# THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION IN MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY

by

RICHARD A. EVANS

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS IN HISTORY

University of Central Oklahoma

Spring, 2014

THESIS APPROVAL

The abstract and thesis of Richard A. Evans for the Master of Arts in History was submitted to the graduate college on April 16 2014, and approved by the undersigned committee

COMMITTEE APPROVALS:

Dr. Jessica Sheetz-Nguyen

Dr. Stanley Adamiak

Dr. Michael Springer

## ABSTRACT

This thesis focuses on the political relationship between the Massachusetts Bay Colony and the English Crown between 1630 and 1691. It begins with the establishment of the colony and how the Puritans who settled in Massachusetts Bay understood their place in the British Empire based on their charter. The settlers connection to London was altered each time the executive authority changed during the turbulent seventeenth century. The colony had an antagonistic relationship with the Stuarts during most of this time. This tension reached its apex with Charles II's removal of the Massachusetts Bay's colonial charter in1684. The Puritans interpreted their place in the empire much differently than Charles II but the king's methods to control the colony only reconfirmed the misunderstanding between the two. After Charles II's death his brother James II acted more aggressive with the colony. He used imperialistic tactics to subdue the Puritans. Under his appointed governor Edmond Andros, James II combined the New England colonies to form the Dominion of New England.

Under the Dominion government, the colonists faced a host of reform measures that restricted the liberties they enjoyed under the old charter. Andros removed the colonial assemblies, restricted town meetings, and enforced recognition of Anglicanism. The new colonial government also removed land titles and forced the Puritans to reapply for them under the Dominion. Despite pleading for relief from James II, none came. The attack on the colonist's liberties were abated only by the Glorious Revolution in England and the ascension of William of Orange to the throne. The change in government in London changed the relationship yet again between Crown and colony. The efforts of New England's agent in London, Increase Mather, who sought to reestablish the liberties

lost under the old charter, shed light on the divergent views between the British government and the colonists regarding civil liberties. The issuing of the new charter created a new paradigm between the colony and England which remained intact until the American Revolution.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project has been the most extensive project I have worked on in my academic career. I want to thank the professors and staff at the University of Central Oklahoma for the assistance and training they have provided that aided me in my research. I am very appreciative of Dr. Kenney Brown's help in guiding me through the submission process. I want to thank Stanley Adamiak for his assistance with the American history portion of my thesis and his assistance with the historiography. I appreciate Dr. Michael Springer's insight as I compiled this thesis. I owe much gratitude to my committee chair Dr. Jessica Sheetz-Nguyen who offered invaluable direction, as I researched my topic, and helpful criticism to bring the finer points out in my thesis. Without her help this project would not had been as successful. I especially want to thank my lovely wife Alana Evans for helping me with editing and enduring countless hours of discussion on British Colonialism, the history of Boston, and political philosophy. Without her assistance my graduate studies would have been much more difficult.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# INTRODUCTION

England underwent dynamic political change in the seventeenth century which affected the balance between executive and legislative powers, as well as the governance of the fledgling empire. The status and influence of Parliament had risen since the time of Henry VIII, and by the time the Stuarts ascended the throne, the legislative branch asserted that it had a larger role in the kingdom; thus the reigning monarchs did not see themselves as a mere formality to sanction royal decrees.[1] Although the men elected to the House of Commons did not represent all parts of England, they did represent a rising class of wealthy, educated Protestants, mostly dominated by Puritans, who were a sect that sought to "purify" the Anglican Church from its Catholic roots. This group now wanted a voice in royal matters.[2] Unfortunately for these Parliamentarians, Charles I, House of Stuart (r. 1625-1649) did not see the need to cede to them any of his authority.[3] Members of Parliament, such as Edward Coke and John Prynne, both inspirations to North American colonials, took umbrage with Charles I's policies of circumventing the legislature to raise taxes, who enforced the new levies by commissions, who then punished non-compliant citizens without trial. Coke and Prynne based their arguments on the *Magna Carta* and previous legal precedent.[4] This political turmoil eventually erupted into bloodshed in the form of the English Civil War.

The victorious Parliamentary forces took the first great step in redefining executive power when they executed Charles I in 1649. The Commonwealth, established

---

[1] John Guy, *Tudor England* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 177.
[2] Guy, *Tudor England,* 11.
[3] For more on Charles I see L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
[4] United Kingdom, *Petition of Right* (London: 1628).

under Oliver Cromwell, created the *Instrument of Government,* granting the legislature the right to meet on a regular basis.[5] Cromwell's Protectorate government did not survive his death in 1658. His son succeeded Cromwell, but his office did not survive the tumultuous political pressures and divisions. At that point Parliament invited the Stuarts to return, an event known as the Restoration. Charles II's reign (1660-1685) saw a more stable polity.[6] Political tensions, however, continued to simmer with the opposing political factions from the English Civil War. The supporters of the Crown formed themselves into the Tory party, while the pro-Parliament forces formed themselves into the Whig party. His brother James II (r. 1685-1688), did not fare as well when he ascended the throne.[7] The specter of the contest between the executive and legislative branches returned, resulting in the Parliament's call to William of Orange to invade England in what is now known as the Glorious Revolution.[8] In a period of nearly forty years, Parliaments had beheaded a king, confirmed a Lord Protector, removed a second Lord Protector, restored a king, and then removed another by armed invasion. By 1688, the legislature had asserted its right to exist and redefined executive power in England.

All of this had a profound effect on the government, but the changes in London also had an impact on English colonies. These transfers of administrative power shaped transatlantic policy, both politically and economically, especially in the Massachusetts Bay colony. The standard view of the colony's relationship to England (by the general public and some historians) is that the Puritans wanted to completely separate themselves

---

[5] United Kingdom, *Commonwealth Instrument of Government,* (London: 1653); For more on Cromwell see Roy Edward Sherwood, *Oliver Cromwell: King in all but Name 1653-1658* (New York: St Martin's Press, 1977) and Peter Gaunt, *Oliver Cromwell* (New York: New York University Press, 2004).
[6] For more on Charles II see Osmund Airy, *Charles II* (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1904).
[7] For More on James II see John Miller, *James II* (London: Wayland Ltd., 1978).
[8] For More on William of Orange see David Ogg, *William III* (New York: Macmillan, 1956).

from the mother country and form a new entity without the crown's influence. A closer examination of the interaction between crown and colony does not support this assumption, in fact it shows that the Puritans were much more connected to England than originally thought, and that their relationship with the mother country changed continually as the crown changed; in fact, the Puritans took great care to secure their rights as Englishmen and the question of whether or not those rights traveled with them across the ocean was the crux of the antagonisms between England's authorities in Massachusetts and the Puritans, from the inception of the colony to the Glorious Revolution. When the Glorious Revolution settled the relationship between the legislative and executive branches in England it also solidified the relationship between Massachusetts Bay colony and the crown, wherein the colonists believed they secured their rights as Englishmen by William III.

Understanding how the colonists viewed their relationship to England, how the crown regarded Massachusetts Bay, and how the politics played out requires a review of the historical literature. Generally, historical narratives on this topic can be divided into three topics: Puritans in America, the Glorious Revolution in a trans-Atlantic world, and politics in the New England colonies. This study will begin with a review of the Puritans, because it is they who envisioned themselves as Englishmen with all the rights due to an English subject; and they who struggled with their legal identity with the political powers in London.

## PURITANS IN AMERICA

The first work to consider is Perry Miller's *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*. He begins with the inception of the colony and the reasons why

Massachusetts Bay's first governor, John Winthrop, and his followers sailed to North America. They sought to create a separation from England in order to be an example of Christian faith and devotion.[9] Miller argues that the tenets of the Puritan's Congregationalist faith became the primary social structure of the colony for the rest of the century and perhaps longer.[10] Puritan doctrine permeated all facets of society, including politics, education, and science.[11] Perry further argues that the founder's vision of a Christian community did not completely transfer to the rising generations who were influenced by trade and encroachment of English society.[12] The greatest upheaval came toward the end of the century, after the colony lost its charter and the Dominion of New England was established. The Glorious Revolution in England allowed the colonists to rid themselves of the Dominion, but they had to accept the new regime in London under William III.[13] The Puritans could rally behind the new king because he defended Protestantism.[14] However, this required the Puritans to tolerate other Protestant faiths.[15] Perry concludes that this caused the eventual weakening of Congregational supremacy but they still maintained a strong influence on New England society into the eighteenth century.[16]

John Demos presents an understanding of the nature of Puritan life and culture in his 1970 monograph *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony.* Demos employs anthropology and the sociology of family life research as well as public records

---

[9] Perry Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press of the Harvard University Press, 1953), 4-5.
[10] Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*, 14.
[11] Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*, 14.
[12] Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province*, 16-7.
[13] Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province,* 158-9.
[14] Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province,* 158-9.
[15] Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province,* 164-5.
[16] Miller, *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province,* 482-3.

such as wills and court documents and the private writings of the colonists.[17] Demos approached his subject topically rather than chronologically. He provides valuable insight by addressing the physical conditions in which the Puritans lived, the family relationships in the household and the individual's role within the family. He argues that the early arrivals in Plymouth believed they were outside the Crown's political reach; and by 1638, they laid groundwork for representative government.[18] They kept the government separate from religious affairs, but as Demos stated "they were formally separate but in practice they were intertwined." [19] Demos also focused on the family unit. He reports that the family set the belief structure, schooled the children, and provided the economic life for the colony.[20] He concludes that the family was the force that bound the community together, but each succeeding generation's differing view of their religion caused broader changes within the community.[21] The expansion of new land reduced the influence of the family and the colony in general.[22] Families moved away to start new homes and new settlers came in and changed the nature of the early Puritan society.[23]

The next work on the Puritans came from John Adair in 1982. In the book *Founding Fathers: The Puritans in England and America*, Adair examines the links between the religious movement from its origins in Europe and its export of ideas to the New England colonies. In researching the rise of the sect, he dispels the false notion that Puritans were overly strict and that they were profoundly different from other Protestant

---

[17] John Demos, *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony* (London: Oxford University Press 1970), ix, x iii.
[18] Demos, *A Little Commonwealth,* 4, 7.
[19] Demos, *A Little Commonwealth,* 13.
[20] Demos, *A Little Commonwealth,* 183.
[21] Demos, *A Little Commonwealth,* 186.
[22] Demos, *A Little Commonwealth,* 188.
[23] Demos, *A Little Commonwealth,* 188.

denominations.[24] Adair contends that Puritan worship was not unique and that it derived like other Protestant denominations, from humanist and Reformation ideals.[25] Adair argues that Puritans attributed three important values to the colonial world: individuality, the Protestant form of worship, and education.[26] While Adair provided a look at the transfer of Puritan doctrine from England to America, Michael Winship provides a study of how eighteenth century political thought affected their beliefs. In his 1996 book, *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment.* Winship examines the role Providence played in Puritan theology as a means to show how social attitudes changed.[27] He claims that Puritan ideology had declined in both England and America from 1660 into the eighteenth century.[28] Winship relies on the writing of Cotton Mather, one of the foremost Puritan ministers in his time, because of his large correspondence with ministers in England.[29] Winship concludes that the society of New England changed with the arrival of the Enlightenment.[30] He contrasts preachers' political sermons during election cycles; for example, Mather and his fellow older ministers asserted God's agency in the prosperity of the colonies, while younger preachers emphasized the importance of England in their successes.[31] Thus, secular learning spurred New England society into modernity.[32]

---

[24] John Adair, *Founding Fathers: The Puritans in England and America* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd. 1982), xi.
[25] Adair, *Founding Fathers: The Puritans in England and America,* xi.
[26] Adair, *Founding Fathers: The Puritans in England and America,* 27, 91.
[27] Michael P. Winship, *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press 1996), 1.
[28] Winship, *Seers of God,* 3.
[29] Winship, *Seers of God,* 6.
[30] Winship, *Seers of God,* 138.
[31] Winship, *Seers of God,* 141-2, 145.
[32] Winship, *Seers of God,* 151-2.

In 1999, Alison Games took the relationship between England and her colonies in a different direction in her book *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World.* Unlike Winship, who focused on a small a narrow group with a particular religious bent, Games broadened her research to a wide array of people who were leaving England. Primarily using port records from London and the eastern parts of England, she created a good demographic base of the thousands of travelers who sailed into the Atlantic.[33] Games theorized that the need for expanded trade drove migration to the colonies and made them successful.[34] She focused on three areas; the initial starting and founding of the colony, its building and growth, and integration within the colony of the settlers with the other parts of the Atlantic.[35] She took a prospographical approach to identify the reasons why these people left and where they went. Games offered an insightful analysis of the Puritans. She found that Puritans were responsible for the largest wave of migrations between 1635and 1636.[36] Not only did they travel to New England, but Bermuda as well.[37] She found that that the new arrivals brought with them changes in worship.[38] This difference in doctrine became even greater in 1641 when a more radical element of the movement arrived in New England.[39] Her analysis of the attempted re-exportation of radical ideas back to England showed the extent of the communications between the colonies and the mother county.[40] She concluded that the settlers of the New

---

[33] Alison Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press 1999), 1, 4.
[34] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 4.
[35] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 5-6.
[36] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 132.
[37] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 133.
[38] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 133.
[39] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 161
[40] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 161-2.

World found a more complex society when they arrived than what they had left behind.[41] Therefore, they had to build a new type of society.[42] Unlike the British Isles where the Irish, Scots, Welsh and English lived in separate areas for the most part, America became more integrated because the settlers from the various parts of Great Britain now lived next to each other.[43] Ties to England, other colonies, and even other European powers, held the new settlements together.[44]

In 2006, Michael Winship expanded his work on the Puritans with an article titled "Godly Republicanism and the Origins of the Massachusetts Polity." He argues that as a reaction to Charles I's financial and political positions, the Puritans turned to a republican form of government to "preserve the purity of the churches."[45] The political structure of republican ideals practiced in Massachusetts centered on the local magistrates and their assistants and did not involve the customary legislative body.[46] He found that the freemen in the society kept watch on the magistrates while the magistrates kept watch on the church.[47] This reinforces Demos' position that the government at Plymouth was separate from the church, but they were in practice the same. Winship also explored the correspondence between New England and Great Britain. Despite trans-Atlantic dialog, arguments for the use of a more republican government were not transmitted back to England.[48] He goes on to argue that the basic structure of Calvinist churches lends itself

---

[41] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 207.
[42] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 215.
[43] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 215.
[44] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 216.
[45] Michael P. Winship, "Godly Republicanism and the Origins of the Massachusetts Polity," *William and Mary Quarterly* vol. 63, 427-8.
[46] Winship, "Godly Republicanism and the Origins of the Massachusetts Polity," 454.
[47] Winship, "Godly Republicanism and the Origins of the Massachusetts Polity," 454.
[48] Winship, "Godly Republicanism and the Origins of the Massachusetts Polity," 455.

to a republican form of polity.[49] Winship theorized that the rise of republican ideology had more to do with its use in the colonies than with its exportation from the Whig faction in London, who promoted representative government in England.[50]

Mark Valeri adds to our most recent understanding of the Puritans in his 2010 article "William Petty in Boston: Political Economy, Religion, and Money in Provincial New England." Valeri studies the economic impact of the Glorious Revolution and its aftermath on New England society. He argued that the Puritan clergy modified their doctrine on the practice of investments and the use of money.[51] The changes in trade and new economic thinking caused Puritans to change the way they understood such doctrines and the role of Providence.[52] This argument coincides with Winship's analysis on the changes in theology brought by the Enlightenment. He determined that Puritan ministers such as Cotton Mather understood the impact of the new economic realities they faced.[53] Therefore, for example, they redefined what usury meant and separated it from investment.[54] This coincided with the new understanding of Providence and God's place in the affairs of men.[55]

## GLORIOUS REVOLUTION

Demos, Winship, Games, and Valeri, argue that life for the Puritans visibly changed with the advent of the Glorious Revolution. The understanding of this event in England is important to provide context to the changes that it created throughout

---

[49] Winship, "Godly Republicanism and the Origins of the Massachusetts Polity," 457.
[50] Winship, "Godly Republicanism and the Origins of the Massachusetts Polity," 461.
[51] Mark Valeri, "William Petty in Boston: Political Economy, Religion, and Money in Provincial New England" *Early American Studies, An Interdisciplinary Journal* 8, 550.
[52] Valeri, "William Petty in Boston," 551-2.
[53] Valeri, "William Petty in Boston," 579.
[54] Valeri, "William Petty in Boston," 579.
[55] Valeri, "William Petty in Boston," 579-60.

