considerably reduced Indian population were separated from English settlements which rapidly reoccupied the area laid waste by war and occupied conquered Indian lands. Indians were to remain
tightly policed and restricted. Although some praying Indians continued in their faith, the feeling was that Indians as a whole were lost to civilization and salvation. "Whatever Hopes may be of their Conversion to Christianity in after Time, there is but little Appearance of any Truth in their Hearts at present." The Indians had been written off by "the natural Barbarousness and Perfidiousness of their Disposition."
Notes to Chapter VIII:


3. Williams, Complete Writings, VI, 319.

4. For the argument that the territorial issue was the main cause behind the war see Douglas E. Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk: New England in King Philip's War, (New York: Macmillan, 1958), 24-49; Vaughan, New England Frontier, disagrees and argues "through the seventeenth century, Puritan institutions and Puritan officials kept most frontier dealings equitable as well as peaceful. At bottom, Philip seems to have been moved to violence by a combination of growing Puritan influence and gradual realization of his own declining power.", 312.


6. Williams, Complete Writings, VI, 342.


11. Increase Mather, A Brief History of the Warr with the Indians in New England, (Boston, 1676), Al verso, 4.

13. Leach, Flintlock and Tomahawk, 11-49.


18. A True Account of the Most Considerable Occurrences That have In the Warr ..., in The Old Indian Chronicles ..., ed., Samuel G. Drake, (Boston: Drake, 1867), 247-55, 251.


23. Saltonstall, Present State, 47, emphasis mine.


25. Mather, A Brief History, 35.

26. Saltonstall, Continuation, 73, 74.

27. Ibid., 74.


32. True Account, 258.
35. Saltonstall, *Continuation*, 72.
42. Saltonstall, *Present State*, 27.
43. Saltonstall, *New and Further Narrative*, 86.
44. *True Account*, 255.
47. *Brief and True Narration*, 317; *True Account*, 256.
57. Ibid., I, 239.
58. Saltonstall, New and Further Narrative, 78.
60. Ibid., I, 239.
61. Ibid., I, 148.
62. True Account, 27h.
63. Harris Letter, 77.
64. Ibid., 43.
65. Ibid., 81.
66. Mather, A Brief History, 27.
68. Ibid., I, 199.
69. Harris Letter, 61.
70. Hubbard, History of the Indian Wars, II, 118.
71. Ibid., I, 241.
72. Hubbard mentions that a group of women and children who were captured at Lancaster on February 10, 1675 and released some months later, "let it be observed, that none of the women were abused", History of the Indian Wars, II, 48; Mary Rowlandson was among this group; during her captivity "not one of them \the Indians/ ever offered me the least abuse of unchastity", Mary Rowlandson, Narrative of the Captivity of Mary Rowlandson, (1682), in Lincoln, Narratives, 112-67, 161.
73. Saltonstall, Present State, 28.
74. Saltonstall, New and Further Narrative, 82-3.
75. Ibid., 82-3.
76. Ibid., 98.

79. Ibid., 105.

80. Church, History of the Great War, 105.

81. Hubbard, History of the Indian Wars, II, 63; I, 111; I, 100.

82. Ibid., II, 135, emphasis mine.

83. Mather, A Brief History, 42; Hubbard, History of the Indian Wars, I, 100.

84. Saltonstall, New and Further Narrative, 99.

85. Hubbard, History of the Indian Wars, II, 64.

86. Ibid., II, 64.

87. Ibid., I, 87.

88. Ibid., II, 181; I, 104.

89. Ibid., I, 87.

90. Saltonstall, New and Further Narrative, 89.


92. Cotton Mather, Magnalia Christi, II, 499.

93. Rowlandson, Narrative of the Captivity, 122.

94. Ibid., 121.

95. Ibid., 121.

96. Ibid., 121.

97. Ibid., 137.

98. Ibid., 134.

99. Ibid., 167.

100. Ibid., 140.

101. Ibid., 133, Proverbs xxvii: 7.
102. Ibid., 137.
103. Ibid., 149, Job 6:7.
104. Ibid., 129.
105. Ibid., 162.
106. Ibid., 165.
107. Ibid., 166.
108. Ibid., 161.
109. Mather, A Brief History, 49.
110. Harris Letter, 65.
111. Saltonstall, Continuation, 74.
113. Ibid., 479.
114. Ibid., 507.
116. Saltonstall, Present State, 40.
118. Ibid., 490.
119. Ibid., 453; Saltonstall, Present State, 41.
120. Records Massachusetts, V, 130.
122. Ibid., II, 275.
History consists, for the greater part, of the miseries brought upon the world by pride, ambition, avarice, revenge, lust, sedition, hypocrisy, ungoverned zeal, and all the train of disorderly appetites which shake the public with the same.