England's emerging global empire. A quick review of some of the more recent additions to the historiography of this event across the Atlantic from New England will show what was being marketed in the realm of political thought at the time. In 1961, Christopher Hill published *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714* which takes a Marxist approach of class warfare in examining the formation of political thought in the seventeenth century. He explores the relationship between the Stuarts and the Parliament, contending that the complexities of the century stemmed from the intermingling of religious, economic and political goals between the Crown and members of the gentry.[56] Hill asserts that the Stuarts did not have the administrative abilities to handle the changes taking place in society while the Puritans were taking the lead in pursuing the reformation of the government to suit them.[57] He defines revolution as "Revolution happens only when the government has lost the confidence of an important section of the ruling class."[58] After the English Civil War, the Puritans were the group that had lost the confidence of the ruling class by Hill's definition, precipitating the Restoration in 1660, making this an aborted revolution.[59] Hill argues that by the end of the century, concern for economic and scientific thought and not religion were the primary motivators in society.[60] Commercial concerns that drove the polity allowed the Parliament to gain supremacy over the monarch.[61] The struggle of how the government was to be funded put the landholders in

---

[56] Christopher Hill, *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714* (New York: W. W, Norton & Company, 1961), 87.
[57] Hill, *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714*, 87.
[58] Hill, *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714*, 88.
[59] Hill, *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714*, 161, 163.
[60] Hill, *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714*, 163.
[61] Hill, *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714*, 263.

the position to gain the most from the Glorious Revolution, however the lower classes were generally left out of the gains made by the *Declaration of Rights.*[62]

Mark Kishlansky broadens out the historical approach of the study of the Glorious Revolution by taking the century as a whole in his 1996 book *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*. He places the political history of the problems between the Stuarts and Parliament in a narrative focusing on three changes that took place during their reign.[63] The mixed monarchical government was revolutionized; each generation of Stuarts were unable to cope with the changes that took place during their respective reigns and that England itself changed from an agrarian state to a thriving economic, colonial empire.[64] Like Hill, he asserts that the tensions in the early part of the century were between two elitist groups, the monarchy and the Puritans.[65] The Puritan movement would eventually cause problems in the Parliament. Their absolute religious positions did not conform to the traditional way Parliament came to a decision, which was based on compromise until a unanimous consent could be reached.[66] Eventually, Cromwell's inability to find a legitimate government and continuing religious issues brought about the Restoration.[67] Kishlansky argued further that the religious issues receded when the gentry compromised on what they wanted in government.[68] He takes the position that the *Declaration of Rights* was a vague enough document that both Tories and Whigs could claim it, returning to the art of compromise.[69] Kishlansky concluded that two revolutions were needed to achieve a stable government, claiming that they only arose by the

---

[62] Hill, *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714*, 265.
[63] Mark Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714* (London: Penguin Books, 1996), xi.
[64] Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*, xi.
[65] Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*, 33.
[66] Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*, 63.
[67] Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*, 212.
[68] Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*, 285.
[69] Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*, 285.

changing conditions of the seventeenth century.[70] The long lasting effect of the Glorious Revolution was the way dissent could be handled in the Parliament without destroying the government.[71]

In 2009 Steve Pincus wrote the most recent book on the Glorious Revolution, *1688: The First Modern Revolution.* Here Pincus breaks away from the traditional view of the revolution and redefines what was happening in the latter seventeenth century. Pincus argued that a modern revolution occurs "when the regime in power decides, for whatever reason, that it needs to modernize. In so doing the regime extends the tendrils of the state deeper and more extensively into society than they had ever gone before, necessarily generating resentment. At the same time, by announcing a break with the past, the regime has lowered the bar for opposition movements."[72] He explained that modernization has two components.[73] In the first condition the modern state would experience changes in statecraft, create a central bureaucracy, professional military and use the state to affect the economy, society and politics.[74] The second condition required society to make a permanent break with the past.[75] Pincus contends that two groups wanted to move England into a modern state, but they held two opposing models of government. James II and his followers sought to create an absolute monarchy like France under Louis XIV.[76] The Whigs favored a republic like the Dutch, adhering to Protestantism.[77] Pincus points out that the roots of the struggle went back to the early part of the century, but religion became less an issue of debate as foreign policy and its effects

---

[70] Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*, 338.
[71] Kishlansky, *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*, 341.
[72] Steve Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 7-8.
[73] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 8.
[74] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution,* 8.
[75] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 8.
[76] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 6.
[77] Pincus, 1*688: The First Modern Revolution*, 6-7.

of trade rose to the foreground.[78] Both groups wanted to further England's economy in trade, but they saw different enemies as the ones who would hinder the expansion of markets.[79] James II feared the Dutch, while the Whigs feared the French. Pincus also took issue that James II was inept. He pointed out that James had already modernized the army and consolidated the bureaucracy to control the populace and it was not a forgone conclusion that he would lose to the Whig faction.[80] He attributed James' loss to his bad timing in that he moved too fast and offended the sensibilities of the one group that held the balance between the monarch and the Whigs—the Tories. Pincus argued that the Tories joined with the Whigs and pushed England into modernity under a republican government.[81] In the long term, the Whig victory moved England's political model away from the absolute monarchy that most of Europe embraced, and ushered in bourgeois culture.[82]

## Politics In America

The final area of study is the effect the Glorious Revolution had on British Colonies. Limited research exists for this area, but several works have been produced on it. Bernard Bailyn tackled this subject in his 1967 work *The Origins of American Politics.* He examined the political thought in the colonies after the Glorious Revolution up to the American Revolution. He theorized that political ideology from both England and America played a role the American Revolution.[83] Radical Whig propaganda crossed the

---

[78] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 8.
[79] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 477.
[80] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 481.
[81] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 483.
[82] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution,* 485, 487.
[83] Bernard Bailyn, *The Origins of American Politics* (New York: Vintage Books, 1967), 10.

Atlantic and became infused in colonial political thought.[84] This line of reasoning believed that constitutional government in England and America were under attack. [85] Unlike England, the colonial governments had more liberty and were practicing the principle of divided powers with the populace represented in the legislature and the executive by the royal governors.[86] Bailyn concluded that the expansion of republican government, coupled with the limited authority of the governors, and the heightened conspiracy theories of Whig propaganda led to the American Revolution.[87] Bailyn's work begins at the Glorious Revolution but did not investigate how America changed from this event.

David Lovejoy published one of the first studies focusing on this important topic in his 1972 book titled *The Glorious Revolution in America.* Lovejoy proposes that the result of the change in the English government and the acceptance of Glorious Revolution in the colonies drew them closer politically and economically to London.[88] To support his position, Lovejoy assesses how each colony developed and argued they were essentially separate units.[89] The colonists themselves developed, understood, and defended their rights under English law. [90] He argues that since the Restoration, trade had expanded in an unorganized fashion and investors wanted a more coherent royal policy regarding the colonies to maximize profit.[91] This, along with increased pressure from foreign competition compelled the Stuarts to take firmer control in North America.[92]

---

[84] Bailyn, *The Origins of American Politics,* 13.
[85] Bailyn, *The Origins of American Politics,* 10.
[86] Bailyn, *The Origins of American Politics,* 60, 67.
[87] Bailyn, *The Origins of American Politics,* 106, 160-1.
[88] David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1972), xv.
[89] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* xiv.
[90] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* xv.
[91] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 1, 31.
[92] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 31.

Massachusetts Bay, which enjoyed the most liberal charter, suffered from the effects of the Crown's actions the most.[93] James II sought to centralize the crown's power, eventually causing the revolt in North America.[94] Lovejoy concludes that the acceptance of the Glorious Revolution by the colonies increased the power of the Parliament.[95] However, both the Parliament and William of Orange ignored the colonies, despite their support for the new government and they did not realize their hope for a more equitable policy in North America.[96] In the case of Massachusetts Bay, Puritans understood that they would have to change their religious practices and become more secular.[97] This resulted in their belief that the English *Bill of Rights* also applied to them, just like their fellow countrymen in the England, and they too enjoyed the same protections from it.[98]

Nine years after Lovejoy's work, Richard Johnson published *Adjustment to Empire: The New England Colonies 1675-1715.* Johnson devotes his work to understanding the institutions around colonial government and the way they shaped the social and religious history of the Puritans.[99] He argues that the incoherent Stuart policies allowed New Englanders to use the English system to their advantage to support their own colony.[100] These changes also included the way the colonies related to each other as well as stronger economic ties to England.[101] He asserts that the issue of the legitimacy of Massachusetts Bay's charter left much doubt in how much self-rule they had.[102] He

---

[93] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 123.
[94] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 179.
[95] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 233.
[96] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 376.
[97] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 377.
[98] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 378.
[99] Richard R. Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715* (Piscataway, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press 1981), ix-x.
[100] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* x.
[101] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* x.
[102] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* 69.

explains James II's policies as a reaction to colonial resistance to royal oversight of New England's affairs.[103] He points to Charles II's vague reference that the colonial governor could call an assembly if he wanted to, as consent for his brother's policies of complete removal of the General Court at the time of the revocation of the Massachusetts Bay charter.[104] Johnson did not see an attempt on James II's part of creating an absolutist state in New England.[105] His reasoning for this was that James permitted the Southern and Caribbean colonies to retain their assemblies. Significantly, Johnson devoted only a footnote to this reason.[106] This area deserves more attention in order to create a clearer picture of James II's policies. Johnson concludes that the Glorious Revolution brought more definition and expanded the role of government.[107] Under this new enhanced role, a new form of colonial government emerged. The colonies departed from the English form of government. In America, the executive power and the legislature remained separate due to the limited self-rule but they also had a royal governor, which tended to create a consensus on most issues.[108] This action diminished the Biblical Commonwealth and enhanced the rule of law in New England, leading toward constitutional liberties with certain rights enforced by act of Parliament and not fully bound to the Crown, resulting in a more stable control of the empire.[109]

Shortly after Johnson's publication appeared, Stephen Sauders Webb offered a different reason for the Stuart's attack on colonial charters in his book *1676: The End of American Independence.* Webb argues that the Crown shifted its emphasis to the middle

---

[103] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* 55.
[104] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* 56.
[105] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* 56.
[106] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* 56.
[107] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* 365.
[108] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* 406-7.
[109] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715,* 414, 419-21.

and Caribbean colonies.[110] They also attempted to create a stronger defensive position by courting the loyalty of Native Americans and were trying to avoid another costly engagement such as King Philip's War (1675-1676), as well as checking the growing French influence on the northern frontier.[111] In order to achieve these goals, the Stuarts needed to remove the royal charters to limit colonial government.[112] They also sent governors who were adept at negotiating with native tribes, such as Edmond Andros in New England.[113] Webb concluded that the Crown's efforts to secure Native American allies reduced the independence of the American colonies and made them more British. Along with this change in culture came a change in focus from New England to the middle and southern colonies.[114]

Brendon McConville had a different understanding of colonial ideology after the Glorious Revolution than did Bailyn. In his 2006 book, *The Kings Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America 1688-1776,* he argues that royalism in America has been removed from the social memory.[115] The colonies did not make large outcry for a republican form of government.[116] McConville theorizes that common beliefs and historical bias about the American Revolution had diminished how much colonial America valued the British monarchy and membership in the empire, which is essentially the opposite of the Whiggish view of history.[117] He postulates that the Stuarts were ineffectual rulers and that their ties to Catholic France had unsettled the masses, resulting

---

[110] Stephen Saunders Webb, *1676: The End of American Independence* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1984), xv.
[111] Webb, *1676: The End of American Independence,* xvi.
[112] Webb, *1676: The End of American Independence,* xviii.
[113] Webb, *1676: The End of American Independence,* 303-4.
[114] Webb, *1676: The End of American Independence,* 415-6.
[115] Brendan McConville, *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America 1688-1776* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press 2006), 4.
[116] McConville, *The King's Three Faces,* 6.
[117] McConville, *The King's Three Faces,* 7-8.

in the political upheaval of 1688.[118] The Glorious Revolution brought stability to the government by settling the question of the balance of power between the monarchy and the Parliament.[119] He also dismisses the contention between the supporters of James II known as Jacobites, and the Whigs after the settlement; he claims they were merely fringe groups that were not taken seriously in the colonies.[120] McConville asserts that the colonists thought they were subject to the monarch and had little to do with the Parliament.[121] To support his claim of affection for the monarch, McConville cites the widespread volume of positive statements about the king appearing in the American print media at the time.[122] What he attributed to the cause of the American Revolution was a misunderstanding by the colonies of what the Glorious Revolution actually accomplished in terms of changing the British government.[123] The reason McConville provides this perspective of the settlement with the monarchy was that America had not moved into the modern age the same time as England.[124]

In this review of the literature, two major issues appear. The first involved the political ideology of the colonies after the Glorious Revolution. On this subject Bailyn and McConville came to different conclusions. In Bailyn's case, Americans identified with the expansion of representative government and limited executive power. While McConville argues that the colonists held a deep reverence for the monarch and did not place much value in Whig rhetoric from England, both views have validity if considering Massachusetts Bay's experience during the Glorious Revolution. Bailyn and

---

[118] McConville, *The King's Three Faces,* 8.
[119] McConville, *The King's Three Faces,* 8.
[120] McConville, *The King's Three Faces,* 8.
[121] McConville, *The King's Three Faces,* 8.
[122] McConville, *The King's Three Faces,* 9.
[123] McConville, *The King's Three Faces,* 9.
[124] McConville, *The King's Three Faces,* 10.

McConville's contrasting opinions can be reconciled by the way William III restored Massachusetts Bay's colonial charter. The second issue involved how the Puritans in Boston moved closer to England. Lovejoy, Johnson and Webb took the position that the colonists charted an independent course in North America. Webb had them becoming more English by Crown intervention before the Glorious Revolution. Lovejoy and Johnson place this rapprochement after 1688. Perry Miller explored this subject from a religious view point and argued that Puritans were more willing to follow William III because he defended the Protestant religion. But they do agree that colonists had a different view from England on what it meant to be English; however, they do not discuss how all the monarch's involved, except James II, reconfirmed this errant view by the methods they used to deal with Massachusetts Bay. If we look to Pincus' theory that James II sought to become an absolute monarch, then the actions of the Andros government in New England account for this deviation. By examining James II's actions as a form of imperialism against a peripheral territory to gain their submission to the metropole, we can see how the restoration of the colonies rights, through their charter, brings them closer to England.

In sum, this research challenges extant interpretations of historical questions surrounding the political identity, or the political rights that seventeenth century Puritans believed they possessed, by arguing that the heirs of Massachusetts Bay believed they were directly answerable to the monarch and not to Parliament. This thesis will develop this argument by incorporating untapped resources found in Parliament's archive in London and redefining the current understanding of this significant issue.

Chapter one explores the foundation of the colony up to the reign of James II and differences between how the colonist and the Crown understood the charter. This research departs from the previous works by considering the relationship at an earlier stage and their place in the empire. Chapter two examines James II's departure from previous monarchs in the methods he used to govern the colony, wherein he became more imperialistic than in past policies, by using Steven Pincus' premise that James II sought to establish an absolute monarchy. The third chapter follows the course of the restoration of the charter and the final disposition of the relationship between the colony and the British Government. In this final chapter, the role of the Parliament is heighted as a potential player in the political settlement of the colony, and how William III's policies toward consolidation of his rule helped shape the second charter of Massachusetts Bay. This left the colony's agent, Increase Mather at the mercy of the politics in London and dependent on William III and his ministers for final resolution of the charter.

## Methods and Sources

To understand fully what was happening and how the colonists dealt with these upheavals, the need exists for a better understanding of their social connections. This thesis relies on the political arguments made during the restoration of the Massachusetts Bay charter by leading members of the rebellion, as well as those who supported Governor Sir Edmond Andros. It will shed light on the intersection between religious, economic and political connections. Previous historical studies have overlooked some important points in personal journals, official letters and papers, and published pamphlets, in particular; Parliamentary debates, housed in the archives in Parliament and in the William Blathwayt letters at the British National Archives. This research also

incorporates the language of the charters themselves to understand how the colonials interpreted royal grants. Finally, it relies on the Calendar Papers to explain British government actions. The use of these sources will reveal the extent of political beliefs in the colony and show us the political dynamics in their society. A better understanding of this era will help further explain the dynamic of trans-Atlantic relationships in the early part of the British Empire.

# CHAPTER ONE
# THE MOVEMENT OF POLITICAL RIGHTS

## MASSACHUSETTS BAY

On 19 March 1630, John Winthrop and his group of about nine hundred colonists set sail for America from England in ten vessels.[1] Winthrop and his company arrived in Massachusetts Bay in August and founded the city of Boston on October 18, 1630.[2] Shortly thereafter, this city became the capital of the newly created Massachusetts Bay colony. Prior to departure, Charles I granted the charter for this new settlement on 4 March 1629.[3] This set the stage for differences in political opinions between the colonists and the crown. The king had made a more liberal compact with the Massachusetts Bay Company than either of the previous charters for Virginia or Plymouth.[4] The boundaries marked out land "not inhabited by a Christian Prince," between forty and forty eight degrees latitude.[5] The agreement bound Charles I and his heirs, and with the descendants of the five-member council of Massachusetts Bay.[6] They had the right to sell, bargain or distribute the land of the new settlement as they saw fit.[7]

---

[1] John Winthrop, *Winthrop's Journal: A History of New England,* ed. James Kendall Hosmer (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons 1908), 24.
[2] Winthrop, *Winthrop's Journal*, 52.
[3] United States Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts" in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*, ed. Francis Newton Thorpe (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909).
[4] United States Congress, "First Charter of Virginia; April 10, 1606," in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*, ed. Francis Newton Thorpe (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909); United States Congress, "First Charter of New England: 1620," in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*, ed. Francis Newton Thorpe (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909).
[5] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."
[6] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."
[7] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."

He also granted fishing rights in the waters around the new colony. The most important privilege bestowed upon them was the extent of self-government in the colony.

The charter empowered the council to create and maintain a political body and select their own governor.[8] This body consisted of eighteen freemen "chosen from time to time" to "care for the best disposeing and ordering of the generall buysines and affaires of, for, and concerning the said Landes and Premisses."[9] The agreement required that the governor and his deputy swear allegiance to the crown.[10] The governor had the power to call a legislature, or call the General Court into session when necessary. Unlike the Parliament, Virginia, or Plymouth, the assembly had a set meeting time which consisted of "Yearely once in the yeare, for ever hereafter, namely the last Wednesday in Easter Tearme."[11] This body consisted of two parts. One chamber was comprised of the magistrates who also administered the law in concert with the governor with his assistants. The other was the House of Deputies who were representatives elected by the various towns in the colony.[12] The charter granted the General Court wide latitude in writing laws but they could not pass legislation "contrairie to the Lawes of this our Realme of England."[13] The charter also provided a mechanism to remove the Governor or his deputy, if needed, by the public courts for "misdemeanors or defects."[14] One right in particular, granted to Massachusetts Bay and not expressly written in either Virginia's or Plymouth's charters, profoundly affected the colonist's view of themselves and their

---

[8] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."
[9] The citation includes the original spelling and usage as found in the document; U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."
[10] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."
[11] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."
[12] Elizabeth Dale, "Conflicts of Law: Reconsidering the Influence of Religion on Law in Massachusetts Bay," *Numen* 43 (1996): 139-156; Celebrate Boston, "Massachusetts Bay Colony: A Brief History," accessed April 19, 2014, http://www.celebrateboston.com/history/massachusetts.htm.
[13] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."
[14] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."

relationship to England. The agreement promised that they and their children, even if born in transit, retained the rights of Englishmen and had all "liberties and immunities of free and natural subjects."[15]

With this framework of self-government, the Puritans of Massachusetts Bay went to work building their settlement in North America. The General Court eventually defined civil rights in the colony in the *Body of Liberties,* which outlined who could vote, the rights to property, and the general welfare of the citizens of the colony.[16]

Besides their loyalty, Charles I granted the Puritans their charter by laying out certain expectations on them. First, the crown required Massachusetts Bay to remit twenty percent of any gold and silver found back to the treasury.[17] The king granted a reprieve from the collection of any taxes for seven years, but after that time, the crown expected a five percent excise levy on all goods traded with England. They also had an exemption from taxes of inter-colonial traffic for twenty-one years.[18] The colony could not, however, trade with foreign nations except for the first thirteen months.[19] This allowed the settlers to acquire the things they needed to become established. The charter warned that if they continued in international trade after the initial thirteen months, the crown could impose financial penalties on them. Once tax collection started, the law required funds to be transported back to England every six months. Clearly, the Stuarts expected the colony to render tax monies back to the government.

---

[15] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."; A similar foundational document is the *Mayflower Compact* found in United States Congress, "Mayflower Compact: 1620" in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*, ed. Francis Newton Thorpe (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909).
[16] Massachusetts Bay Colony, *The Massachusetts Body of Liberties* (Boston: 1641).
[17] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."
[18] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."
[19] U. S. Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts."

With the approval of the king, the Puritans went about creating their new colony. Unlike other ventures in North America, the Puritans wanted to create a religious enclave in the New World. The first governor of Massachusetts Bay, John Winthrop explained to his fellow colonists what he expected of them as they crossed the Atlantic. Although a lay member, and not a minister, Winthrop held very passionate religious views as demonstrated by his sermon on Christian charity that he delivered while in transit on the *Arabella*. In this sermon, he expressed his desire to have a tight-knit Christian community, as found in the early church, where the members held "all things in common."[20] This departed from the manner of worship found in the Anglican Church. For example, the Puritans did not celebrate most standard religious holidays including Christmas, and they turned to the *Bible* instead of using the *Book of Common Prayer*.[21] Furthermore, civil liberties and community participation depended upon full standing with the Church. Only men in who obtained membership could vote or hold office in the colony.[22] Further down the social rung were those of other religions who the colonists often ran out of Massachusetts Bay, especially Quakers whom the Puritans intensely disliked.[23] The restricting of political and religious freedoms created a confessional state in Boston and her sister communities.

---

[20] John Winthrop, "A Modell of Christian Charity," Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 3rd series, 7:31-48.
[21] A publishing date was unavailable for the Calendar Series documents. United Kingdom. Public Record Office. "Objections against the Massachusetts Charter," July 20 1677. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* CO 1/41, no. 35, 129-30.
[22] Michael P. Winship, "Godly Republicanism and the Origins of the Massachusetts Polity," *William and Mary Quarterly,* 63 (2006): 428.
[23] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 127-6.

To foster this idea of an "in common" community, each family needed their own land to cultivate.[24] This did not happen because of unprofitability of the soil, and the small area that Boston occupied.[25] In addition, the Puritans misused their land; for example, the new settlers found the marshes useful for meadow grass, but this led to erosion of the soil, causing beach sand to intermix with it.[26] This ill-informed land management practice forced the people of Boston to look to the bounty of the ocean for their livelihood and to supplement the food supply by fishing. Besides seafood, the area had an abundance of timber. Lumber provided the material for the building of homes, the heating of them, and a plentiful resource for shipbuilding. Winthrop seemed to understand this himself and took steps to improve the city's maritime infrastructure. The town erected the first dock by 1631 and on July 4 of that same year, they launched the *Blessing of the Bay*, the first ship built by the colony.[27] All of the improvements made it possible for Boston absorb the expected arrival of more of co-religionists.

The next twenty years saw the "great migration" of other Puritans descending on the area.[28] Several policies exercised by Charles I, made England inhospitable to them and contributed to the exodus. Some also desired to find a new life as indicated by a tract published in 1634 titled *New England Prospect* by William Wood and author of articles on America.[29] In his pamphlet, Wood described what potential settlers could expect in

---

[24] Darrett B. Rutman, *Winthrop's Boston: Portrait of a Puritan Town 1630-1649* (Chapel Hill North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965), 4-5. For an additional analysis of the importance of Boston's dependence on the maritime industries, see Samuel Eliot Morison, *The Maritime History of Massachusetts* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921), chapter two.
[25] Michael P. Conzen and George K. Lewis, *Boston: A Geographical Portrait* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976), 10.
[26] John R. Stilgoe, "A New England Coastal Wilderness" *Geographical Review* 71 (1981): 42-3.
[27] Winthrop, *Winthrop's Journal*, 65.
[28] Alison Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 43.
[29] *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, "William Wood 1608-1691."

Massachusetts Bay. Among the many highlights, he emphasized the abundance of forest that could be used to build homes and provide fuel. He listed the many plants and animals that inhabited the area and how they could be useful to a colonist. He also described the richness of the bay and the fishing waters. He even provided tips on traveling to New England. He extolled the land and climate of New England as "agreeing well with the temper with our English bodies."[30] Furthermore, he asserted that the land could support agriculture production, stating, "The ground affords very good kitchin gardens... whatsoever growes well in England, growes as well there, many things being better and larger."[31] Wood essentially provided an enticing claim and promised wealth for those moving to Massachusetts Bay while minimizing the negatives.

Family provided the final reason for people to migrate. Unlike other colonial outposts where single men composed the majority of the new arrivals, entire families settled New England.[32] Allison Games, in her study of migration patterns, showed that the Puritans tried to build a separate community, more than just a profit-seeking venture. She found the gender ratio in New England much closer than in other colonies, thus prompting more families to come.[33] Once they arrived, they usually already had some of their kin or close friends waiting for them. This helped to increase the viability of the colony because in some cases people sold all of their possessions to make the voyage.[34] This action exemplified what Winthrop sought to achieve, this Christian brotherhood with the help of family and the charity of the community cared for newcomers. By the

---

[30] William Wood, *New England's Prospect: A True, Lively, and Experimental Description of that Part of America Commonly Called New England* (London: Thomas Cotes, 1634), 4.
[31] Wood, *New England's Prospect*, 15.
[32] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 52.
[33] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 47.
[34] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 55.

year 1635, as many as 3,000 people settled in Massachusetts Bay.[35] The arrival of so many interrelated people conformed to Winthrop's desires to create a close community.

With the influx of his co-religionists, coupled with the poor condition of the soil, Boston did not possess a foundation upon which self-substance would prove possible. Transatlantic trade became Massachusetts Bay's largest industry. Indeed, the most dramatic changes to the landscape of Boston would come as the marshes were filled in to expand the port. The General Court supported the construction of docks and ships. The General Court passed laws to support improvement projects such as in 1641, when Valentine Hill was given large tracts of land to build docks.[36] The waterfront continued to be built up throughout the century from about thirty-five docks in 1648 to about ninety in 1676.[37] Besides the slips for the ocean going vessels, other buildings were erected to improve the waterfront. City leaders expected owners of a wharf to erect a warehouse to support the shipping industry.[38] However, the seaport comprised only a portion of the economic impact of the trans-Atlantic trade.

By 1700, Boston and its sister communities had become North America's largest ship manufacturers.[39] The colony fostered ship building as early as 1639,when the General Court passed laws exempting shipwrights from military service and provided tax

---

[35] Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 138.
[36] Writers Program Work Project Administration, *Boston Looks Seaward: Story of the Port 1630-1940* (Boston: Bruce Humphries Inc., 1941), 23.
[37] From 1919 to 1920, Samuel Clough created two sets of Boston maps taken from the records of ownership, known as the *Book of Possessions*, court records, and journals from the period. Clough's map of 1648 shows the construction of piers, warehouses, other related buildings, and who owned them. His second maps, from 1676, shows the continual improvements to port. Samuel C. Clough, "Map of the Town of Boston 1648" Drawn by Samuel Clough April 10, 1919.
[38] Walter Muir Whitehill, *Boston: A Topographical History* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 1950), 11.
[39] Bernard Bailyn and Lotte Bailyn, *Massachusetts Shipping 1697-1714: A Statistical Study* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press, 1959), 28.

incentives to encourage them to ply their trade.[40] By 1665, the shipyards of Boston launched an estimated 300 vessels.[41] Between 1674 and 1714 these same shipyards produced 1,257 ships.[42] The Atlantic trade business brought prosperity to the Puritans of Boston. They tapped into a very large market that saw goods such as dried fish, liquor, linen cloth, and timber exported; and corn, tobacco, and sugar imported.[43] The West Indies, where their Puritan brethren lived, proved to be the most lucrative area for trade, especially timber, due to the scarcity of wood on the islands. Coastal and overseas trade became the economic life of the city. Winthrop's own son, John Winthrop Jr., invested heavily in shipping. Likewise, other citizens of the city put their money into maritime transportation. Up to one third of the citizens of Boston had part ownership in a cargo vessel.[44] Bernard Bailyn completed a statistical study on how many ships in Massachusetts were registered. He found, based on the records ending on 25 December, 1698, that Massachusetts's registry accounted for 171 of the 211 ships in Boston; and most of these ships had multiple owners.[45] Of the 171 ships out of Massachusetts, only 48 were owned by one person.[46] This heavy investment in trade had become the economic livelihood for Massachusetts Bay Colony.

Boston also became important to Oliver Cromwell during the Interregnum. He saw the Puritans in North America as part of the larger community of his co-

---

[40] Writers Program, Works Project Administration, *Boston Looks Seaward,* 23.
[41] Writers Program, Works Project Administration, *Boston Looks Seaward,* 23.
[42] Louis E. Cellineri, *Seaport Dynamics: A Regional Perspective* (Lexington Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1976), 64.
[43] Cellineri, *Seaport Dynamics: A Regional Perspective*, 64.
[44] Cellineri, *Seaport Dynamics: A Regional Perspective*, 65.
[45] Bailyn, *Massachusetts Shipping 1697-1714: A Statistical Study,* 78.
[46] Bailyn, *Massachusetts Shipping 1697-1714: A Statistical Study,* 79.

religionists.[47] A letter from Cromwell to John Cotton, a minister in Boston, demonstrates his religious ties to the colony. He assured the Reverend "Truly I am ready to serve you and the rest of your brethren and churches with you."[48] With this connection to Massachusetts Bay, Cromwell incorporated the religious fervor of the colony to recruit missionaries to spread the beliefs of Congregationalists to Ireland.[49] Increase Mather, a Puritan minster, who would become the primary religious firebrand in Boston, traveled to Ireland early in his career to help Cromwell's proselytizing scheme.[50] Besides his religious zeal, the Lord Protector also incorporated a pragmatic secular imperialist policy. He understood the value that overseas colonies could provide, especially in regards to the sugar trade, and ordered the invasion of Jamaica in 1655.[51] Once secured, he tried to persuade the colonists of New England to move to the island.[52] However, most of the citizens of Boston were reluctant to transplant to the tropics because of the high mortality rate.[53] They were content to remain the middlemen in the cargo business, supporting the Caribbean plantations with supplies and transporting their goods. Indeed, sugar and the business need to support the plantations, became quite lucrative.[54]

---

[47] Alison Games, *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 224.
[48] Cromwell to John Cotton, October 2. 1651. Oliver Cromwell, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches* ed. Thomas Carlyle (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1868), 10.
[49] Games, *The Web of Empire*, 281.
[50] John Cotton mention previously was Increase Mather's father in law. Cotton Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the late Reverend Increase Mather* (London: John Clark and Richard Hett, 1725), 7-8; For more on Increase Mather see Michael G. Hall, *The Last American Puritan: The Life of Increase Mather* (Hanover, New Hampshire: Wesleyan University Press, 1988).
[51] Sidney W. Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History* (New York: Penguin, 1985), 38.
[52] Games, *The Web of Empire,* 269.
[53] Games, *The Web of Empire,* 269.
[54] Mintz, *Sweetness and Power,* 65.

## CHARLES II

In 1660, the Stuarts returned to the throne. Shortly after, the restored monarch Charles II received a petition for a new colony in New England. In 1662, the crown bestowed to Connecticut a charter that resembled the one that Massachusetts Bay received thirty-two years earlier. Charles II, like his father, gave the colonists a large amount of autonomy in the form of a legislative body and election of their own governor.[55] The following year the colony of Rhode Island sought a charter from the king. He granted the settlers a patent as well, but with more restrictive language than in Connecticut's charter. Although they still had a legislature and an elected governor, this time the king made sure that the colonists recognized and allowed the Church of England to hold services.[56] The expressed concern over the status of the Anglican Church demonstrated the crown's increasing uneasiness with its North American possessions.

Three years later, England became interested in Boston's economics. Charles II needed to assess the emerging British Empire. To that end, he sent a commission to England's colonies to determine how well they functioned. In 1665, one such commission was sent to New England. Richard Nichols led a panel of five men.[57]

---

[55] United States Congress, "Charter of Connecticut 1662" in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*, ed. Francis Newton Thorpe (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909).

[56] United States Congress, "Charter of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations- July 15, 1663" in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*, ed. Francis Newton Thorpe (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909).

[57] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Secret instructions for the Commissioners employed by the King to the plantations in America in and about New England to be considered and communicated only to themselves" April 23 1664. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* CO 1/18 no. 52, (1661-1668), 200-1. The document did not name all who were selected.

The committee, more or less, attempted to introduce the colonists to their new king. Apparently, the crown became suspicious of its subjects in North America because, the commission also had a set of secret instructions. These orders charged them with determining the disposition of the upper classes or ruling class toward Charles II. The crown also wanted the committee to report on laws passed by colonial legislatures and to persuade the members of the New England establishment to renew their charter or submit to his will. Charles II advised discretion and encouraged his ministers to become part of colonial society by attending their church and community meetings.[58] The colonists too, were just as distrustful of the crown's motives because the commission did not receive a very warm welcome from the Puritans.[59]

Boston came to London's attention again in 1676 over territorial disputes with the other colonies, primarily New Hampshire and Maine. Massachusetts Bay disputed land holdings along its northern frontier and began encroaching into New Hampshire's borders and actively courting the settlers in Maine to join them. The Puritans sought political and religious dominance over the entire area.[60] These actions precipitated the complaints of John Mason who held large amounts of property in New Hampshire.[61] The Lords of Trade dispatched Edward Randolph to investigate the matter.[62] Randolph, prior to this appointment, served as a commissioner of the Cinque Ports and was very loyal to

---

[58] United Kingdom "Secret instructions for the Commissioners employed by the King to the plantations in America in and about New England to be considered and communicated only to themselves."
[59] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 128.
[60] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire,* 19.
[61] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire,* 19.
[62] Increase Mather, *The Diary of Increase Mather* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: John Wilson and Son University Press, 1900), 46. Entry of June 10, 1676.

the Stuarts.[63] He did not like what he found in Massachusetts Bay. Besides the controversy over property ownership, he discovered many other things amiss in New England. Despite knowledge of the Navigation Acts, in 1663 the colony refused to adhere to the law unless the General Court agreed to it.[64] In addition, they did not take loyalty oaths to obey the king. Randolph returned to England the following year. In his report to the Board of Trade, the administrative body that governed British colonies, he submitted a list of thirty-four charges against the Boston government.[65] The accusations included: encroachment on land claims in the other colonies, laws that did not conform to those of England, Anglicans denied the right to worship, and ignoring the Navigation Acts by direct trade with other European nations.[66] He found the colony so out of order that he recommended that their charter be removed and Massachusetts Bay be converted to a royal government. Randolph's report caused Puritan minster Increase Mather, to bestow on him the title "The Enemy of New England."[67] Thus began the crown's seven-year effort to bring Boston into compliance with British law.

## The Removal of the Charter

Charles II opted to use the English court system to bring the wayward colony to heel, just as he would any other corporation that violated the law.[68] He had done this before with Virginia and Bermuda, but Massachusetts Bay proved challenging.[69] His first attempt to remove the colony's charter ended in failure. The crown tried to revive a case

---

[63] Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers from the New England, Middle, and Southern Colonies in America with Other Documents Relating Chiefly to the Vacating of the Royal Charter of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1678-1700* (Boston: John Winslow and Sons, 1909), 78.
[64] Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* , 72.
[65] Encyclopedia Britannica Online, "Board of Trade," accessed April 19, 2014.
[66] United Kingdom. Public Record Office, "Objections against the Massachusetts Charter."
[67] Mather, *The Diary of Increase Mather*, 56. Entry on November 16 1679.
[68] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire*, 34.
[69] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire,* 31-2.

submitted to the King's Court in 1635 by Charles I. The 1635 case centered on the argument that the petitioners for the patent had deceived the king and obtained his seal illegally.[70] The crown also charged that none of the original grantees listed on the charter actually ever lived, or even traveled to Massachusetts.[71] Finally, the company did not maintain a presence in England as the law required for a corporation, instead the entire leadership of the colony settled in North America.[72] In 1635, the court ruled in the king's favor and dispatched Fernando Georges to serve the papers to Massachusetts Bay. Unfortunately, for Charles I, the English Civil War broke out and prevented the court order from being delivered. Misfortune stuck the crown's suit again because the court of the King's Bench refused to resuscitate the 1635 case. In April 1678, the court ruled that since the crown failed to serve the 1635 decision, it could not be enforced.[73] It also upheld the Massachusetts charter as a valid patent.[74] Additionally, any past actions of the colony that violated English law must be forgiven because of the Act of Oblivion of 1660, which removed all illegal acts against the crown prior to that date.[75] The court further that any new actions against Boston must be accompanied by new evidence.[76]

---

[70] Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers from the New England, Middle, and Southern Colonies in America with Other Documents Relating Chiefly to the Vacating of the Royal Charter of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1676-1703,* vol. 4 (Boston: John Winslow and Sons, 1899), 17; Apparently this also extended to Plymouth. See United States Congress, "The Act of Surrender of the Great Charter of New England to His Majesty: 1635" in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America,* ed. Francis Newton Thorpe (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909).

[71] Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 17.

[72] Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 17.

[73] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Sir Robert Southwell to the Attorney and Solicitor-General, with their Answers," April1678. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* CO 1/42, Nos. 72, 73, co 5/903, (1677-1680), 265-68.

[74] United Kingdom, "Sir Robert Southwell to the Attorney and Solicitor-General, with their Answers."

[75] United Kingdom, "Sir Robert Southwell to the Attorney and Solicitor-General, with their Answers." Encyclopedia Britannica Online, "Act of Oblivion." Accessed April 21, 2013, http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/423890/Act-of-Oblivion

[76] Colonial Office, "Sir Robert Southwell to the Attorney and Solicitor-General, with their Answers."

Charles II also suffered another legal defeat in February, the following year, over the dispute on land holdings. The court ruled that Massachusetts Bay did have claim over Maine because the colony improved the land, and therefore, that granted them ownership rights. After his defeat, Charles II sought for an agent in Massachusetts Bay to bring them into compliance with London, and to collect evidence for future legal action.[77]

Upon hearing that the crown sought a Commissioner of Customs for New England, Edward Randolph presented himself as a candidate for the office. Agents for the Boston government, William Stoughton and Peter Buckley, in London sent a letter of protest to Randolph's appointment to the Commission of his Majesties' Customs. They complained that because of his low station and poverty, Randolph would exaggerate violations of the trading laws.[78] They also claimed that he did not report the problems in the colony factually to the Lords of Trade and did not believe that Massachusetts Bay had a right to self-government despite this privilege upheld by the King's Bench.[79] They laid a thinly veiled charge of lying about Massachusetts Bay and complained of his obnoxious and rude behavior toward the citizens of New England.[80] Stoughton and Buckley requested that another agent be found. In his defense for the position, Randolph accused the colonists of fraud against England by breaking the Navigation Acts and the only reason he seemed rude, stemmed from his pointing out their disobedience to the crown.[81]

---

[77] A report to the board of trade on the Massachusetts agents, April 1678, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 75.
[78] Massachusetts agents protest against Randolph, April 1678, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 75.
[79] Massachusetts agents protest against Randolph, April 1678, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 75.
[80] Massachusetts agents protest against Randolph, April 1678, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 75.
[81] Randolph defending himself against the Agent's charges, April 1678, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 78-9.