Edmund Burke.
Those who founded New England felt compelled to record their history. Even before the Puritans reached the New World the story of their settlement was begun in diaries, journals and tracts. But it was not until mid-century that the first formal history of New England was printed. Edward Johnson was not a scholar, he was a carpenter and moving force in the establishment of Woburn. This busy man had not the time or inclination to make his history a catalog of facts for the curious or use it to show off his literary skill, the history he wrote served a more urgent purpose than this. Johnson's history, first published in 1654, was a piece of militant propaganda for the Puritan cause in America. He narrated the settlement of New England as a sustained allegory: a series of battles fought by Christ's armies against the forces of Antichrist. Puritans had come to America to plant a church which would complete "Christ's glorious Reformation". The Puritans' story was both a quest or journey and a struggle against adversity. From Johnson's vantage the journey had been a success and the struggle was being won. With a growing population and the erection of over thirty orthodox churches, Johnson celebrated God's commitment to his people and proclaimed the Puritans triumph in the New World. But this was no simple paean for Johnson had a didactic purpose behind writing. Like Winthrop he described the Puritans in America "as lights upon a Hill more obvious than the highest Mountaine in the World", their example would help guide Europe's misdirected religious purpose.

With the appearance of Nathaniel Morton's *New England Memorial* in 1669 a new mood prevailed. Morton stood in awe of his uncle
William Bradford whom he had served as private secretary. Drawing heavily from Bradford's Journal, Morton's history reflected the glories of first settlement. Morton was nostalgic for the stirring events of the first generation, the title he chose for his book suggests as much. Though different in tone _New England Memorial_ strikes the same themes sounded by Johnson. The journey to New England and the endeavor to plant church and civilization there were beset with adversity, Morton spoke of a "Sea of Troubles". Where the first Pilgrims succeeded it was because God assisted them. Again the intent is strongly didactic. "I Shall close up this small History with a word of Advice to the Rising-generation", a generation which had lost the high moral purpose of the original settlers. "God did once plant a Noble vine in New-England, but it is degenerated into the plant of a strange vine." Morton warned his contemporaries of God's admonition and urged that they look for example and inspiration to the first generation.

Over half a century separated William Hubbard from the first struggling settlements, but the themes of his _General History ..._ were still the quest to America and the struggle to maintain order and religion in that land. After the popular reception given his history of the Indian wars, Hubbard had been commissioned by the Massachusetts General Court to write a history of the colony. By the 1680's the Court's authority was coming under attack, Hubbard came to the defense. His history emphasized the blessings of civil order and argued the cause of centralized authority. The objectives of settling New England were to plant "settled and orderly government, to direct, protect, and
defend the people, and promote the cause of God and religion amongst them, as well as their civil rights and liberties." Strong emphasis was placed on the need to establish civil government: "Order and government being as necessary to the uniting together and upholding a civil society, as the foundation or the studs to support and conjoin the parts of a building." Hubbard was aware of the great danger inherent in a threat to established order. Roger Williams was condemned for threatening social stability, "men of great parts and strong affections, for want of stability in their judgements to discern the truth in matters of controversy, like a vessel that carries too high a sail, are apt to overset in the stream, and ruin those that are embarked with them". So Hubbard endorsed the banishment of this man "a disturber of the peace, both of the church and Commonwealth". Antinomians were censored for their contempt of authority, whilst Hutchinson's covenant of grace was denounced as spiritual anarchy. After all, "there were never worse times in Israel than when there was no King." Like Morton's, Hubbard's account was retrospective and tended to register the discouragement felt as the first generation of leaders died. In similar fashion did Hubbard's history trace the actions of God towards his people. "It is the providence of the Almighty that rules the world, and not the wisdom and contrivements of the sons of men."