The Commission appointed him, despite the Boston agent's objections, noting they did not care whether the colonists found Randolph obnoxious or not.[82]

The "Enemy of New England" returned in 1679 and tried to enforce the trade laws and gather evidence of their non-compliance. By February, Randolph compiled a comprehensive list of abuses of the king's laws. The colony still insisted that the General Court must confirm a law made in England before Massachusetts Bay could honor it.[83] The Boston government sent out privateers and continued disputing territory boundaries with other colonies.[84] He also noted that the settlers in Maine complained that they did not want to be part of Massachusetts Bay.[85] Finally, the Navigation Acts continued to be disobeyed. Randolph noted that once the Boston merchants paid the tariff on their goods, they believed they had the right to re-export their products anywhere they liked, including overseas markets.[86] The Commissioner of Customs also had trouble in prosecuting violators of the law in New England courts. The Boston government required Randolph to pay for court costs upfront before a case would be heard.[87] In one example, Randolph brought charges against John Place, captain of the *Hope,* for transporting wine from Madeira.[88] Before the trial commenced, three men came forward, each one claiming ownership of the vessel.[89] The judge refused to continue the hearing until proper

---

[82] Randolph defending himself against the Agent's charges, April 1678, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 81.
[83] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Abstract of letter from Mr. Randolph and Sir E. Andros" February 25, 1680, *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1677-1680). CO 1/44, no 31, 487-90.
[84] United Kingdom, "Abstract of letter from Mr. Randolph and Sir E. Andros."
[85] United Kingdom, "Abstract of letter from Mr. Randolph and Sir E. Andros."
[86] United Kingdom, "Abstract of letter from Mr. Randolph and Sir E. Andros."
[87] Articles against Governor Danforth of Massachusetts Bay, January 1680, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 87.
[88] Articles against Governor Danforth of Massachusetts Bay, January 1680, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 112.
[89] Articles against Governor Danforth of Massachusetts Bay, January 1680, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 113.

ownership could be established, thus delaying the procedures.[90] Once a case went to trial, the jury often favored the defendant, and even assessed damages against the Commission of Customs.[91] Randolph tried to appeal to England but the Massachusetts Bay government did not allow it.[92] In responding to the exasperated Custom Commissioner's complaints about prohibiting an appeal to London, the Lieutenant Governor of the Colony, Thomas Danforth replied, "It was an infringement of their liberties granted by the charter."[93]

Randolph reported to London, in April 1681, that the crown should use the court system to void the charter, believing it to be the most effective way to resolve the problem and maintain the peace in the colony.[94] He put the blame for the colonist's misdeeds on the Puritan minsters, and argued that the key to reducing the power of the clergy over Massachusetts Bay centered on their economic reliance on the shipping industry, writing, "Deny them further trade and without trade they cannot subsist."[95] Randolph understood that the revenue generated by trade allowed the Puritans to maintain their religious stronghold. In a subsequent letter, he proposed suggestions to reform the colony. He thought it best to unite all of the colonies under one royal government under a governor general.[96] The combined entity would provide better

---

[90] Articles against Governor Danforth of Massachusetts Bay, January 1680, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 113.
[91] Articles against Governor Danforth of Massachusetts Bay, January 1680, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 85.
[92] Articles against Governor Danforth of Massachusetts Bay, January 1680, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 85.
[93] Articles against Governor Danforth of Massachusetts Bay, January 1680, Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 85.
[94] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins," April 16, 1681. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/46, no 123, 31-2.
[95] United Kingdom, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins."
[96] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins," April 30, 1681. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/46 no 130 34-6.

security from foreign powers, especially the French.[97] The resources found in North America could be protected for the benefit of the Empire and most importantly, make the subjects of Massachusetts Bay more loyal to the king.[98] As expected, Charles II was not pleased with his Commissioner's report. The agents in London did not have instructions to answer Randolph's charges, nor had Massachusetts Bay, despite being commanded to do so the previous year, sent new representatives with answers to the king's concerns.[99] By the fall, Charles II had run out of patience. On October 21 1681, he dispatched a terse letter to Boston, demanding an answer as to why they were not complying with his laws.[100] He charged them with exalting the General Court over Parliament, and not paying their taxes.[101] Charles II concluded by demanding that agents be sent within three months, otherwise the crown would seek a *Quo Warranto* to remove their charter.[102]

This pressure on New England was part of a broader policy of Charles II. Shortly after Randolph's appointment, the crown installed William Blathwyat as Surveyor and Auditor General of American Revenues.[103] This office made him responsible for the collection of taxes in the Americas, but his commission focused his duties to Virginia and the Caribbean, while his subordinate Edward Randolph, concentrated on New England.

---

[97] United Kingdom, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins."
[98] United Kingdom, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins."
[99] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 147.
[100] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Report of Lords of Trade and Plantations to the King," October 21, 1681. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/47, no. 79.
[101] United Kingdom, "Report of Lords of Trade and Plantations to the King."
[102] United Kingdom, "Report of Lords of Trade and Plantations to the King."
[103] From the commission of William Blathwayt. United Kingdom, *Journal of William Blathwayt, Surveyor and Auditor General of American Revenues* (copies of letters) (London). The items from this material had two different pagination systems, both incomplete. Therefore page numbers will be left off and only the title of the documents will be used. For more on William Blathwayt see Stephen S. Webb, "William Blathwayt, Imperial Fixer: From Popish Plot to Glorious Revolution" *William and Mary Quarterly* 25 (1968): 3-21.

[104] The way in which the Board of Trade segregated their responsibilities indicated a north- south division of the colonies. Nonetheless, both areas were pressured to submit to the king's authority. In October 1680, Whitehall requested that Governor Thomas Culpeper of Virginia start collecting property tax and ensure that the colonial legislature pass an extension on the tobacco levy of two shillings per hogshead.[105] In November, the crown successfully obtained a warrant to remove the charter of Barbados if it did not comply with the king's request for revenue. The Attorney General would enforce the Court's order. [106] Charles II not only demanded a four and half- percent levy on all "dead commodities" from the Leeward Islands, but he also wanted a copy of all the laws passed by the legislature.[107] The crown not only sought revenues, but more political control over the colony.

Despite the bluster, the king did try to reach an alternative accommodation with his colonies. In the same letter where he commanded that the Leeward Islands remit their taxes, he made the following offer:

> That if the inhabitants thereof shall at any time hereafter during the term of seven years desire to commute or exchange the said duty of 4 ½ per cent for some other imposition which may be more advantageous to us and yet of more ease and convenience to the inhabitants of the said and respective Islands, and in order thereunto shall at lawful and general assembly of the inhabitants and proprietors of the said respective islands, pass some other law or act for the raising of some other imposition which many be a recompense at least equivalent to the duty of four and half per

---

[104] "The Commission of William Blathwayt" *Journal of William Blathwayt*. Further evidence of this division is revealed in Blathwayt's salary. It appears that a separation of colonies is being made here because only the Caribbean Islands and the Virginia colony were responsible for raising the funds to pay the auditor, while the New England colonials had to pay the salary of their customer collector Edward Randolph.

[105] "A report to the Treasury about the revenue of the Plantations October 4 1680," *Journal of William Blathwayt.*

[106] "Report to the Treasury regarding Barbados Company November 6, 1680," *Journal of William Blathwayt.*

[107] Charles II to William Stapleton, Governor of the Leeward Islands, November 19, 1680, *Journal of William Blathwayt.*

> cent and shall tender the same to unto Our chief governor of the said islands respectively for a final assent and that We shall thereupon approve and confirm this said law.[108]

It appears that he also extended this type of offer to Barbados as well. In a letter to Sir Richard Dutton, the Governor of Barbados, the king accepted an agreement to satisfy the taxes owed for 82,792 pounds of sugar.[109] Charles II promised that the crown would permanently honor his arrangement, stating, "We are graciously pleased hereby to declare shall be good and effectual against us our heirs and successors."[110] The southern colonies were able to come to terms with England much easier than Massachusetts Bay because they possessed a very lucrative commodity— sugar. Indeed, by the end of the century, sugar had out-paced all other commodities in England, including tobacco.[111] The transfer of a large amount of sugar into the coffers of the king was of immense value. Boston's wealth laid in the carrying trade and they simply could not provide such an easily marketable product. Additionally, they were still reeling from the effects of King Phillip's War fought five years before.[112] Over one thousand colonists lost their lives over eighteen months of fighting. However, unlike the Caribbean colonies, Massachusetts Bay was more than a commercial venture. The nature of the people who settled Boston made it more like an extension of Great Britain itself.

The Puritan's procrastination in complying with royal commands stemmed from their perspective of their place in the empire. Many of them settled in New England for

---

[108] Charles II to William Stapleton Governor of the Leeward Islands November 19, 1680. United Kingdom, *Journal of William Blathwayt.*
[109] Charles II to Sir Richard Dutton, July 14, 1682. United Kingdom, *Journal of William Blathwayt,*
[110] Charles II to Sir Richard Dutton, July 14, 1682. United Kingdom, *Journal of William Blathwayt.*
[111] Mintz, *Sweetness and Power,* 36.
[112] Stephen Saunders Webb, *1676: The End of American Independence* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1984), 242-43. King Phillips War broke out in 1675 with the Wampanoags and lasted about eighteen months. The fighting destroyed many towns on the frontier and ended when Edmond Andros recruited the Mohawks to attack the Wampanoags.

religious reasons and the continual attention of the crown into their affairs annoyed them. They took the stand that the charter allowed the colonists the same privileges they enjoyed in England, and the *Magna Carta* protected these rights.[113] Their belief in these liberties made possible the settlement of new lands. Increase Mather emphasized this point, writing, "No Englishman in their wits will ever venture their lives and estates to enlarge the king's dominions abroad and enrich the whole English nation if their reward after all must be deprived of their English liberties."[114] The notion that English rights traveled to new lands was not confined to the colonists of New England.

Mr. Jones, in a 1651 pamphlet discussing the legal opinions of Edward Coke, asserted that Englishmen in Ireland enjoyed the same rights as those who lived in Great Britain.[115] Therefore, if a person retained their rights by crossing the Irish Sea, why not by crossing the Atlantic? They also aided in the spread of Christianity to the Native Americans and besides saving their souls, they educated them to "make them serviceable to their own countrymen."[116] Additionally, the Puritans believed they earned their co-equal status because they tamed the "howling wilderness."[117] The labor the colonists employed in building up, promoting and increasing England's territory, justified their place in the Empire.

---

[113] Increase Mather, "A Vindication of New England," in *The Andros Tracts: Being a Collection of Pamphlets and Official Papers, Issued During the Period Between the Overthrow of the Andros Government and the Establishment of the Second Charter of Massachusetts,* vol. 2, ed. W. H. Whitmore (Boston: Prince Society, 1869), 33.
[114] Mather, "A Vindication of New England," 58.
[115] No information exists on who Mr. Jones is other than he edited Coke's opinions. Edward Coke, *Judges Judged Out of Their Own Mouths or The Question Resolved by Magna Charta & C. Who Have Been England's Enemies, Kings Seducers, and Peoples Destroyers, from Henry 3 to Henry 8 and Before and Since* (London: W. Bently, 1651), 49.
[116] Mather, "A Vindication of New England," 7.
[117] Mather, "A Vindication of New England," 5.

On a more practical level, New Englanders argued that they proved their worth by providing the materials, food, and horses that British possessions in the West Indies needed to survive.[118] Since the founding of the Massachusetts Bay government, they fostered the shipping industry and it became central to the trade business throughout North America.[119] Their natural resources made possible the fleets of vessels plying their trade across the Atlantic. Mather emphasized the colony's importance to Britain, stating:

> Their shipping has also been considerable, for which they are (or may be with encouragement) so well furnished with all materials, that the King may (if he please, and as occasion requires) there build whole navies as well as thence fetch a few masts and that at very easy rates as judged by men that understand those affairs.[120]

The Massachusetts Bay government understood the viability of their colony, and their way of life rested on the income that shipping provided.

Nonetheless, the General Court knew they could not ignore their sovereign forever. In May 1682, the legislature sent two agents, Joseph Dudley and John Richards, to answer to Charles II for the colony.[121] Governor Simon Bradstreet instructed them to beg the forgiveness of the king, assure him that they had stopped discriminatory laws against other denominations, the Acts of Trade were being enforced and all cases brought by the crown's agents conformed to the law.[122] He also wanted Dudley and Richards to remind Charles II of his promise to respect the charter, but most importantly they were to "neither do nor consent to anything that may violate or infringe the liberties conferred by

---

[118] Mather, "A Vindication of New England," 6.
[119] Although the following pamphlet was anonymous William Henry Whitmore of the Prince Society believed that Increase Mather wrote it and his name appears in brackets as the probable author. [Increase Mather], *A Brief Relation of the State of New England, from the Beginning of that Plantation to this Present Year 1689* (London: Printed for Richard Baldwine, 1689), 9.
[120] Mather, "A Vindication of New England," 6.
[121] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 148.
[122] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Instructions to Joseph Dudley and John Richards, Agents for the Massachusetts, on arriving in England," February 15, 1682. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/48, no. 32, CO 5/904, 164-165.

that charter, but if anything tending that way be propounded you will say that you have no instructions, and ask leave to consult us before answering."[123] The agent's orders, besides continuing the delaying tactics with London, also demonstrated the Puritan's hostile relationship with the Stuarts. Their ideology placed them in the camp of the opponents of Charles II and many of their co-religionists in England belonged to the Whig party.[124] Edward Randolph cited this connection as one of the reasons to remove the charter, writing "lastly this will absolutely dissolve, and cut off all correspondence betwixt the phanaticks at home and the factious party in that country , which to my knowledge is still maintained and upon the opinion that New England will be a good retreat for them." [125] Thus duly charged, the new agents for Massachusetts Bay sailed to London. Besides these representatives, Bradstreet thought it necessary for himself to write to Charles II. He asked for his sovereign's pardon and his understanding of the difficulties of colonial life.[126] He also begged forgiveness for the conflicting laws with England and promised to do better.[127] Likewise, Massachusetts Bay did not intentionally insult his Majesty regarding the dispute over Maine, they were only assisting the colonists there and that resulted in the territory wishing to join with Massachusetts Bay.[128] However, Bradstreet's hopes of assuaging the crown's ire proved fruitless.

---

[123][123] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Instructions to Joseph Dudley and John Richards, Agents for the Massachusetts, on arriving in England."
[124] Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America*, 149.
[125] Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* 91.
[126] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Petition of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay to the King," August 24, 1682. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/49, no. 29, CO 5/904, 143-145.
[127] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Petition of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay to the King."
[128] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Petition of the Governor and Company of Massachusetts Bay to the King,"

Dudley and Richard's mission failed to resolve anything in London. When pressed for an adequate submission to the king, the agents responded as instructed and pleaded for time to receive further answers from Boston.[129] After giving the colonial representatives nearly a year to receive these instructions from New England, the king's tolerance for the impasse came to an end. On June 4 1683, the Lords of Trade sent to the Kings Bench a list of grievances that proved Massachusetts Bay violated its charter.[130] The crown called Edward Randolph back to England to give testimony against the colony.[131] The court issued a summons to Governor Bradstreet and the General Court in July. Charles II also made one more attempt to end the conflict with his subjects in America, by offering an amnesty to the people of Massachusetts if they voluntarily surrendered their charter to him. The king promised to respect their land titles, be generous in forming a new government, and provide tax relief.[132] The crown dispatched Randolph back to Boston with two hundred copies of the Court's summons and the king's clemency.[133] The Commissioner of Customs warned the Board that unless they provided a warship as a show of force, the colonists would rebel at the news of the summons.[134] Unfortunately, for Randolph, he could not secure a frigate and ended up departing in August on a commercial vessel.[135]

---

[129] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire*, 49-50.
[130] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Articles against the Governor and Company of Massachusetts," June 4 1683. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/52. No. 4, 440-441.
[131] Randolph had returned to Boston to resume his duties as collector about the same time the Dudley and Richardson were sent.
[132] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Order of the King in Council," July 20, 1683. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/52, nos. 33, 33 I., CO 5/904, 185-186.
[133] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Order of the King in Council," July 20, 1683.
[134] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins," July 26, 1683. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/52, nos. 37, 37 I, 459-460.
[135] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins," August 3, 1683. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), Co 1/52, no. 45, 463-464.

In late October, the "Enemy of New England" arrived in Boston, and dutifully presented the documents from the king to the General Court which happened to still be in session. However, Dudley and Richards had arrived two weeks before Randolph and the legislature already knew of what took place in London.[136] Despite the advanced notice, debate on what course to take had not taken place, and would not until early November.[137] Some, including Bradstreet, wanted to submit, but others would "rather have the matter settled by law then wrong their consciences."[138] During the nine day debate, a letter circulated from London about the conditions of some cites in England such as Norwich who surrendered their charters.[139] The letter described how these towns were defrauded of their rights, further unsettling the General Court.[140] When they finally voted, they refused the king's offer, ordered a lawyer to be hired, and decided to take their chances in court.[141] Randolph noted that votes of "forty eight inferior planters" won the day.[142] However, in light of the gravity of the situation, the Boston government called for a meeting of all free men in the following month. Randolph did not stay for this event; he left for England again on December 14. On January 23, the colonists gathered in Boston to discuss the king's offer. They debated their situation and then asked all non-freemen to leave so a vote could be held.[143] However, before the poll took place, a few men wanted the opinion of Increase Mather. The minister attacked the king's offer on

---

[136] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins," February 14, 1684. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/54, no. 33, 587-588.
[137] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins," February 14, 1684.
[138] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Order of the King in Council," February 29, 1684. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/54, nos. 43, 43 I, CO 5/904, 200.
[139] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Order of the King in Council," February 29, 1684.
[140] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Order of the King in Council," February 29, 1684.
[141] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Order of the King in Council," February 29, 1684.
[142] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Order of the King in Council," February 29, 1684.
[143] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Abstract of a Letter from Boston to Edward Randolph," March 14, 1684. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/54, no. 51, 606-607.

religious grounds saying "it is a sin to resign their charter by which their liberties and properties where held."[144] He went on to argue that they should be led by God and not men and by accepting the king's offer this amounted to the same as trusting in the "hands of men."[145] Mather's oratory won the day, and by unanimous consent of the voting members of Massachusetts Bay, the colony moved forward with the General Court's decision to defend the charter in court.[146]

The Puritans never had their day before the judges. Time and distance saved them. Edward Randolph experienced a difficult journey back to England, even losing many of his possessions while in transit.[147] He did not arrive until March and for a second time the crown's case fell to a legal technicality. When Randolph reported to the Sheriff of London that he served the court papers, the Sheriff refused to forward the summons to the judges because time had run out on the summons.[148] This incident brought to light the problem of overseas administration. The Attorney General for the crown described his discussion with the Sheriff over the problem, saying, "The Sheriffs' principal objection against returning a summons was because notice was given after the return was past. He also raised the question whether he could take notice of New England as out of his Bailiwick."[149] Frustrated by the apparent inability of the King's Bench to accomplish his desires, Charles II looked to a different legal direction. On June 21 1684, the crown

---

[144] Cotton Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Reverend Increase Mather* (London: John Clark and Richard Hett, 1725), 34.
[145] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Reverend Increase Mather*. 34.
[146] Mather. *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Reverend Increase Mather*, 34.
[147] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Edward Randolph to Sir Leoline Jenkins," February 14, 1684.
[148] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "The Attorney-General to Mr. Wynne," May 13, 1684. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/54, nos. 95, 05I, CO 5/904, 199.
[149] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "The Attorney-General to Mr. Wynne."

submitted the case to the Court of the Chancery.[150] This time the king used a legal technicality in his favor. The Court issued an order that representatives of Massachusetts Bay must be present in London by October to defend their charter; otherwise, it would be removed by default.[151] Time and distance became the Puritan's enemy, for by the time Boston received notice, they were unable to send instructions to their attorney in London before October. On October 23, the court ruled against the colony for failing to appear and issued a *Quo Warranto* against their charter.[152] Charles II now needed to consider the form of government for New England. Despite his inexperience in America, the king chose Percy Kirke as the new Royal Governor.[153] He even indicated openness to a representative body. The Board of Trade contemplated allowing the Royal Governor to call an assembly if needed.[154] The final version of this plan will never be known because Charles II died on February 6, 1685. The removal of the charter followed English law. The proposed new government did not seem a far departure from the old charter. This only confirmed to the Puritans that they retained their rights as Englishmen in America; however, they now had a new monarch to come to terms with. The form of the new government for Massachusetts Bay now laid in the hands of the late king's brother, James II. The new king would take a stronger hand in the governance of the colony.

---

[150] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Order of Chancery for Entering Judgment against the Massachusetts Charter if They Do not Come to Trial Next Term," June 21, 1684. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/54, no. 135, CO 5/904, 203-204.
[151] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Order of Chancery for Entering Judgment Against the Massachusetts Charter if They Do Not Come to Trial Next Term."
[152] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Rule in Chancery Confirming the Judgment Against the Charter of Massachusetts," October 23, 1684. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 1/55, no. 55, 706.
[153] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Journal of Lords of Trade and Plantations," November 8, 1684. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of Charles II,* (1681-1685), CO 391/5, 718-719.
[154] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Journal of Lords of Trade and Plantations," November 8, 1684.

# CHAPTER TWO
# THE REVOCATION OF RIGHTS

## THE DUDLEY GOVERNMENT

Within two weeks of Edward Randolph's arrival with the *Quo Warranto* order, which removed the 1628 Charter, the document warranted the turning of a new leaf in government. James II's order appointed Joseph Dudley as the Royal Governor of the Dominion of New England.[1] The colony's relationship with the crown took a radical turn as the king now had a greater influence in the governing of Massachusetts Bay. Unlike the provisions that ruled the old Massachusetts Bay Colony, the governor had the power to make laws, set tax rates, and was not inhibited by approval from a legislative body.[2] He only had to work with a council of fourteen men, appointed by his Majesty, whose role it was to offer their advice and consent to the acts of the Dominion.[3] He was also given authority over the militia and the powers of admiralty. Since an assembly was no longer required, Governor Dudley called together the General Court on May 25, 1686 and presented the letter from James II, abolishing the old colonial government and establishing his authority.[4] He introduced the new council, confirming that they were "good and loyal men" and explained his new duties and the powers he had been granted.[5] He revealed the new boundaries of the Dominion, which would now include the colonies of Plymouth, Rhode Island, Providence, and Connecticut.[6] He also secured the

---

[1] Joseph Dudley, *A Proclamation the 28th day of May 1686* (Boston: 1686); for more on the Dominion of New England see Guy Howard Miller, "Rebellion in Zion: The Overthrow of the Dominion of New England," *Historian* 30 (1968): 439-59.
[2] Dudley, *A Proclamation the 28th day of May 1686.*
[3] Dudley, *A Proclamation the 28th day of May 1686.*
[4] Joseph Dudley, *The Speech of the Honorable Joseph Dudley, May 17, 1686* (Boston: Pierce for Phillips, 1686), 1.
[5] Dudley, *The Speech of the Honorable Joseph Dudley, May 17, 1686*, 2.
[6] Dudley, *The Speech of the Honorable Joseph Dudley, May 17, 1686,* 3.

fortifications at the mouth of the harbor known as Castle Island and put the occupants of the fort under the command of Wait Winthrop.[7] Despite mistreatment he had received from some of his fellow citizens, Dudley assured the representatives that he would continue to promote trade and do his upmost to see that the colony continued to thrive.[8] Aware of his audience and their potential opposition, he told them "but if ye be so hardy to object to any clauses in his Majesties Commission we have no direction or allowance to capitulate with you about his Majesties Command therein."[9] He further warned that they would have to take all complaints to the crown, but if they did, it could be construed as treason.[10]

The General Court, as Dudley expected and despite his warning, was not pleased with the recent turn of events. In the assembly's response to the new governor's instructions to surrender authority to him, they complained that Dudley's commission was "arbitrary" and that it removed the rights of the colony because taxes could be raised without the legislature's approval.[11] They also questioned his wisdom in accepting the position, but did not challenge his authority, and being the faithful subjects that they were, appealed to God and the king for redress. The Court then adjourned until October.[12] Before the threat of appealing to London by local representatives, on 18 May, Reverends

---

[7] Governor Dudley and the council to the Committee of Trade June 1, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: Including His Letters and Official Papers from the New England, Middle, and Southern Colonies in America, With Other Documents Relating Chiefly to the Vacating of the Royal Charter of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1676-1703,* vol. 4 (Boston: John Winslow and Son, 1899), 80-2.
[8] Dudley, *The Speech of the Honorable Joseph Dudley, May 17, 1686,* 4.
[9] Dudley, *The Speech of the Honorable Joseph Dudley, May 17, 1686, 3.*
[10] Dudley, *The Speech of the Honorable Joseph Dudley, May 17, 1686, 3.*
[11] General Court, Massachusetts Bay Colony, *The General Court's Answers to Joseph Dudley* (Boston: 1686).
[12] Massachusetts Bay Colony, *The General Court's Answer to Joseph Dudley*; Randolph's letter to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade July 7, 1686. Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers 1676-1703,* 89-91.

John Phillips, and Increase Mather met with Dudley in the home of Samuel Willard. They tried to thwart the new order by pressuring Dudley to reject the governorship just as Simon Bradstreet and his son had refused to serve on the council.[13] These mild responses marked the beginning of the Puritan's campaign against James' designs to reform New England. At every turn over the next three years, the colonists exhibited some form of resistance against the new order imposed on them.

It did not take long for the animosity between the two parties to manifest itself. In addition to Dudley's new authority, the crown expressly commanded to ensure that the Liberty of Conscience Act was enforced.[14] This meant that Church of England services must be held. Edward Randolph, previously the collector of customs, now the Dominion's new secretary; along with one other member of the council, and a couple of militia captains who were the few Anglicans in Boston, were delighted with James II's decree.[15] With this ruling, Randolph sought a place for Reverend Robert Ratcliff who had accompanied him to America to hold services. Boston supported three Congregational church buildings. The secretary requested use of the south side church, when the local congregation did not occupy it. The Council flatly denied his request.[16] Instead they offered the use of the town's council house.[17] Therefore, on June 6, the Church of

---

[13] Randolph to William Blathwayt, Secretary on the Committee on Trade, May 29, 1686 in Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers from New England, Middle and Southern Colonies in America and the West Indies, 1678-1700,* vol. 4. (Boston: John Wilson and Son, 1909), 171; Samuel Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall: 1674-1729,* vol. 1, ed. M. Halsey Thomas (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1973), 114.
[14] Dudley, *A Proclamation the 28th day of May 1686.*
[15] Randolph's letter to William Blathwayt, Secretary for the Committee of Trade, July 7, 1686. Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 89-91.
[16] Sewall, *Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 115.
[17] Randolph's letter to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, July 7, 1686. Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers:1676-1703,* vol. 4, 89-91

England met for the first time in Boston, having been illegal to do so, up to this time.[18] The arrival of Anglicans upset the Puritan's religious sensibilities because the new congregation brought with them the ceremonial observances of the English church that they had escaped from by coming to America.[19] The Anglican minster's officiating at weddings, baptisms and funerals, upset Samuel Sewall so much that he recorded in his diary any rites that he heard about.[20] Sewall, who also served as captain in the militia, was also distressed at the prospect of putting the cross on his unit's colors.[21] The new policy was initiated on August 20 and he offered his resignation at that time, but the government did not accept it. By November, Sewall forced the issue by just handing them his notice and returned to his home.[22] Others in the community made their views known to the Anglicans by calling Ratcliff a "priest of Baal" and the members "papist dogs and rouges."[23] Besides this outright prejudice and disrespect, even the governor would not pay Ratcliff's salary out of the treasury, requiring the Anglicans to come up with the

---

[18] Increase Mather, "A Vindication of New England," *The Andros Tracts: A Collection of Pamphlets and Official Papers, Issued During the Period Between the Overthrow of the Andros Government and the Establishment of the Second Charter of Massachusetts,* vol. 2, ed. W. H. Whitmore (Boston: The Prince Society, 1868), 11; Mather's entry on June 6 1686 Increase Mather *Diary of Increase Mather*.

[19] Edward Rawson and Samuel Seward, *The Revolution in New England Justified, and the People Vindicated from the Aspersions Cast Upon Them by Mr. John Palmer, In His Pretended Answer to the Declaration* (Boston: Printed for Joseph Brunning, 1691), 6.

[20] Entries on May 18, May 30, November 12, all in 1686, October 16, 1687, May 24, June 5, and October 18, all in 1688.Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 114, 116, 125, 152, 168, 169, 181.

[21] Entry on August 22, 1686. Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 119.

[22] Entry on November 11, 1686.Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 125.

[23] J Randolph's letter to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, July 7, 1686. Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 89-91; John Palmer, *An Impartial Account of State of New England: or the Late Government There, Vindicated* (London: Royal Exchange, 1690), 33.

money themselves.[24] Religion, however, was just one battleground; Bostonian's pocketbooks were also being affronted.

Dudley found little money in the treasury. Therefore, on May 28, he and the Council imposed a new fifteen pence per pound tariff on trade, a property tax of one percent on the value of the land, and a twenty pence poll tax.[25] In addition, the crown charged the Dominion government to enforce the Navigation Acts.[26] Dudley tasked John George, captain of the frigate HMS *Rose* to impound ships in violation of the law.[27] The first ship that was seized was the *Johanna,* for bringing in wine and oil from France and for not obeying the law. The court ordered the captain of the *Johanna* to put up a security bond for good behavior.[28] By the end of August, six ships had been seized for illegal trade.[29] The tax hikes, along with trade being carefully watched, caused economic distress in Boston. Randolph, the secretary for the Dominion and responsible for the collection of the revenue, who already had an unfavorable reputation in Massachusetts Bay, drew the ire of the local merchants and tavern owners so much so, that he became despised by them.[30] His problems in the colony extended beyond the locals. Captain George did not work well with Randolph. The Dominion secretary complained bitterly to London that the commander of the *Rose* would seize vessels, but not remit the money he

---

[24] Randolph to the Commission of Trade, July 26, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 100-3.
[25] Governor Dudley and the council to the Committee of Trade June 1, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* 80-2.
[26] Governor Dudley and the Council to the Committee of Trade, June 1, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 80-2.
[27] Governor Dudley and the council to the Committee of Trade, June 1, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 80-2.
[28] John Palmer, "John Palmer to Edward Randolph July 24, 1686," *The Andros Tracts,* vol. 3, 59-60.
[29] Randolph to the Lord Treasurer, August 23, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 113-15.
[30] Randolph to the Archbishop of Canterbury August 2, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 103-9.

collected back to the treasury so that it could be sent to the Crown.[31] He also had problems with the governor's council which did not confiscate all the ships that Randolph suspected as violating the law and this was because of how intertwined the trade business had become in Boston society.[32]

Besides enforcement of the Navigation Acts, Randolph had difficulty securing the records, primarily land deeds, from the old Massachusetts Bay Colony. The secretary needed the accounts because Whitehall expected the Dominion to charge land owners quit rents, a tax to the king, on their land. Randolph estimated that this could generate £3,000 to £4,000 per year for the crown.[33] The former secretary, Edward Rawson, did not want to give them up, nor were the council any help in securing them because they themselves were large landholders.[34] Besides resistance to stopping irregular trade and not providing estate records, the council had other problems. Some council members believed they were not paid enough to serve in the Dominion government. Randolph found them in disarray.[35] He also believed that the council was failing its duties toward England and advised the Committee on Trade to replace them.[36] Randolph already knew that Joseph Dudley was not going to be the permanent governor; Edmond Andros who

---

[31] Randolph's letter to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, July 28, 1686. Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 98.
[32] Randolph to the Commission of Trade, July 26, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703 vol.4, 100-3.* Randolph to the Lord Treasurer, August 23, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 113-15.
[33] Randolph to Povey, June 18, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 177, 181.
[34] Randolph to the Committee on Trade. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703* vol. 4,116-18.
[35] Randolph's letter to William Blathwayt, Secretary on the Committee on Trade, July 28, 1686. Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 98.
[36] Randolph to the Commission of Trade, July 26, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 100-3.

had received his commission on June 3, 1686 would replace him.[37] By July, the Dominion secretary was so upset with the way Dudley and the council were discharging their duties that in his correspondence with Whitehall he requested that the new royal governor be sent to Boston as soon as possible.[38] He believed only an outsider could bring the colony into line with royal policy, stop the abuse of the Anglican Church, enforce the Navigation Acts, and obtain the old colonial records.[39] Unfortunately for the frustrated secretary, Andros did not travel until the fall.

## THE ANDROS GOVERNMENT

Much to the relief of Edward Randolph, Sir Edmond Andros arrived in Boston on board the HMS *Kingfisher* on December 20 1686 [40] James most likely appointed him governor because of the close ties his family enjoyed with the Stuarts, his loyalty to the Crown and experience in New York. Andros was born in London on December 6 1637. In 1651, the Andros family, being royalist, went into exile in The Hague.[41] At nineteen Edmond was apprenticed to his uncle, Sir Robert Andros to serve in the army of Queen Elizabeth of Bohemia, the sister of James I.[42] It was in her service in 1660, that Edmond Andros received his knighthood for his military skill.[43] After the Restoration, he served with the English in New York against the Dutch where again he distinguished himself in

---

[37] Increase Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England* (London: 1688), 5.
[38] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, July 12, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 188.
[39] Randolph to the Commission of Trade, July 26, 1686. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 100-3.
[40] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, July 12, 1686. Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 208.
[41] Mary Lou Lustig, *The Imperial Executive in America: Sir Edmond Andros 1637-1714* (Danvers, Massachusetts: Rosemont Publishing, 2002), 27.
[42] Lustig, *The Imperial Executive in America,* 27.
[43] Lustig, *The Imperial Executive in America*, 29.

the field.[44] In 1674, James II, as Duke of York, became owner of the newly acquired colony of New York and appointed Andros governor because of his proven skills in America.[45] He served in this capacity until 1680 when he was recalled in the midst of political maneuvers at court.[46] Andros was able to settle his troubles and James now called on him to return to America as his governor of the Dominion of New England.[47]

James bestowed on Andros a commission, which like Dudley's, gave him the power to raise and collect taxes, appoint judges, clerks, and sheriffs, and create courts.[48] In addition, he received extensive authority, to create admiralty courts, ports and fortifications. [49] He also had command over the militias and could change out officers as he wished, as opposed to the previous practice of electing officers.[50] He could authorize martial law in times of war or insurrection, and had the power to pardon all offences except treason.[51] More importantly, his commission explicitly instructed him to "agree with the planter and inhabitants of oir said territyor and dominion concerning such lands, tenements & hereditaments as now are or hereafter shall be in our power to dispose of and them to grant unto any person or persons for such terms and under such moderat quit

---

[44] Lustig, *The Imperial Executive in America*, 31.
[45] Lustig, *The Imperial Executive in America*, 38.
[46] Lustig, *The Imperial Executive in America,* 120.
[47] Lustig, *The Imperial Executive in America,* 127.
[48] This is from Andros' revised commission of 1688 but it had the same provisions in it as the previous one other than the amount of territory defined by the Dominion 1686. United States Congress, "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England April 7 1688," in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America,* ed. Francis Newton Thorpe (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909).
[49] United States Congress, "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England April 7 1688."
[50] Sewall, *Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 107.
[51] United States Congress, "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England April 7 1688."

rents."[52] This far-reaching authority essentially gave him the power to grant land titles. He was also allowed to "make constitute and ordain lawes statutes and ordinances for the public pease welfare and good government of our said territory & dominion," along with the advice and consent of the council.[53] Unlike the Dudley government, Andros could add or remove council members as he wished.[54] James II had provided his new governor with the ability to reshape New England just as James intended to do in England.[55] To help his new administrator in America, the King sent over two companies of regular troops consisting of one hundred men.[56] When rumors first arose of troops being sent to America during Charles II's reign, Cotton Mather wrote in his diary that Redcoats would "sacrifice the best lives among us" and was happy that Charles' death prevented their deployment at that time.[57] Cotton's father, Increase saw the British military as occupiers and outsiders who swore, drank, and were immoral and stated that they were "A crew that began to teach New England to drab, drink, blaspheme, curse and damm. A crew that were every foot moving tumults and committing insufferable riots among a quiet and peaceable people. "[58] To add insult to injury, one of the officers was an actual Catholic.[59]

The British troops were not the only strangers added to the colony. Apparently, in Randolph's reports, railing against the current council members prompted the new

---

[52] United States Congress, "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England April 7 1688."
[53] United States Congress, "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England April 7 1688."
[54] United States Congress, "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England April 7 1688."
[55] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 9.
[56] Establishment of two foot companies in New England. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph Papers: 1676-1703,* 122.
[57] Cotton Mather, *Cotton Mather's Diary* (Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1909), entry from January 27, 1686. The years between 1687 and 1690 are missing from Cotton Mather's diary only a fragment remains in the hands of the American Antiquarian Society.
[58] Increase Mather, "A Vindication of New England," 19, 32.
[59] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 35.

Governor to bring some new members to the body. Andros recruited several men that he had known while serving in New York to his council. Two in particular would become most troublesome to the Boston establishment, Colonel John Palmer and John West.[60] Once new oaths were given to the reformed council, Andros had a committee review and determine which Massachusetts Bay laws were or were not in harmony with those of the Crown.[61] The committee recommended that all civil officers should remain in their current positions.[62] West, however, ignored the committee and refused to include the recommendations in the record.[63] This action began to sour the relationship between Andros's new appointees and the members from Massachusetts Bay.

## TAX POLICY

Andros faced continual financial problems in the colony. He had to repair the fort at Castle Island and he saw the need to erect defenses on Fort Hill as well.[64] To make matters worse, the imposition of the Dudley tariffs caused trade to decline.[65] Members of the council disagreed on how to raise new revenue. Those who owned more land wanted the burden to fall on trade, while the merchants wanted estates to be taxed, but both sides

---

[60] Not much is known of the prior relationship between Andros, Palmer and West. What is known is that they served with Andros while he was governor of New York in the 1670's; Lustig, *The Imperial Executive in America* 146; Richard R. Johnson. *Adjustment to Empire and the New England Colonies 1675-1715*, 82.

[61] William Stoughton, Thomas Hinckley, Wait Winthrop, Barthol Gedney, and Samuel Shrimpton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices* (Boston: unknown 1691), 7.

[62] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices,* 7.

[63] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices,* 7.

[64] Edmond Andros, "Edmond Andros to the Lords of the Treasury, August 31, 1687," *The Andros Tracts,* vol. 3, 61-2.

[65] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, March 14, 1687. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 214-6.

agreed that taxes were not in the best interest of the colony at that moment.[66] As a loyal subject of the Crown, Andros insisted on a rate change to satisfy the orders he received from London and stood firm against the majority of the council on the changing of the rates.[67] At the end of the heated meeting, most members believed that no decisions had been reached. A few of Andros' allies including Palmer, Randolph and West pushed the proposal through with a quorum of only six or seven members.[68] Andros signed the new tax law on February 15, 1687, which increased the rate on all imports by ten shillings, except for wine that went up twenty.[69] This action aggravated many, but Andros defended it, claiming he had seven council members present, which constituted a quorum, which conformed to his commission.[70] The rift between the Andros government and many Puritan leaders deepened. They complained of irregular meetings where their views were overruled and ignored.[71] They also took issue with certain council members who met in private to make the laws, accusing them of being baser men in positions of authority they did not deserve.[72]

## RELIGIOUS POLICY

Shortly after the tax issue was addressed, the governor turned his attention to the matter of the Anglicans and their meeting place for Sunday services. Like Randolph,

---

[66] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, February 3, 1687. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 210-2.
[67] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, March Randolph February14, 1687. *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 214-16; Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices,* 7-8.
[68] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 9-10: Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 32.
[69] Rawston, *The Revolution in New England Justified,* 19.
[70] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 31.
[71] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 8-9; Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices,* 9-10.
[72] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 6; Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 6.