Cotton Mather, ransacking his library to give bulk to his Magnalia Christi Americana, wrote a history which typified its predecessors. The literary difficulties which these historians faced had
been mounting. The simplicity and directness of the first generation's journals had long since clouded over. New England's history had become complex, the dramatic narrative of first settlement far more tangled. Historians had lost direct contact with the events and were forced to rely upon documents. Mather, assembling an overwhelming array of facts and conjectures, sought to embrace New England's burgeoning history. As he did the onus to teach and warn was never more serious. Mather was writing in what he considered an era of fading glory. As the colony prospered there was a corresponding decline in spiritual alertness. Even King Philip's War, described in the strongest terms as God's punishment, failed to check a backsliding population. A Reforming Synod was called in Boston in 1679 to inquire into the evils which caused the Lord to bring such judgments upon New England.

Like the other historians, Mather was convinced that the events he focused upon were of universal significance. *Magnalia Christi Americana* described the relationship between God and the people with whom God had "established His covenant". New England was settled for "advancing the true reformed religion", an endeavor which prospered only because it had "the good hand of God upon it from the beginning unto this day, in granting such a measure of good success". In this way was New England's history "a monument, in relation to future times, of a fuller and better reformation of the Church of God."

This venture to America was the means whereby God "gave a specimen of many good things, which he would have His Churches elsewhere aspire and arise unto." But by the early 1700's it was not the European
church or the Reformation at large with which Mather was most concerned. His history addressed itself to violations of that covenant struck between God and the Puritans. "If there by any breach between the Lord and his people, it shall appear plainly to lye on his people's part". Mather agreed with Hubbard that the best safeguard was a strong church and government. Making a stand for orthodoxy, Mather condemned those who would move beyond the gospel. Such western settlers were without "churches as it were to garrison them", their children went without instruction and "where schools are not vigorously and honourably encouraged whole colonies will sink apace into a degenerate and contemptible condition". Mather wished his history to stand as witness against those who would "forget the religious design of their fathers, and forsake the holy ways of God". But it would also record the great sacrifices and temptations that the Lord's people had overcome.

These histories are important as an indication of the cultural vantage from which the Indian was observed. Puritan historians interpreted everything in the New World in terms of the enterprise which God's people had embarked upon. They cast the story of how religion and order were brought to America in an epic form. In his definition of the epic, E. M. W. Tillyard demands that it possess three qualities: "that it should be narrative on a large scale, that it should be so serious as to merit the epithet 'universal', and that it should be positive rather than critical". As we have seen these Puritan histories accord them with each of these criteria. In function the Puritan epic accorded to both the medieval and renaissance forms. The
Puritan epic was an exposition on the "great medieval subject, the progress and salvation of the soul of man". Though the Puritan epic also served a political and cultural function. Like the renaissance epics, Puritan histories sought to teach and instruct the reader. The example of the great men who instituted government was used to instill a sense of civic awareness. If Puritan history was weakened in its ability to analyze events by its reliance upon the theory of providential causation, it was also limited by its tendency to overplay the role of great men. In this sense the vision of Puritan history was shaped by its ethnocentric objectives. By telling and embellishing the story of New England's settlement the Puritan histories sought to define the identity of the emigrants. Nothing unites a people like a common quest, and this notion was fundamental to the Puritan imagination. William Haller has this to say:

The Puritan imagination saw the life of the spirit as pilgrimage and battle. The images of wayfaring and warfaring which fill the Old Testament had been exploited by that fighting itinerant, Paul, and by generations upon generations of subsequent evangelists. Reaching the pulpits of the seventeenth century by a hundred channels, they there underwent new and peculiarly vigorous development. The Christian was a traveller through a strange country and a soldier in battle. He was a traveller who, fleeing from destruction, must adhere through peril and hardship to the way that leads home. He was a soldier who, having been pressed to serve under the banners of the spirit, must enact faithfully his part in the unceasing war of the spirit against carnal man.

For New England Puritans these images gained force by being literally true, they were the basis of Puritan mythology and were developed in the Puritans epic literature. Epic history was the means whereby a
strong ethnocentrism was given literary shape. If the Puritan epic looked inwards to a settled land and a chosen people, the Indian lay on the periphery of this vision, for he was seen only as he affected the central concerns of the Puritan experience. Although initially the subject of conversion, the Indian as potential Christian figured hardly at all in the Puritans' conception of the red man. Much more important was the relationship of the Indian to the wild land against which Puritan settlement pitted itself. The Indian came to epitomize those difficulties which obstructed Puritan mission. Ultimately the Indian became a military, and given Puritan mythology, a spiritual adversary.