Andros belonged to the Church of England. He too requested use of the south-end church during off hours for services shortly after his arrival in Boston. He met with four ministers from each of the three meetinghouses to reach an agreement to use one of their buildings. Increase Mather and Samuel Willard met with the governor the next day and as before, the Puritan clergy rebuffed him.[73] Increase Mather claimed that the town meeting house was large enough for the Anglicans.[74] Andros let the issue lie until March 22, 1687, when he made a tour of all three Congregational meetinghouses.[75] The next day Andros used the power of his office and demanded the keys to the south building or he would seize all of the churches and withhold the Congregational ministers' stipends out of the treasury.[76] Samuel Sewall and several members of the south-end church met with the governor to show him the deed to the building, and that they could not consent to the Anglican's use of it.[77] Andros was unmoved by the legal documentation and the local clergy relented. After nine months, the Church of England met in a proper church building. As a measure of good faith on their part, they took the off times of eleven in the morning, and four in the afternoon.[78] Both parties, however, harassed each other by extending their time allotted, making the other congregation wait to start their services.[79] To avoid this conflict, the Church of England erected a building for their services. Andros allowed them to borrow from the treasury, reducing the time it would take to build, but

---

[73] Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 128; Also see Owen Stanwood, "The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire," *Journal of British Studies* vol. 46 (2007): 481-508.
[74] Increase Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 26.
[75] Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 135.
[76] Mather, *A Vindication of New England,* 27-8; Entry made on March 16, 1687, Mather, *Diary of Increase Mather.*
[77] Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 135.
[78] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 33.
[79] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 33; Mather, *A Vindication of New England,* 28.

the members themselves paid for the new church.[80] Moving out of the south-end church and constructing a building turned out to be a difficult process. Many Puritan landowners would not sell property to the Anglicans. Samuel Sewall, for instance, was approached, but declined, saying, "I would not set up that which the people of New England came over to avoid."[81] Eventually, the Anglicans obtained land near an old cemetery on which to build their church.[82]

The separation of the two congregations did not lessen the Puritan's ire at having a non-reformist in their midst. They continued to harass their foes over the next two years. The Anglicans, for their part, also took occasion to distress the Congregationalists, such as celebrating the king's coronation day, which fell on the Sabbath in 1687 by shooting off fireworks on the Lord's Day.[83] On another Sunday, artillery from the fort began firing during services, causing Samuel Sewall to lament "twas never so in Boston before."[84] On the first day in May, Anglicans erected a maypole in Charlestown. Local Puritans cut it down because the practice of dancing around it to music offended their beliefs, only to be replaced by a larger one the next day.[85] The governor denied the local ministers' request to hold a day of thanksgiving in honor of the king's Freedom of Conscience Act.[86] Puritan minsters openly railed against their new religious neighbors. Joseph Eliot warned his congregation against heeding false teachers and following untrue

---

[80] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 33; Edmond Andros, "A Report of his Administration, May 27, 1690," *The Andros Tracts,* vol. 3, 11.
[81] Entry on March 28, 1688. Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 163.
[82] Mather, *A Vindication of New England,* 46.
[83] Entry April 23, 1687 Mather, *Diary of Increase Mather,*
[84] Entry February, 6, 1687. Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 133.
[85] Entry on May 27, 1687. Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 141; Entry May 1, 1687, Mather, *Diary of Increase Mather.*
[86] Cotton Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 38.

doctrines.[87] A pamphlet penned by Increase Mather and titled *The Unlawfulness of Common Prayer Worship,* associated many Anglican practices with those of Roman Catholics. He claimed that Anglicans revered the *Book of Common Prayer* in that same way that Catholics honored saints – both were idols.[88] He went on to complain about the robes the priests wore, how the Sacrament was administered, and even mocked the use of the cross as a symbol of Christ, saying "suppose a man should honor one of the nails which fastened Christ to the cross or the spear that pierced him, or the whip wherewith Pilate caused him to be scourged."[89] Mather also criticized the practice of swearing on the Bible before testifying in a court of law. He saw these practices as idolatrous and unnecessary for validation of an oath.[90] As Mather indicated, this practice was odious to the Puritans and it infuriated them that Andros ordered everyone to swear on the Bible prior to all court proceedings.[91]

The colonists resisted this practice as much as possible, but many were fined, and all who refused to pay the penalty were jailed. John Palmer, who was also a judge during the Dominion government, defended Andros' policy. He argued that swearing on the Bible was an age-old custom in England and that they were trying to conform the laws of the colony to that of the mother country. He further claimed that no one was fined for not swearing on the Book, only for being contemptuous in court.[92] The difficulty for the Puritans was that they left this practice behind when they came to settle America.

---

[87] Sewall, *Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 153.
[88] Increase Mather, *A Brief Discourse Concerning the Unlawfulness of the Common Prayer Worship and the Laying of the Hand and Kissing the Book in Swearing* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: unknown, 1686), 4.
[89] Mather, *A Brief Discourse Concerning the Unlawfulness of the Common Prayer Worship,* 4-10.
[90] Mather, *A Brief Discourse Concerning the Unlawfulness of the Common Prayer Worship,* 18.
[91] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 26-7.
[92] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 26-7.

Samuel Sewall spoke to one of the oldest residents in Boston, Simon Bradstreet, to confirm that the Book was never used in the colony. Bradstreet, who had sailed to New England with John Winthrop's group in 1630, confirmed that all who took an oath had only raised their right hand.[93] He also recorded several occasions where colonists would rather face fines than swear on the Book.[94]The Reverend Samuel Willard wrote a tract tilted *Whether the English Custom of Laying the Hand upon the Bible in Swearing Lawful?* He argued that only God can define religious worship and that if man creates a ceremony with religious connotations it is sinful.[95] He opined that to take an oath to tell the truth in court requires the involvement of Deity, hence a non-approved ceremony.[96] Therefore, if the ceremony required an object, even the Bible, that would make the object a thing of worship and thus it becomes an idol.[97] Willard asserted that it was a sin to knowingly break God's commandments. If a person were to swear an oath using the Bible, now turned into an idol, they would be committing a sin against God.[98] Willard concluded that the raising of a hand should be good enough to make an oath and to ask otherwise was a violation of the king's Freedom of Conscience Act.[99] The Andros government was unmoved by Puritan's beliefs. They had come to change the culture, not just with religion, but also in how the colony was administered.

---

[93] Entry of April 13, 1688. Sewall, *Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 165-6.
[94] Entries on February 8, March 28, April 13, all in 1688. Sewall, *Diary of Samuel Sewall.* 160, 163, 165.
[95] Samuel Willard, *A Brief Discourse Concerning that Ceremony of Laying the Hand on the Bible in Swearing* (London: J. A., 1689) 7-8.
[96] Willard, *A Brief Discourse Concerning that Ceremony of Laying the Hand on the Bible in Swearing,* 9.
[97] Willard, *A Brief Discourse Concerning that Ceremony of Laying the Hand on the Bible in Swearing,* 10.
[98] Willard, *A Brief Discourse Concerning that Ceremony of Laying the Hand on the Bible in Swearing,* 8.
[99] Willard, *A Brief Discourse Concerning that Ceremony of Laying the Hand on the Bible in Swearing,* 6.

## CIVIL LIBERTY POLICY

Andros' next target in the colony was civil liberties. He issued a ban on all town meetings, except once a year.[100] This outraged the Puritans because it prevented them from properly administering local business and stifled public debate about the governor's actions[101] The Governor began changing the court system in New England. His first action was to revise the rates charged by the courts for legal business.[102] A sharp debate ensued in council over the proposed changes. Many took the position that they were excessive and posed an undue hardship on the populace.[103] Andros also required most legal hearings in the Dominion to be tried in Boston, where the higher rates were imposed as opposed to the lower charges at the local county courts.[104] This move by the government could possibly have been in response to the continued economic problems in the colony. Even though the governor sent the HMS *Kingfisher* back to London with the Crown's taxes, his own administration suffered from insufficient funding. Increased expenses stemmed from improvements of the fortifications in Boston and the continual loss of income from the worsening of the shipping industry, which was feeling the toll from the enforcement of the Navigation Acts, also causing some merchants to go out of business.[105] The first major incident with Sir Edmond's policies broke out in August 1687 with the Town of Ipswich over the appointment of a town officer. The governor called on them to have a town meeting outside the newly imposed-once-a-year requirement to

---

[100] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 18.
[101] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 20.
[102] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 20.
[103] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 20.
[104] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices,* 12-13.
[105] Edmond Andros, "Andros to the Lords of the Treasury, August 31, 1687," 61-2; Randolph to William Blathwayt, Secretary on the Committee on Trade, March 14, 1687. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 217-20.

appoint a tax collector.[106] They claimed they could not comply with Andros' order because only an assembly could decide on a tax matter. Since a representative body no longer existed, it was impossible to select a commissioner to collect the current levies.[107] The citizens of Ipswich's resistance displeased the Dominion government, resulting in a charge of contempt and forced the leaders of the town to come to Boston for trial. Joseph Dudley presided over the case. The representatives of the town argued that only by the consent of a legislature could taxes be raised and that the *Magna Carta*, which applied to all English men, guaranteed this right to them.[108] Dudley responded, "That the laws of England would not follow them to the end of the earth" and found them guilty of contempt.[109] The court fined the men between fifteen to twenty pounds and some had to put up a bond ranging from £500 to £1,000, and had to promise good behavior for a year.[110] Their leader, John Appleton, besides being fined, and a bond imposed, was also banned from holding office for a year.[111] The Ipswich men however, were not the only ones who resisted the collecting of taxes for the Dominion. Shadrach Wildboar of Tauten was fined as well, for not collecting the levies for the government. He used the same reasons as his fellow colonists, that without the consent of an elective body it remained illegal for Andros to tax them.[112] Once the Ipswich affair was over, news of Dudley's charge spread throughout the colony, infuriating the Puritan establishment, but Sir Edmond's next act would put them at the edge of open rebellion.

---

[106] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 19.
[107] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 19-20.
[108] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 20.
[109] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 20; Whitmore attributes this statement to Joseph Dudley.
[110] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 20.
[111] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 20.
[112] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 20-1.

## LAND OWNERSHIP

On March 5, Andros seized the records of the defunct Massachusetts Bay colony from the custody of Edward Rawson and delivered them to Edward Randolph.[113] In late May, Randolph completed his review of the land titles of both privately held properties and land held in common throughout the Dominion. He concluded that the titles were illegal for a variety of reasons.[114] For example, early records on the land grants contained errors (on how the land was granted) and in some cases, conflicting claims existed.[115] Another problem relating to purchases were transactions with the Native Americans. Some documents appeared to be fraudulent.[116] In some instances, people who claimed a parcel did not have either a title from the old charter, or any documentation that they purchased the land they claimed from the Indians.[117] John Palmer alleged that some large land owners had thousands of acres that they claimed as common land, essentially dodging the taxes for it.[118] However, the main argument the king's agents made against the existing land patents reflected James II's view of property. In his view, all wealth derived from land ownership, or in other words, actual real estate. By contrast, the Whig view of wealth flowed from the ideas of John Locke, that property was also derived from one's own work or improvements that one made to their land.[119] Andros' view on the

---

[113] Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 133-34.
[114] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, May 21, 1687. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 221-24; Also see Theodore b. Lewis, "Land Speculation and the Dudley Council of 1686" *William and Mary Quarterly* vol. 31 (2006): 675-92..
[115] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, May 21, 1687. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 221-24.
[116] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 31.
[117] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, May 21, 1687. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 221-24.
[118] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 30.
[119] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution,* 376.

matter was that since the old charter was removed, all titles of land granted on that charter were now void, and all property reverted to James.[120] Palmer also argued that an incorporated body could not create another incorporated body, thereby making all towns in New England non-entities.[121] Andros justified this action because he had instructions to make sure all the laws of the Dominion complied with the laws of England.[122] Therefore, landowners had to reapply for the patents or deeds to their land or be charged with trespassing against the king.[123] Furthermore, all the cases involving reapplications were required to be heard in Boston causing further hardship for the colonists.[124]

These views of land ownership were certainly different from how Native Americans saw their rights. Unlike the laws imported from Great Britain where property titles listed a specific owner, Native American lands consisted of a much looser legal definition. They essentially held their land in trust for the tribe.[125] The land was subdivided by tribe, into clans, then into a family group and finally into single-family units.[126] Each family had stewardship over their area but all could use it.[127] Therefore selling the land to the new settlers was not as clear and defined to the Native Americans as it was to the English who bought it.[128] The colonists supplanted the Native American system of land ownership with the English legal system.[129] These differences between the settlers and the local tribes also prompted Andros to question the land titles. For instance,

---

[120] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 25.
[121] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 28.
[122] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England,* 28-30.
[123] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices,* 11.
[124] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 12.
[125] J. C. Smith, "The Concept of Native Title" *The University of Toronto Law Journal,* 24, no. 1 (Winter, 1974), 7.
[126] Smith, "The Concept of Native Title," 7.
[127] Smith, "The Concept of Native Title," 7.
[128] Smith, "The Concept of Native Title," 10.
[129] Smith, "The Concept of Native Title," 12.

Andros believed the claims of Plymouth Colony were bogus.[130] He also reported to the Board of Trade that the Puritans used coercion to gain territory. Andros related to London an incident in Narragansett County, Rhode Island where three deeds of land were submitted, all purchased from a Sachem named Coginaquon.[131] The first took place in 1659 to John Winthrop, the second also to Winthrop, and the third in 1660 included other Native American leaders, but this time with the stipulation that it settled a debt, they owed to the colonists. However, as Governor Andros noted in his report, that this agreement "was extorted by a troop of horse from Massachusetts."[132] Regardless of his reasons the citizens of Massachusetts Bay resented Andros' actions.

Many on the council were upset with this turn of events because now they had large holdings they could not sell, effectively ruining their businesses.[133] They also believed that the problems of the conflicting claims were minor, and at the time they were granted by Massachusetts Bay, it was a legal entity, and as such, any grants made by the old government should still stand.[134] The problem did not seem to require the drastic measure that Andros took. Some council members also saw no reason why the title issues had to be heard before the courts in Boston, when the local courts could handle them with less cost.[135] For most of the Puritan establishment, these changes were an outrage.

---

[130] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Governor Sir E. Andros to Lords of Trade and Plantations," August 31 1687. *Calendar Series of State Papers, Colonial Office, of James II.* (1681-1685), CO 5/904, 10-12, CO 5/905, 3-8, 5/904, 360-362, 1/63, Nos. 21, 21I.-VIII., 5/904, 358, 359.
[131] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Governor Sir E. Andros to Lords of Trade and Plantations."
[132] United Kingdom, Public Record Office, "Governor Sir E. Andros to Lords of Trade and Plantations."
[133] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, March 30, 1687. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 217-20.
[134] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 10.
[135] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 12-3.

Increase Mather pointed out that during the ordeal of the vacating of the old charter that Charles II had promised, the old titles would be honored.[136] Many also held the opinion that since they made improvements on the land, and were clever enough to obtain it by bargaining with the Indians, the property was theirs, not the kings.[137] Not only did they obtain and work the land by their own industry, some had held their properties in their families for fifty to sixty years.[138] These different views of land ownership were well illustrated by a conversation that Reverend Higgson claimed he had with Governor Andros in March 1688 as Andros traveled from New York to Massachusetts to take charge of fresh hostilities between colonists and Native Americans. Higgson and the Governor were engaged on current events and Andros pressed for the Reverend's views on the matter of the property ownership. Higgson opined that the rights to the land first came from God to man through Adam because he was given dominion over the earth and hence the descendants of Adam had right to it.[139] Either the colonists purchased their property from the Indians, who were also children of Adam and therefore rightful owners of the land and could sell it, or they had moved in and taken up ownership because the land was vacant.[140] By this Higgson concluded that the land belonged to the subjects of the king, not the king himself.[141] Andros' answered that James II was the owner because the people of New England did not fulfill the conditions of the old charter that was revoked. Andros also rebutted the claim of buying land from Native Americans by arguing that they too were his Majesty's subjects and had no authority to sell it to

---

[136] Increase Mather, *The Present State of New England Affairs* (Boston: Samuel Green, 1689), 4.
[137] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 3, 6, 8.
[138] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 25.
[139] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 26-7.
[140] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 27.
[141] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 27.

anyone.[142] Higgson replied that the king did not own the natives and they were given the land by God and could sell it. Andros curtly replied that whoever did not get a new title and did not pay rents to the king, was a rebel.[143]

Despite all the objections, the Dominion government moved forward with the new policy that also included paying a quit rent to the Crown, requiring the colonists not only to pay a local tax, but they were now remitting additional money directly to the king.[144] The government seized the commons in Charlestown, Lynn, Plymouth, and Rhode Island.[145] In the case of Charlestown, it was measured out and part of it was patented to Lieutenant Colonel Lidget.[146] In some cases, the legal proceedings caused considerable hardship for the residents of New England, such as the suit over an island owned by Plymouth. Nathaniel Clark applied for a title to it. Representatives of the town had to travel to Boston to settle the matter, wherein they lost the case.[147] In some instances, those who applied for the confirmation of their land did not get all of it back because it was sold to others.[148] Some just ignored the policy and had writs of intrusion entered against them. Samuel Sewall held a property on one of the many islands in Massachusetts Bay called Hog Island. He often went to the island to make improvements to the land by planting chestnut trees but despite his efforts to show ownership of the property, Sewall

---

[142] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 27.
[143] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 28.
[144] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 11.
[145] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 34.
[146] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England*, 39-40; In his diary, Samuel Sewall confirms that the land being parceled out but only to "particular persons." Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 147.
[147] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 8.
[148] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 11.

was presented with a writ of intrusion. Once the papers were served he conformed to the desires of the Andros government and requested a new patent for the land.[149]

For those who tried to comply with the governor's order, the process itself was often confusing, as the case of Mr. Lynde illustrates. He tried to conform to the law and sought a new patent for this property, but his lands came to him through different avenues. Some he inherited from his father in law, other parcels he purchased from Indians and other parts granted to him by Massachusetts Bay.[150] After receiving his petition, John West told him his parcels were scattered among different counties and that he would be required to put in a claim for his land in each one.[151] The process had become so confusing to Lynde that he no longer pursued the new title until the summer of 1688 when a writ of intrusion was issued against him by the Dominion.[152] He sought the help of Mr. Graham, the Attorney General of the colony who said he would settle the matter for a ten pound fee plus court costs.[153] To Mr. Lynde's dismay the court granted some of his land to a Quaker, that Andros promised to him that he could have it.[154]

Exacerbating the claims process was the problem of corruption. The disaffected members of the council complained that legal proceedings were mishandled, leading to exploitation of the system, corruption, and to bad government.[155] They also claimed that some judges and Crown attorneys took bribes and those unqualified men, who charged large court fees, especially Mr. West, presided over legal hearings.[156] Both colonists and

---

[149] Entry on July 8, 1688. Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 172-3.
[150] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 29-31.
[151] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 29-31.
[152] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 29-31.
[153] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 29-31.
[154] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 29-31.
[155] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 5.
[156] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 13.

Randolph substantiated the complaints against West. For example, both he and Palmer were able to obtain large tracts of land in the Boston area.[157] Edward Randolph even saw this problem and asked in council that Whitehall be consulted about auditor fees.[158] West disagreed, and asserted that the Dominion Council had the authority to set them and would not hear a protest from Randolph who said that he was "very sharply handled with the gavel."[159] In a letter to Mr. Povey, Randolph accuses West of enriching himself in his office.[160] In a letter to William Blathwayt, in April 1688, Randolph wrote that title applications were down because the colonists were contemplating an appeal to James II. He also reported that in addition to paying the fine West charged some people to send a surveyor to their property for what he considered a "good reward."[161]

## Colonial Resistance

By March 1688 the colonists, having faced several tax increases, the loss of their property rights, and affronts to their religion, decided to appeal directly to the king. Several ministers in Boston concluded that Increase Mather, the president of Harvard, was the best person to send to London because he was the most politically perceptive of them.[162] Mather, for his part, would not agree to the mission unless his congregation approved of his leaving, which they did by unanimous consent.[163] While Mather prepared

---

[157] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 52.
[158] Randolph to William Blathwayt, Secretary on the Committee on Trade, July 28, 1688. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 257.
[159] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, July 28, 1688. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 257.
[160] Randolph to Povey, October 7, 1688. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 268-71.
[161] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, April 2, 1688. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 249-53.
[162] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 38.
[163] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 38.

for his journey, Andros was in New York settling affairs resulting from the annexation of both New York and parts of New Jersey into the Dominion.[164] Apparently, Andros had gotten wind of Mather's mission because he issued a new order restricting travel. The governor now required all ship captains, of even small coastal craft, put up a £1,000 bond, preventing them to transport any person without his leave.[165] A person who wished to travel out of the colony required approval from Andros and had to present it to the captain of the ship conveying them out of the territory.[166] Many on the council considered this an unwise law because it only hurt the already diminishing trade business and they knew it was primarily to keep Mather in Boston.[167] To prevent the President of Harvard from leaving, the government used a libel suit between Mather and Edward Randolph, which involved Mather's letter that was then publicized, insulting Randolph.[168] Mather's trial resulted in an acquittal; however, John Palmer, who presided over the case, insisted that Mather still had unfinished legal business, and would not allow him to leave.[169] Andros tried to have him arrested, but Mather was alerted to the warrant before Sheriff Sherlock arrived, and locked himself in his study, claiming to be ill. The sheriff was told to come the next day.[170] Despite a guard watching the house, the minister made his way to a friend's home in Charlestown, eluding the deputies who had followed after him.[171]

---

[164] Andros, "Andros to the Lords of the Treasury, August 31, 1687," 61-2.
[165] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 18.
[166] "An Act Against Emigration," *The Andros Tracts,* vol. 3, 82-3.
[167] Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices*, 10.
[168] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 39.
[169] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 39; Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England*, 32.
[170] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 39-40.
[171] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 39-40.

On April 7, his accomplices managed to smuggle him out on a sloop to a waiting ship in the bay bound for London. [172]

Mather arrived in England the end of May and on June 1 was granted an audience with the king. James II was very cordial with his colonial guest. The Boston minister thanked the king for the liberty of conscience. James, in turn, confided it was a policy he was pursuing prior to taking the throne.[173] Once the pleasantries were over, Mather briefly explained the New Englanders' dilemma and asked for a restoration of an assembly so that the people had a voice in taxation policy.[174] He also delivered several petitions to his Majesty from the Boston area. One of the pleas was from John Gipson and George Willow, who were eighty-seven and eighty-six respectively. They claimed a right to the land because they had improved the "wilderness" by building homes and planting orchards. The old charter confirmed their titles, as well as their purchases from the Indians.[175] They accused Andros of ignoring their proof of ownership and despite having owned the land for sixty years, removed their titles.[176] They ended their appeal by calling on the king's favor, who they viewed as a father to help the people of Cambridge.[177] James II thanked the Harvard president for the messages and assured him that they would have "a *Magna Carta* of liberty of conscience."[178]

The Committee of Foreign Plantations received the New Englanders pleas and over the next month reviewed the complaints. In the final report, the Earl of Sunderland,

---

[172] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 39-40.
[173] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 40; Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 9-10.
[174] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 10.
[175] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 10.
[176] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 10.
[177] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 10.
[178] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 41.

a supporter of Edmond Andros, had the request for an assembly stricken from the petition.[179] His reasoning was that James would never agree to it.[180] A second meeting was granted to Mather with the king, where James again confirmed the Puritan's freedom of worship.[181] He then asked the minister how well his governor was doing. Mather replied that Andros was ruling over the colony in an arbitrary manner. He described the fines imposed, arrests made, and the banning of the day of thanksgiving for the Liberty of Conscience Act. He finished his account by appealing for relief from His Majesty.[182] James acted surprised by this report; he requested that Mather write a detailed account of the problems, and bring it with him when they next met.[183] The Boston minster delivered his report on July 2. It contained an account of the problems with the Church of England's use of the South Church, swearing on the Bible, and the land grants that the Puritans believed were illegal.[184] At the conclusion of their meeting, James again confirmed freedom of worship, but would not reinstate the old charter; however, he agreed to uphold the old land titles and allow an assembly.[185] The king received Mather again on September 26. As before, the minister urged James to act on their agreement, yet still nothing was done.[186] Mather met with the King one last time in October but again

---

[179] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 11.
[180] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 11.
[181] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather*, 41.
[182] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather*, 41.
[183] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather*, 41.
[184] Cotton Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tracts*, vol. 3, ed. William Henry Whitmore (Boston: The Prince Society, 1874), 121-2. Two different versions of this memoir exist. The one in the *Andros Tracts* list more direct quotes from both William and Mary but neither have exactly the same information. The one from the *Andros Tracts* did not give the original publican date. I put *Andros Tracts* in the citation when I use that version.
[185] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather*, 42.
[186] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather*, 42.

left empty handed.[187] While Mather was in England, the colonists continued to resist the efforts of the Dominion to reform the colony.

Besides the petition to James II, over the nearly three years of the Andros government, the colonists waged a campaign of subtle resistance. In matters of religion, they berated Church of England members and put obstacles in their way, such as resisting the use of their buildings. They refused to celebrate the birth of the king's heir or announce the birth of James's son in their church meetings.[188] As the men of Ipswich had shown, they did their upmost to thwart paying their taxes. Some New Englanders hampered land to be parceled out by removing the surveyor's markers as they went about their work.[189] They were slow at applying for new land titles. Andros had only granted twenty or so petitions, which Palmer attributed to time spent consolidating the territory and his diplomatic efforts among the Native Americans.[190]

The Governor's problems with the Indian tribes on the northern frontier were both foreign and domestic; this too hampered the colonists. The French had off and on attacked the empire's native allies and Andros had to spend time supporting them, and threatening the French.[191] On the domestic side, the problems stemmed from an Indian war that broke out with the colonists in northern Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Maine in the spring of 1688. The colonists blamed Andros for the hostilities and likewise,

---

[187] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 42.
[188] Randolph to William Blathwayt, Secretary on the Committee on Trade, October 2, 1688. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 260-65.
[189] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England*, 31.
[190] Randolph to William Blathwayt Secretary on the Committee on Trade, April 2, 1688. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers: 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 249-53; Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England*, 28.
[191] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England*, 28; Andros, "A report on his administration," 10-11; Andros, "Andros to the Lords of Treasury, August 31, 1687," 61-2.

the governor and his allies on the council accused the colonists of starting the war.[192] As Sir Edmond was overseeing the campaign against the Native Americans, the Puritans saw this as an opportunity to undermine his government by smuggling arms to the tribes in Maine in trade for furs.[193] However, this marked the limit of potential insurrection against the Dominion. Despite the loss of trade, being bereft of their liberty and property, and believing that the purpose of the Dominion government was "indeed to destroy the fundamentals of the English and to erect a French Government" they did not do more because of their belief in Providentialism. Men honored and respected the monarch, as long as he followed a righteous path, because it was God's will that he was on the throne.[194] They believed their current troubles and all that they had suffered was the will of Deity.[195] In addition, as a practical matter, they knew they could not successfully fight England.[196] Therefore, they had to wait until they saw a sign that would allow them to take overt action, and that came in the form of William of Orange.

## THE REVOLT

The Puritans were aware of rumors of events in England from the empire's trade network as well as their correspondence with their co-religionists throughout the Atlantic world.[197] They had an inkling of a possible invasion by William as early as 1688. This

---

[192] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England*, 35,W. H. Whitmore ed., *The Andros Tracts,* vol. 1, 55; Stoughton, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of Sir Edmond Andros and His Complices,* 13-4.
[193] This letter dated October 30, 1688, "Boston Prison to the Honorable the Judges of his Majesties Territory and Dominion of New England," *Andros Tracts,* vol. 3, 80-1;John Carter Brown, *New England's Faction Discovered* (London: Printed for J. Hindmarth, 1690), 14.
[194] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 18.
[195] Michael P. Winship, *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment,* 145.
[196] Palmer, *An Impartial Account of the State of New England*, 39.
[197]Alison Games, *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World,* 133.

was based on a proclamation that Sir Edmond Andros had circulated in January of that year warning that strangers may approach the colony and that citizens were not to aid them in any manner.[198] Although James II had already vacated the throne in the previous December, confirmation of it had not yet arrived to the colonies.

The story of William's ascension took four months to arrive in Boston. On April 4, John Winslow arrived with the Prince of Orange's Declaration.[199] Winslow's intent was to show it to the colonists and most likely the Puritan leaders. Unfortunately for Winslow, Andros became aware of it and had him picked up by the sheriff and brought to his home.[200] Sir Edmond asked his guest why he did not report this news to him, as governor, first. Winslow answered that it was not his place to deliver news to the governor and pointed out that Andros had already spoken to the captain of the ship he had traveled on and could have gotten the same news from him. His Excellency demanded the document, but Winslow denied having it. Andros called him a "saucy fellow" and had him arrested and tried for bringing treasonable literature into the Dominion.[201] The judge demanded the paper from Winslow as well, but this time instead of denying its existence, he refused to surrender it.[202] The judge imprisoned him until he produced the Prince of Orange's Declaration. Winslow turned it over the next day and was charged a £2,000 bond for his "sauce."[203]

---

[198] Edmond Andros, *By his Excellency a Proclamation* (Boston: 1688); Also see Richard C. Simmons, "The Massachusetts Revolution of 1689" Three Early American Political Broadsides" *Journal of American Studies* vol. 2 (1968): 1-12.
[199] William of Orange landed in England on November 5th 1688 and by January was crowned king; however word of the Revolution did not arrive into the colonies until the spring of 1689; Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 16.
[200] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 17.
[201] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 17.
[202] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 18.
[203] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 18.

Winslow's news prompted Puritan leaders to retake their colony from the Andros government. They justified their intentions based on Biblical teachings that allowed insurrection in the case of an unrighteous king. In addition, they viewed William as God's instrument to restore the old charters, fight Catholicism, and arbitrary government.[204] For instance, Increase Mather referred to the Prince, as another "David" and that he and Mary were righteous monarchs.[205] Additionally, they were only following the lead of their fellow countrymen in England who revolted against James II.[206] Therefore, having justified their morals, they began to move against Andros. In early April, many of Boston's local leaders met at the home of Cotton Mather.[207] At this meeting, they decided that any revolt should be accomplished with minimum bloodshed.[208] The leaders wrote a list of grievances that could be presented to the populace explaining why the disaffected members of the council were rebelling.[209] Cotton Mather wanted to ensure that once captured, the Governor and his associates were unharmed because he believed it was better for the colony and for the Dominion leaders to be tried in England, not Massachusetts.[210] Since Winslow's arrival, rumors continued to swirl around New England. One of the tales whispered about, was that Andros had arranged to board the *Rose,* defect to the French and leave the colony defenseless.[211]

---

[204] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 67; [Increase Mather], *A Brief Relation of the State of New England, from the Beginning of that Plantation to the Present Year 1689* (London: Richard Baldwine, 1689), 16.
[205] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 16; Mather, *A Vindication of New England,* 24; "Charges Against Andros and Others," *The Andros Tracts,* vol. 1, 164.
[206] Rawson, *The Revolution in New England Justified*, 10.
[207] From a statement made by Samuel Mather regarding his father Cotton Mather's involvement in the revolt, W. H. Whitmore ed., *The Andros Tracts,* vol. 3, 40-1.
[208] From a statement made by Samuel Mather regarding his father Cotton Mather's involvement in the revolt, Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tracts,* 135.
[209] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tracts,* 135.
[210] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tracts,* 135.
[211] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 7.

These tales reached the ears of the militia and they began to leave the field on the frontier in Maine and return to Boston.[212]

On April 18 1689, at eight in the morning, groups of armed men began rounding up members of the Dominion government. Captain George, commander of the *HMS Rose,* who was on shore at the time was the first person arrested in order to prevent Sir Edmond's escape and to ensure the frigate's guns could not be used against the town.[213] At nine A. M., the throng brought Simon Bradstreet and the other conspirators to the Council House. Then the mob continued to round up Andros' faction. They took Sheriff Sherlock, several militia officers, some minor Dominion officials and Edward Randolph into custody; while also ransacking Randolph's papers.[214] By noon, Simon Bradstreet read a declaration, prepared in advance, to the populace. It contained a litany of charges including: affronting the Congregationalist churches, arbitrary government, intentional destruction of the trade business, loss of land titles, taxing without the consent of the governed, disallowing *Habeas Corpus,* ill treatment of some of the council members. Further, the men reiterated the infamous statement from the Ipswich trial "that we must not think the privileges of English men would follow them to the end of the world."[215] The declaration also asserted that "his Majesty's desire was none other than the happy increase and advance of these provinces by their more immediate dependence on the Crown of England" and that they took this action for William and that the new "King and

---

[212] Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England*, 6.
[213] Nathanael Byfield, *An Account of the Late Revolution in New England* (London: Rose and Crown, 1689), 1.
[214] Byfield, *An Account of the Late Revolution in New England,* 4; Andros. "Edmond Andros report of his administration in New England," 16-7.
[215] Byfield, *An Account of the Late Revolution in New England,* 14.

Parliament "would have to decide what to do with the Governor and his associates.[216] The new leaders, acting in behalf of the "spontaneous" crowd drew up a surrender notice for Sir Edmond, requesting to hand over himself and his associates to the militia officers.[217] By two in the afternoon, over 1500-armed men had arrived in Boston and the militia officers set out to deliver the demand for Andros' surrender. Just as they arrived at Fort Hill, where Andros fled to when the rebellion broke out, a ship in the harbor launched a boat toward the garrison. Andros and company, including John Palmer and the hated John West, emerged from the fortress and tried to make for the docks, but the mob intercepted them and took the fugitives to the Council House.[218] The rebels treated Andros well during the whole ordeal. The new council told the Governor and his fellows why they were arrested and they requested that Andros surrender Castle Island, which he did.[219] The incident was over in a day, except for the detention of Joseph Dudley, who apprehended the next day. Now the people of Boston had to decide on a new framework of government to replace the one they had taken down.

Once the Dominion of New England fell, the other constituent parts returned to their old charters, except for New York, which under the leadership of Jacob Leister also rebelled against the Andros government and eventually established their own legislature.[220] The people of Massachusetts Bay were confronted with the problem of how to govern, now that they had removed Andros. Some wanted to reinstate the old charter, but many on the new council believed that a return to the 1628 charter would be a mistake, because

---

[216] Byfield, *An Account of the Late Revolution in New England,* 19; Byfield, *An Account of the Late Revolution in New England,* 3-4.
[217] Byfield, *An Account of the Late Revolution in New England,* 10-11.
[218] Byfield, *An Account of the Late Revolution in New England,* 3-4.
[219] Byfield, *An Account of the Late Revolution in New England,* 3-4.
[220] David S. Lovejoy, *The Glorious Revolution in America,* 276.

it was legally revoked and it should be returned the same way.[221] They decided that since it was close to the annual elections, a vote should be held on whether to return to the old charter, or remain as they were until they had clearer instructions from England.[222] In the meantime, the new government called itself the "Committee for the Conservation of Peace" and confirmed Simon Bradstreet, the last governor of Massachusetts Bay, their temporary leader.[223] In mid-May, the representatives of the various communities met in Boston and chose to continue under the newly established Committee, and Bradstreet.[224] At the end of the month, two ships arrived confirming the regime change in England. The Dominion government that James II had created did its best to subject the Puritans to the will of the Crown. Now that the throne changed yet again and they no longer had a legitimate government because of the vacating of the charter, the Puritans needed to seek for restoration of their rights. This quest for legitimacy rested in London. They had to rely on English law and tradition to restore what they had lost. This task rested in the hands of the Puritan minister, Increase Mather in London.

---

[221] A. B., *An Account of the Late Revolutions in New England* (London: Benjamin Harris, 1689), 12.
[222] A. B., *An Account of the Late Revolutions in New England*, 12.
[223] A. B., *An Account of the Late Revolutions in New England*, 12.
[224] A. B., *An Account of the Late Revolutions in New England*, 12.

# CHAPTER THREE
# RECONFIRMATION OF POLITICAL RIGHTS

## MATHER AND PARLIAMENT

While the colonists of Massachusetts Bay struggled with the Andros government, Increase Mather, the self-appointed agent for the colony, witnessed the unfolding of the Glorious Revolution. Within a month of his last meeting with James II, William of Orange landed at Torbay, to fulfill his promise to restore English liberties.[1] By December 23, the king had fled to France and abandoned the throne. The election of the Convention Parliament to settle the government followed shortly. This turn of events surely encouraged Mather, because now he saw an opportunity to regain the Massachusetts Bay charter. He used his time in London to make connections with political leaders of the Whig party.[2] He also sought to tell Massachusetts Bay's story. Around the end of December 1688, Mather wrote *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England,* the first of many political tracts in behalf of the colony. Thus began a nearly two year public relations campaign, where Edward Randolph later commented that Mather made the events in Boston seem "as if it were a national concern."[3] Mather's opening statement in *A Narrative* confirmed this observation. He opined "so that he that is sovereign of New England, may by means thereof (when he pleaseth) be emperor of America."[4] The Boston minister equated the fate of Massachusetts Bay to English colonial policy. The remainder of the pamphlet contained a narrative about the removal of the Massachusetts Bay

---

[1] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution,* 237.
[2] Richard R. Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire,* 138. Also see Trevor Burnard, "Making a Whig Empire Work: Transatlantic Politics and the imperial Economy in Britain and British America," *William and Mary Quarterly.* 69 (2012): 51-6.
[3] Randolph to the Committee on Trade, January 10, 1690.Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers from the New England, Middle, and Southern Colonies in America with Other documents Relating Chiefly to the Vacating of the Royal Charter of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 30.
[4] Increase Mather, *A Narrative of the Miseries of New England,* 3.

Charter and the list of abuses of the Andros Government. Mather also included the petitions of redress he had presented to James II several months earlier.

Mather met Lord Philip Wharton, a leader of the Whig party and longtime supporter of the new king.[5] Through his new political connections, who in turn introduced him to William III.[6] Mather met with the Prince of Orange on 9 January 1689. The self-appointed agent for New England presented William with a petition to restore the Massachusetts Bay charter, assuring the soon-to-be new king that they did not want "money nor for soldiers nor any other succors but for their ancient privileges."[7] Clearly still concerned with the settlement of the government, William told the Puritan minster that his purpose for coming to England was to restore the annulled charters, and deferred the matter to his personal secretary, William Jephson; but he took no action at this time.[8]

While Mather waited for the new administration to act on his request, the Convention Parliament confirmed William and Mary as joint sovereigns of England the following month. Shortly after his ascension, William had letters of confirmation drawn up for all of the colonial governors. The new king had decided to keep the same administrative officials that James II had appointed where possible, in order to heal the nation from the internal strife it had just undergone.[9] Jephson alerted Mather of this policy, which alarmed the colonial agent because he believed that, if confirmed, the Dominion of New England would never be removed, and Massachusetts Bay could never regain their charter.[10] Mather requested that the secretary inform William of the

---

[5] Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, "Philip James Wharton (1613-1696).
[6] Cotton Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 43.
[7] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 43.
[8] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 44.
[9] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution*, 299.
[10] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 44-5.

problems with the Andros government and asked him to stop the letter to the Dominion.[11] Jephson dutifully informed the king, who retrieved the letter.[12] However, the issue of the charter remained unresolved.