It is important that the Indian was confronted in a wilderness; the Puritan epic made this significant. New England was not a congenial place; the first settlers found it a hard land to survive in. Johnson understood this struggle from first hand and recalled "the labour and wants accompanying a Desert, and terrible Wilderness". To Mather, the Puritans' "errand into the Wilderness" was part of God's design to test his people, "our wilderness-condition hath been full of humbling, trying, distressing providencies". Ultimately the Puritans tamed this barren and wild country and made it bloom. They succeeded in making a "poore barren wildnesse become a fruitful land". New England became "a country capable, with good improvement, to maintain a nation of people, after once it comes to be subdued." This dichotomy between wilderness and civilization was strengthened by the struggle to settle the colony. Puritans were
aware of a boundary between the civilized and the savage. Johnson compared these two conditions when he celebrated New England's achievement.

Thus hath the Lord been pleased to turn one of the most hideous, boundless, and unknown wildesses in the world in an instant, as 'twere (in comparison of other work) to a well-ordered Commonwealth. 27

The Indian of course was part of this wild environment, he existed on the other side of the Puritans' frontier.

Within a few years a wilderness was subdued before them, and so many Colonies settled, wherein the true and living God in Christ Jesus, is worshipped and served, in a place where, time out of mind, had been nothing but Heathenism, Idolatry and Devil-worship. 28

The Indian was considered to be merely a part of this wild place. Nothing conveys this better than the Puritan response to the smallpox epidemic which depopulated New England prior to their arrival. By means of the disease "Christ (whoes great and glorious workes through­out the Earth are altogether for the benifit of his Churches and chosen) not onley made roome for his people to plant; but also tamed the hard and cruell hearts of these barbarous Indians". No show of concern, the Indians were merely obstructions in the path of Puritan settlement, "as it was of old, God cast out the heathen to make room for his people". A calamity for the Indians, this epidemic was celebrated by the Puritans, "O, God of Hosts, thou hast brought a vine out of England; thou hast cast out the Heathen and planted". Such rhetoric conveys the distance between Puritan and Indian.

It is odd that the breath which celebrated the demise of the Indians sounded a commitment to missionary work. Morton offers this
rather curious logic.

God made way for his people, by removing the Heathen, and planting them in the land; yet we hope in mercy to save some of the posterity of these poor blinde Salvages, by being the means (at least stepping-stones) for others to come and Preach the Gospel amongst them.

Even so, the histories are of one voice in proclaiming the Puritans' commitment to missionary work. They had been sent by God "to Preach in this Wildernesse". Plymouth colony, it was claimed, had as its main aim the conversion of the Indians. In fact "the most considerable part of the English Colonies profess they came into these parts of the world with desire to advance the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ." Afterall, missionary work countered much criticism aimed at the Puritan settlement of New England. The sense of his allegory notwithstanding, Johnson vindicated "the English, who more thirsted after their the Indians conversion than destruction". The first settlers staked their charters on the claim that they would convert the Indians, and the histories endorsed this undertaking. Morton puts the matter clearly. The Puritans were "Instruments in his God's hands, not only of enlarging of our Princes Dominions, but to enlarge the Kindome of the Lord Jesus, in conversion of the poore blinde Natives." One gets the impression that the imperialistic considerations held sway.

The efforts of the Mayhews, Bourne, Wilson, and of course Eliot meant that Indian converts were made, but these missionary efforts did not bring Puritan and Indian into closer accord. Christianity was a crucial difference between the peoples. Without the gospel the Indians
languished in "anti-christian darkness", they were "savage and barbarous natives void of all manner of knowledge of Almighty God".

Ultimately efforts to convert the natives were not successful. In the wake of King Philip's War Indians were either condemned as ignoring the gospel or despised as being unworthy of it. "As for our religion, some, yet a few of them, have seemed seriously to embrace it; but until they be reduced to more civility some judicious persons have conceived no great harvest is to be expected of real converts." Mather tried to breathe life into the missionary rhetoric of an earlier generation, "such English whose hearts may incline to so good and great a work, may be encouraged to go among those who yet have hardly heard the name of the LORD named among them". He went on to describe the independent efforts of a number of ministers who still preached to the Indians. But the pagan Indian fit the general stereotype. Even those Indians who did embrace Christianity were suspect, "their progress that way was not of long continuance, like them that followed Christ for loaves". It was generally accepted that the Indian had remained committed to the Devil. In their natural state they were:

barbarous Indians and infidels, in whom the "prince of the power of the air" did "work in a spirit", noe could it be expected that nations of wretches, whose whole religion was the most explicit sort of devil-worship, should not be acted by the devil to engage in some early and bloody action, for the extinction of a plantation so contrary to his interests, as that of New England was.

The Indians religion, their very society, bound them to the Devil.

As for their religion, they never were observed by any of the first comers or takers, to have any other but what was diabolical, and so uncouth, as if it
were framed and devised by the devil himself, and is
transacted by them they used to call powwows, by some
kind of familiarity with the devil, and to whom they
used to resort for counsel in all kinds of evils,
both corporal and civil. 

So, efforts to convert the Indian did nothing to encourage amity be­ tween the races. A shared Christianity was not to be the basis of
the Indians assimilation into white society. English attitudes hard­ ened as the Indian persisted in his devillish ways.

Hostility against the Natives was brought over by the first
settlers; it was amplified in the Puritan epic. The first settlers
were fearful of landing "among barbarous Indians, famous for nothing
but cruelty". Stories of "pernicious Salvages" and "the barbarous
natives of this wilderness" terrified the first New Englanders. The
first plantations were clearly vulnerable, "what a wonder it was that
all the bloody salvages far and near did not cut off this little
remnant!" It was taken as a matter of record that the Indians were
hostile to the first English settlers. According to Johnson the ex­ pedition that explored New England in 1614 was harried by the Indians.
It was to their good fortune that the Puritans avoided settling along
the Hudson river where a large Indian population would surely have
over run them. In New England the Indians had been disarmed by the
epidemic which decimated their numbers. Even so, the Narragansetts,
unscathed by the plague, were feared as a serious threat to the colony.
Never trusted, the Indians, it was believed, were constantly plotting
and conspiring against the English. When war did come it confirmed
these suspicions. In each case the Indians were held responsible for
the outbreak of hostilities. Hubbard echoes Winthrop's phrase that
the "Pequots grew to an excess of violence and outrage", whilst
Mather was convinced that Philip's War "was begun by a fierce nation
of Indians upon an honest, harmless, Christian generation of English."

From their vantage the epics gave an inevitability to war with
the Indians. War suited the literary objectives pursued by these
histories, it sharpened the focus of Johnson's allegory and drama-
tized the adversity which Puritan settlement overcame. War also gave
unmistakable definition to Puritan society by defining it against its
common enemy, the Indian. It was claimed that the Indians revealed
their true nature in their conduct of war. Unrelieved accounts of
war atrocities, especially the tortures to which the Indians' prison-
ers were subjected, led to the conclusion that the Indians were a
"barbarous and bloody people". The Puritan epic followed the war
narratives in divesting the Indian of his humanity. Native Americans
became "inhumane and barbarous", and bands of hostile Indians prowled
the country like "unkennell'd wolves". As "horrid wolves" and "beasts
of prey" Indians devoured New England's population.

Indian victories were God's manner of chastising the colony.

Alas, the devouring displeasure of God hath said,
concerning us, "Though they go to hide themselves
from my sight afar off upon the sea, thence shall
I command the serpent and he shall bite them."

War served to promote the view of the Indian as a force of evil.
Carrying hostilities against New England, the Indian acted as an agent
of the Devil whose purpose was to rebuke God's children. Soldiers
facing the Indians thought "the Devil was in them, for there were some
Powwowes among them, which work strange things with the help of Satan",
they were "daemons in the shape of armed Indians". As the tide of war turned for the English a great passion for revenge was released. Morton spoke of the "heat of our revenge", a generation later Mather wrote of executing "a dreadful vengeance". Such bellicose sentiments were legitimized by God's will but also by the rationale that punitive expeditions were less to hunt down a human foe than to exorcise a great evil.

So that the infant colonies of New-England, finding themselves necessitated unto the crushing of serpents while they were yet in the cradle, unanimously resolved, that with the assistance of Heaven they would root this 'nest of serpents' out of the world.58

In this light the social and political demands which drove the Indians to war were ignored. The Indian was considered as an abstraction, he was a serpent, a "sword of the wilderness", a scourge for the English. This notion was drawn from the sources which inspired the Puritan epic, "the Hebrews, for good causes afforded the name of Pethen, or a serpent unto such an enemy". Literary precedents established the wilderness as the place of confrontation between good and evil. Johnson made the news of this confrontation come as a voice from the wilderness as "John the Baptist, I must cry, Prepare yee the way of the Lord, makes his paths strait for behold he is coming againe, hee is coming to destroy Antichrist."

The Bible was one source of this image. "That which the Scripture calls 'the place of dragons', I remember one of the Jewish rabbi's expounds, 'a wilderness'". But classical literature also paralleled the same theme. "The land where the gods gave battle to Typhon a serpent killed by
Apollo7 was according to Homer in a Wilderness. In fighting this battle Puritan troops had to be above reproach, in this struggle they would show their moral superiority. Nor could they be deflected from this conflict.

Death the King of terror, with all his dreadful attendance, inhumane and barbarous tortures, doubled and trebled by all the infernal furies, have appeared but light and momentary to the Souldiers of Christ Jesus, so also the Pleasure, Profits, and Honours of this World set forth in their most glorious splendor and magnitude by the alluring Lady of Delight, proffering pleasant embraces, cannot intice with her Syren Songs, such Souldiers of Christ, whose aymes are elevated by him, many Millions above that brave warrier Ulysses.64

This struggle was the epitome of the Puritan epic.

The Puritan epic did attempt a systematic description of Indian society, but these descriptions were heavily influenced by the literary role in which the Indian had been cast. Johnson, the least sophisti-cated of the four writers, recruited the Indian into his allegory, and described him in unabashedly moral terms. Found wanting in terms of English morality and civilization the Indians were censured, they "were very barbarous and uncivilized, going for the most part naked". By devoting themselves to hunting, the men were "extraordinary idle". Such idleness accounted for their indigence which left them "destitute of many necessaries, both in meat, drink, apparell and houses". Indians were also spiritually destitute, "the Divel having them in very great subjection". Never distinguishing between spiritual abstractions and physical reality, Johnson gave the Indian direct converse with the Devil who would "appear unto them in a bodily shape, sometimes very
ugly and terrible, and sometimes like a white boy, and chiefly in
the most hideous woods and swamps".

Hubbard made the most painstaking effort to understand Indian
society. This society was divided into a number of tribes each of
which was composed of several extended family groups which Hubbard
compared to the Scottish clans. Over the tribe one "family is com-
monly found to be predominate above the others, of
which the eldest heir hath the sole absolute government and rule over
the rest, whom they call sagamore or sachem". Power, though staying
within this family, tended to pass from one strong man to another,
"As for succession, it is rather collateral than direct". Leadership
was almost always patriarchal. Each tribe, numbering about two hun-
dred, occupied its own village and possessed a carefully defined
territory. Occasionally a number of such tribes would form together
as a confederation often united by the same language, but these
larger organizations were limited to mutual defense. Usually the
name of sachem applied to the leader of such a confederation.

In describing Indian society Mather shows little evidence of
having ventured beyond his library, and his account is far inferior
to Hubbard's. Mather followed the convention of describing Indian
society as a monarchy.

Their government was purely monarchical; and as for
those whose dominions extended further than would
well admit the prince's personal guidance, it was
committed into the hands of lieutenants, who governed
with no less absoluteness than the prince himself...

Failing to grasp the nature of a tribal system, Mather described the
Indian in terms familiar to English society, talking of nobles, yeomen, villains and so on. His understanding of the dynamics of power was tied to this English system, succession was through eldest son, "male of the blood" and "blood royal".

Despite the care he lavished on his description of Indian society Hubbard's final evaluation of the Indian was made consistent with the epic he was writing. He abruptly terminated his description of Indian society with this:

Their poverty, and barbarous manner of living, not affording opportunity for want of means, to run into many capital evils, which the wealth of other nations doth dispose them unto ... But their inhabitants /habitations/ being so poor and mean, and their manner of life so uncult and brutish, it is scarce worth the while to enquire into their successions thereunto, or the laws and customs whereby they use to be maintained and governed in the possession of them.68

Though the Indians were not lacking in natural ability they were damned by their laziness and their indigence.

Many of them are very active and quick of apprehension in any mechanical science, which, with a little observation they attain, working in iron, brass, pewter, as well as in timber; but have been accustomed to such a lazy, idle kind of life, leaving all their drudgery and laborious work to their women, that it is rare to find any of them that care to be held to any consistent employment or bodily taken for a whole day together.69

The Indians were made into the depraved, warlike, creatures of the Devil which was the role they occupied in the epics. They resembled the "Savage Tartar" that is, the wildman best known to Europe. Hubbard denied the conjecture that the Indians were descendants of the lost tribes of Israel. The Jews' original language
could not have "degenerated" into what the Indians were speaking; in the same way "here was found no footsteps of the Idolatry or rites of any religious worship the people had degenerated into". The Indians' disposition though "indifferently affable and courteous, yet subtle and strangely revengeful, and malicious ... They are very treacherous, deceitful and cruel withal, when they get any of their enemies into their hands." Hubbard agreed with the other historians that these people were barbarians. Although he endowed Indian government with dignity, "it is admirable to see the majestic deportment of the prince, his speech to his council ...", Mather brushed this aside when finally evaluating Indian society. He excoriated English defeats at the hands of the Indians, all the more humiliating for being inflicted "not be a people, but a foolish nation". Hubbard agreed with this and endorsed the "silly wretches" theory which explained the Indian's coming to America:

when the devil was put out of his throne in other parts of the world, and that the mouth of all his oracles was stopped in Europe, Asia, and Africa, he seduced a company of silly wretches to follow his conduct into this unknown part of the world, where he might lie hid and not be disturbed in the idolatrous and abominable, or rather diabolical service he expected from those his followers."
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CONCLUSION

Is man a salvage at heart, skinned o'er with Manners? Or is salvagery but a faint taint in the natural men's gentility, which erupts now and again like pimples on an angel's arse?

John Barth.
It is fairly accurate to say that by the end of King Philip's War attitudes to the Indians were typified by an uncompromising and toughminded hostility. This thoroughgoing antagonism had many of the characteristics of what is now called racial prejudice. Since this elusive concept has hardly been nailed down, even in its twentieth century shape, no ironclad definition is available. But it is safe to claim that the formation and expression of racial prejudice shows a number of common tendencies. As part of ethnosemantics racism is a perceptual observation by one culture of another "alien culture". The attributes which form part of the racist description of the "alien culture" are various: "The term race, or its various ethnosemantic glosses, is applied in vernacular contexts to human populations organized along an astonishing variety of principles."

Of course the significant aspect of the racial characteristics ascribed by racist rhetoric is the pejorative. Racism usually implies an unfavorable evaluation, and in this respect it is racial prejudice that we are concerned with.

According to Lowenberg racism is a learned behavior which is part of a more general pattern of prejudice which emerges as a "natural result of participating in social patterns of behavior."

Perhaps the most significant work towards a definition of racial prejudice has been completed by Gordon Allport. Allport argues that racial prejudice is one means of perceiving an outside group. Like Lowenberg, Allport stresses the functional nature of this form of social prejudice, and racial prejudice is defined as "a pattern of
hostility in interpersonal relations which is directed against an entire group, or against its individual members; it fulfills specific irrational functions for its bearer". He goes on to argue that the perceptual process which defines the "racial category" is important in a behavioralist sense. For Allport argues that the expression of racial prejudice has a cumulative effect, racial prejudice as an idea becomes racial prejudice as a mode of behavior. He distinguishes between antilocution, avoidance, discrimination, physical attack and extermination, and argues the transition from the less to the more intense level of activity.

This present study seems to bear out these hypotheses. Certainly the cultural vantage from which the Indian was observed helped structure the view of the Indian that was formed. The Indian was viewed across the breach of cultural difference which was defined in the first instance by: the preconceptions of the Indian imported into America, the imperialistic purpose in settling this continent, and finally, that set of internalized assumptions most clearly reflected in the typology of "wilderness" and "savage". Of course this has long been recognized by perceptive students of this subject. The idea of inter-cultural perception was grasped by Robert Berkthofer Jr. when he wrote: "The Americans of the past were victims of their cultural values just as their latterday judges are victims of todays beliefs." Roy Harvey Pearce has persuasively argued that the concept of the savage served a useful function for the white observers of the Indians who invented it, "for in the savage and his destiny
there was manifest all that they had long grown away from and yet still had to overcome." The strong sense of cultural difference meant that an implicit comparison was made between white and red society. Given the whitemen's unshakable conviction in the superiority of his civilization, this comparison was almost always to the Indians' disadvantage. The first white settlers in New England guarded themselves against the depredations of a wild land and its savage inhabitants. The Puritans' ethnocentrism and religious exclusivity gave little chance for a culturally relativistic view of the Indians.

The second major influence forming the view of the Indian was the actual situation in which the Indian was confronted. Here some useful purpose might be served by comparing the findings of this study with the work of those anthropologists who have examined the "contact situation" between contemporary field workers and the "primitive" peoples they observe. Cultural, or what Francis L. H. Hsu calls psychological anthropology, has considered how socio-psychic factors affect the perception of "primitive" peoples.

Earliest contacts with the Indians of New England were wrought in a situation of distrust and potential conflict. The tribulations of settling in a strange land, and the great difference between Indian and white culture created a situation of "culture shock" which Durkheim's concept of "anomie" is useful in describing. "Anomie" describes a condition of psychological stress contingent upon the threat to or breakdown of moral and cultural values. This condition
occurs "when men's social context fails to provide them with the requisit sources of attachment and/or regulator, at the appropriate level of intensity, then their psychological or moral health is impaired". The significance of this stress situation has been pointed to by Dennison Nash who argues that the anxiety and confusion of the confrontation situation tends to encourage what he calls the "dysadaptive syndrome" in which the observers' allegiance to his culture completely controls his perception of the "alien culture". Early New English society exercised strong controls against its members "going native", and so maintained what Nash has called a "fortified haven". Rigidly maintained, this controlling influence prevented seventeenth century New English observers making any but the most ethnocentric comparisons between white and red society. Again this present study agrees with the anthropological theory describing a closely analagous situation.

Although some fair measure of success is met by treating the formation of early attitudes to the Indians synchronistically, the same is not true when the problem is dealt with in an diachronistic manner. It might be loosely said that the pre-contact view of the Indian was "favorable". But this is to overlook the fact that little was known about the Indians; that the notion of the "exotic primitive" was disseminated by ill-informed literateurs. Something like a favorable view of the Indian emerges from the early promotional literature, but here we have to remember that the objective of these tracts was not to describe the Indians but to get people to emigrate
to the New World. To this end the existing literary convention of the "exotic primitive" served a useful purpose. But as soon as the inevitable white-Indian clash over lands and religion occurred, a more familiar picture of the Indian emerged. Tracts describing the Pequot War are only slightly less flattering to the Indians than those which described the King Philip's War. These two wars were separated by Puritan efforts to convert the Indians to Christianity. Although some historians have argued that missionary efforts reflected a "favorable" view of the Indians, the thesis offered by this study is that missionary work was not undertaken for altruistic reasons and that the missionary tracts reflect a highly unfavorable view of the Indians.

So, this study asks a simple question: What attitudes did the first Englishmen to settle New England form of the Indians? The answer that seems to have been arrived at is that Native Americans were viewed in racial terms as a people different and inferior. Indians described with racial stereotypes which gained clarity and definition during the first fifty years of white settlement. The attempt of this study was not simply to record the attitudes as they were expressed in the promotional tracts, journals, diaries, histories, and colonial legislation; but to explain how they were arrived at. Notions of say the "barbarous savage" and the "dirty primitive" were not formed solely by the "contact situation", for such ideas rested upon assumptions implicit to the culture brought by Englishmen to America. An attempt to understand the intellectual dynamics of white-Indian contact is
useful in two ways. Firstly, and obviously, it tells how the colonials came to terms with the Indians. Secondly, the interpolation of white accounts of Indians in the colonial period is a crucial part of early Indian ethnography. The most abundant source of information about the Indians in the colonial period is contained in the accounts of them by traders, missionaries, and settlers, not to mention the colonial governments. But, as has been indicated, all of these accounts were formed by a heavy cultural bias. By understanding this bias, an attempt can be made to compensate for it and so derive information useful to writing early Indian ethnography.
Notes to Conclusion:


4. Ibid., passim.
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