Through his friendship with Lord Wharton, Mather managed to arrange another meeting with William. On 14 March, the Boston minister pleaded his case against Governor Andros. The King expressed skepticism with Mather's allegations, but confirmed that he ordered a hold on Andros's reappointment and commanded that the governor should return to England and answer for his actions.[13] He further assured Mather that the irregularities of Massachusetts' government would be taken care of stating, "You may rest Assured that I will shew them all the favour, which it is in my Power to do."[14] Despite this promise, still no action came from Whitehall. Clearly, the king did not act, and it appeared that William had deferred to Parliament because Commons submitted a bill to restore the old charters. With the help of his Whig allies, Mather managed to have Massachusetts Bay added to the Corporations Bill.[15] If passed, Boston and other English cities would have had their charters restored by the power of the legislature. Mather believed once the act passed he could petition the Crown for expanded privileges.[16] This left Massachusetts Bay's legitimacy in the hands of the Parliament.

While the Corporations Bill made its way through the Parliament, Mather continued to solicit the members of Commons and Lords to redress the grievances of

---

[11] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 45.
[12] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 45.
[13] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 45.
[14] Cotton Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tracts,* vol. 3, 34.
[15] Cotton Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 45.
[16] Cotton Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 45.

New England. The Boston minister also enlisted the help of his old friend Samuel Sewall in these efforts. Sewall had traveled to England the previous October for personal and business reasons. He and Mather met with Wharton and Sir Edward Harley to petition for their cause.[17] Sewall also wrote to members of Parliament, such as Thomas Papillion, an influential merchant in London, petitioning his help to rectify his loss in revenue from the removal of his land titles, as well as other members of his family.[18] He pleaded with the member for "a comfortable settlement obtained whereby we might be secured in the possession of our Religion, Liberty and Property."[19] Besides the Parliament, the king's council also debated the defunct Massachusetts' charter. William had left many of James II's ministers in place after he took the throne. He supported a policy of tolerance and wished to avoid retribution for action from the previous regime.[20] Therefore, the Board of Trade consisted of the same members that initiated the proceedings against New England including William Blathwayt, Auditor General of North America. In May, both Mather and Sewall went to Westminster to give testimony in support of the old charter and to counter Blathwayt's assertion of its need to be removed.[21] This debate at court did not lead to any action; apparently, the king still awaited the outcome of the Corporations Bill.

On June 28, Mather and Sewall received some startling news as they breakfasted at a local coffee house. A letter was delivered to them from Captain Byfield announcing the revolution in Boston.[22] Byfield described the event as "a quiet, well-bred, and

---

[17] Entry on April 23, 1689, Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 212; *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,*" Thomas Papillon (1623-1702).
[18] Entry on April 25, 1689. Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 212-13.
[19] Entry on April 25, 1689. Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 213.
[20] Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution,* 299.
[21] Entry on May 14, 1689. Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall*, 216.
[22] Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 222.

bloodless revolution."[23] His written account also undoubtedly made its way into the London press. Upon receiving this news Mather and Sewall made another push to try to get the Corporations Bill passed. They worried that as the news of the rebellion leaked across the Atlantic, the Parliament would hear Andros and his supporter's side of the events.[24] On July 1, Sewall wrote again to his supporter in the Commons, Thomas Papillon, a Huguenot, urging him to expedite the bill and included a copy of Mather's *Narrative.*[25] The news of the Boston rebellion prompted another meeting between Mather and William on July 4.[26] Mather assured the king that his subjects in New England supported him, and their actions against James II's governor were proof of their loyalty to him.[27] The colonial agent then requested a letter from William that he accepted the colonists' removal of Andros.[28] William consented to the desire of the Boston minster and reiterated his promise to see their government returned to them.[29] The news of the rebellion also seemed to spur William to call Andros back to England. The king had a letter sent to Governor Bradstreet ordering the return of his prisoners to England.[30] In an effort to continue to maintain support for the colony, both with the public and Parliament, Mather penned his second tract, *A Brief Relation to the State of New England,* published by the end of the month. Like his previous work, it provided a history of Massachusetts Bay and its importance to the empire.[31] He also provided a summary of the problems the

---

[23] Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 222.
[24] Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 228
[25] Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 224.
[26] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 46.
[27] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 46.
[28] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tracts,* 33.
[29] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tracts,* 33.
[30] Andros to Bradstreet. Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers, 1676-1703,* vol. 4, 26.
[31] Increase Mather, *A Brief Relation of the State of New England, from the Beginning of that Plantation to this Present Year 1689* (London: Printed for Richard Baldwine, 1689), 8.

colonists had with the Andros government. Sewall helped distribute five hundred copies of this pamphlet to garner support for the cause.[32] However, the detractors of Massachusetts Bay soon made their voices herd in Whitehall.

Letters from the colonists' chief antagonist, Edward Randolph began to arrive. Writing from his prison cell in Boston, he informed the Board of Trade of his version of the events, which were that the colonists stepped well beyond their authority in removing the Andros government.[33] In a subsequent letter to Blathwayt, Randolph reported that the still raging Indian war had gone badly for the colony.[34] Despite the losses from the fighting, and much to Randolph's perplexity, the Bradstreet government's focus rested on obtaining a charter. Some still advocated that they should reinitiate the vacated charter on their own. In a letter to Lord Southwell, who was a former member of James II's administration and a member of the Board of Trade, Randolph compared the colony's quest for their charter on par with religious zeal saying, "They are full of expectation for their charter and have as great esteem for it as the Jews had for the Ark."[35] Bradstreet's appointment of three other agents for New England while Randolph was imprisoned verified Randolph's assessment of Massachusetts Bay's goals.[36] The governor's written instructions, issued in December to Sir Henry Ashurst, Elisha Cooke, Thomas Oaks and Increase Mather, were to stress to the Crown the arbitrary rule of Edmond Andros, the

---

[32] Entry on July 29, 1689. Sewall, *The Diary of Samuel Sewall,* 231.
[33] Randolph to the Board of Trade. Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers, 1676-1703,* 3-5.
[34] Randolph to Blathwayt, Secretary of the Board of Trade, July 30, 1689. Edward Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers from the New England, Middle, and Southern Colonies in America with Other Documents Relating Chiefly to the Vacating of the Royal Charter of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 294.
[35] Randolph to Southwell, December 18, 1689. Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers, 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 322.
[36] Simon Bradstreet, "The Governor and Council and Representative of the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay, Convened in General Court in Boston." *Andros Tracts,* vol. 3, ed. William Henry Whitmore (Boston: The Prince Society, 1874), 58-9.

loss of liberty to the colony, and the destruction of the economic livelihood of the citizenry.[37] He further instructed them to mention that the war had taken its toll on Massachusetts Bay, and to solicit first to Parliament, and then elsewhere to regain the "Charter and all its rights and privileges, civil and sacred."[38] Randolph noted that Bradstreet, who had received William's order to return his prisoners to England on 24 November, initially delayed their departure until after the newly appointed agents could be dispatched, using an embargo against all ships going to Europe as a pretext to prevent travel.[39] Randolph further advised the Board of Trade not to approve of any new charter until he and Andros could arrive to produce a full report.

Much to Mather's disappointment, and even before Bradstreet had written his instructions, the legislative option began to fall apart. The Commons had approved the Corporations Bill and sent it on to the House of Lords where it stalled.[40] Then in August, William dismissed the Convention Parliament before they had a final vote on the measure, killing it until the next Parliament sat. Mather, unsure if a new Parliament would reinstate the Corporations Bill explored the possibility of going through the legal branch of the government for redress. He sought to pull the 1684 case from the Court of the Chancery and have it moved back to the King's Bench where judges had been more favorable to Massachusetts Bay in the past.[41] The attorneys consulted by Mather, along with his Whig allies advised that it would be impossible to transfer the suit. He would have to wait to see if the Corporation Bill would pass in the next Parliament.

---

[37] Simon Bradstreet, "Instructions for the Agents for the Colonie of the Massachusetts Bay in New England," *Andros Tracts,* vol. 3, ed. William Henry Whitmore (Boston: The Prince Society, 1874), 59.
[38] Bradstreet, *Instructions for the Agents for the Colonie of the Massachusetts Bay in New England,* 60.
[39] Randolph to Blathwayt, Secretary of the Board of Trade, December 30, 1689. Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers, 1678-1700,* vol. 4, 325.
[40] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 46.
[41] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather,* 46.

At the next sitting, Parliament indeed reintroduced the Corporations Bill and the Commons approved it, just as it had before; and just as before, the Lords held up its passage. Apparently, the Commons added an amendment seeking punishment for those who assisted with attacks on the charters by kings Charles II and James II.[42] The debate on 10 January, 1690, a year after the change in government, reflected the balance between extracting a political vengeance and maintaining a peaceful transition to the new monarch, a course which William sought to follow. MP Walter Younge spoke for those who favored the provision, stating "Where a clause is so fair as this, nobody can be against it, but such as approve of all the villainies of the surrenders. Those who would have brought in popery and slavery if they had power would do the same thing again. They abhorred parliaments and petitions for their sitting."[43] Clearly, the Whigs were trying to maintain the gains in legislative authority they had won. The tenor of the debate, however, took more of the tone of Sir Thomas Clarges, who argued, "I am against this clause. This bill comes with a good prospect; in a great measure, it is a good bill; but this clause is destructive to the peace and quiet of the kingdom; instead of reconciliation, it lays the foundation of perpetual division."[44] They struck down the divisive language, and sent the bill back to the Commons where it died, as well. Thus the end of the Corporations Bill ended with Parliament having no influence over New England. The pro-legislature Whigs had reached their high point. All future settlement of charters

---

[42] Unfortunately a copy of the bill does not exist since it did not pass. The only context is through the surviving documentation for the debate in the House of Lords over this provision.
[43] United Kingdom, *The Parliamentary History of England from the Earliest Period to the Year 1803: From which Last-Mentioned Epoch it is Continued Downwards in the Work Entitled,* "The Debate on the Corporation Bill," vol. V, 1688-1702 (London: T. C. Hansard, 1809), 509-10.
[44] United Kingdom, *The Parliamentary History of England,* 509.

would have to come from the king. Therefore, the only avenue remaining to gain legitimacy for Massachusetts Bay lay with the executive branch.

## MATHER AND WILLIAM

By April 1690 both the agents sent by Boston and the officials of the Dominion had arrived in London. Mather and the other agents from New England presented formal charges to the Crown against the former governor. On 14 April, the agents submitted three charges against Andros. The first was his attempted concealment of William's assumption of the government.[45] The next charge accused Andros of making arbitrary laws by levying taxes, and jailing people illegally; thus depriving them of their English liberties, and removing them from their property.[46] They also blamed the ex-governor for the Indian war and supplying aid to the local tribes.[47] The final charge accused the other officers in the Andros government who abetted the governor in his misdeeds, especially John West and James Graham, of wrongdoings as well. West faced the charge of extortion while the agents faulted Graham with issuing illegal Writs of Intrusion against the colonists.[48] Andros denied trying to hide any news about William. He claimed that the only information in his possession involved a threat of invasion from Holland and acted with causation to protect British territory.[49] As far as raising taxes, the Dominion of New England had the authority from the king at that time to administer the government,

---

[45] "Matters Objected Against Sir Edmond Andros, Mr. Joseph Dudley, Mr. Palmer, Mr. Randolph, Mr. West, Mr. Graham, Mr. Farwell, Mr. Sherlock and Other, as Occasions of their Imprisonment in New England. *Andros Tracts,* vol. 2 ed. W. H. Whitmore (Boston: The Prince Society, 1869), 176.
[46] "Matters Objected Against Sir Edmond Andros," 176-7.
[47] "Matters Objected Against Sir Edmond Andros," 177.
[48] "Matters Objected Against Sir Edmond Andros," 177.
[49] "The Answer of Sir Edmond Andros to the Matters Objected Against him and Other as Occasion of their Imprisonment in New England." *Andros Tracts,* vol. 2. ed. W.H. Whitmore (Boston: The Prince Society, 1869), 179.

including the power to raise revenue if needed.[50] The property titles were in disarray, and the Andros government only attempted to bring order to a chaotic set of laws and conform them to the statues in England.[51] Finally, Andros could not be held responsible for the Indian war. He was over hundred miles away when it started, and at no time in his military career had he ever aided the enemy.[52]

As the Board of Trade reviewed the documents, they found a glaring omission in charges from the colonists; nobody had signed the document. They brought this error to the attention of the New England agents, and the Board advised them that they could not proceed unless someone signed the charges.[53] The attorney for Andros also pointed out to the agents, that if found innocent of the charges, his client could sue whoever signed the indictment for defamation.[54] Faced with this dilemma the excuses for the omission soon followed. Mather excused himself from signing because he had been in England when the rebellion broke out and did not have first-hand knowledge of events in Boston.[55] The same was true for Ashurst. Cooke and Oakes also deferred from signing, arguing that they could not because the charges set against Andros were from the people who rose up on that day and no one person could sign it because all were involved.[56] On 24 April, the Board issued their ruling. Apparently, Mather's public relations campaign had no effect on the Board of Trade. They made no comments on the merits of either side of the arguments. In an anti-climactic decision, they dismissed all charges against the

---

[50] "The Answer of Sir Edmond Andros," 179.
[51] "The Answer of Sir Edmond Andros," 179.
[52] "The Answer of Sir Edmond Andros," 179.
[53] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire,* 172.
[54] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire,* 172.
[55] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire*, 172.
[56] Johnson, *Adjustment to Empire*, 172-3

defendants only because no one would sign them.[57] Like the House of Lord's rejection of the Corporation Bill, this decision by the Board of Trade reflected a policy of dismissing past behavior without punishment. Once again, because of a legal technicality, Massachusetts Bay did not obtain the justice it sought and it continued to function without a charter.

Mather and the other agents again petitioned the king for a new charter. They met several times with two Chief Justices and William's Solicitor General to write the petition for the new charter.[58] They presented the document for review to the king. The king's attorney assured him the petition was sound and supported his privileges as monarch.[59] William turned the matter over to the Board of Trade and then departed for Holland, to continue the war with France. Mather took this opportunity to pen yet another tract, this time specifically to the Board of Trade. His *Reasons for the Confirmation of the Charters* contained many of the same arguments as his *Vindication* works, the series of pamphlets he wrote during the Corporations Bill debate, but much more succinct. This tract is notable for several arguments designed to allay some of the criticisms leveled against Massachusetts Bay. He reiterated that New England had not cost the empire any revenue, but it had increased its profitability.[60] The Commons believed that Massachusetts Bay needed to restore the charter.[61] Ever since the Crown took a direct role in governing the colony, it had cost England more money to administer it.[62] Finally, a charter would cement the relationship between the Crown and Massachusetts Bay,

---

[57] "Order Discharging Sir Edmond Andros," *Andros Tracts,* vol. 2 ed. W. H. Whitmore (Boston: The Prince Society, 1869), 179.
[58] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tracts,* 35.
[59] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tracts,* 35-6.
[60] Increase Mather, *Reasons for the Confirmation of the Charters of the Corporations in New England* (London, 1690), 3.
[61] Mather, *Reasons for the Confirmation of the Charters of the Corporations in New England,* 6.
[62] Mather, *Reasons for the Confirmation of the Charters of the Corporations in New England,* 7-8.

making it more loyal to the United Kingdom.[63] However, the Board took no action on the writing of the new charter.

Even though the hearing ended without any condemnation, the rhetoric from both sides continued to circulate through the English press. The object now appeared to be persuasion of the Board of Trade on the form of the new charter. The war of words actually began in January 1690, with the arrival of more publications from the pro-Andros faction in Boston. Complaints had arrived from some of the colonists in Maine that the new replacement government had itself acted in an arbitrary manner, and exposed their lives and property to a destructive war with the Indians.[64] Likewise, a letter from Anglicans in Charlestown written to the king claimed religious suppression by the Congregationalists.[65] These complaints hoped to show that the existing New England government did not intend to follow William's religious tolerance policies. These items prompted Mather to pen another tract titled *A Vindication of New England.* The tract first defended the method of worship by the Puritans and the reasons they went to America, and again, the value they brought to England; with Mather reminding the public and all that would listen that New England had "been no ways chargeable to the Crown of England while they quietly enjoyed their charters."[66] Edward Randolph wasted no time writing a rebuttal against Mather's tracts. If the ministers of William's government chose to look, the ensuing pamphlet war actually clearly demarked how both sides viewed the role of the overseas colonies to that of the core nation.

---

[63] Mather, *Reasons for the Confirmation of the Charters of the Corporations in New England,* 8.
[64] "Petition of the Inhabitants of Maine," *Andros Tracts,* vol. 1, ed. W. H. Whitmore (Boston: The Prince Society, 1868), 176-8.
[65] "Petition of the Inhabitants of Charlestown," *Andros Tracts,* vol. 2 ed. W. H. Whitmore (Boston: The Prince Society, 1869), 79-81.
[66] Increase Mather, *A Vindication of New England,* 6.

Randolph attacked Massachusetts Bay on two fronts. The first was trade. The colony came to the interest of the Crown because of violations of the Navigation Acts. Randolph wrote a report to the Board of Trade on the continual illegal trade in Boston. He provided dates, names of ships, and the illicit cargo they carried.[67] This flouting of the law stemmed from the problem Massachusetts Bay had with England, that is, no respect for the laws passed by Parliament. He penned anther tract listing all of the laws passed by the General Court that did not conform to those in England.[68] This included the Congregationalists peculiarity in not swearing on the *Bible*. Randolph accused them of complete disregard for England, writing, "But why do I call them Subjects, when indeed they act as a free and independent Commonwealth, as they in their law-book file themselves."[69] Indeed, Randolph, despite living more than a decade in New England, also seemed perplexed by the nature of the colony. In one of his last letters before he left his Boston cell, he reminded the Board of Trade that the Massachusetts Bay Company like that of the Royal Africa or the East India Company should have been governed out of England.[70] What Randolph did not understand, or refused to see, was that the Puritans did not look at their charter as a commercial document, but as a foundational political tract tied to the *Magna Carta*.

John Palmer however, saw this more clearly than ever. He assaulted the colonists on their place in the empire in his defense of the Andros Government. His conception of

---

[67] Randolph to the Board of Trade, December 12, 1689. Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers, 1678-1703,* vol. 4, 23; Evidently, this report did get published because Mather responded to it in a pamphlet titled *Answer to Mr. Randolph's Account of the Irregular Trade Since the Revolution in New England.*

[68] Edward Randolph, *Abstract of Laws of New England, Contrary to the Laws of England* (London: 1690), 2-4.

[69] Edward Randolph, *A Short Discourse Shewing the Great Inconvenience of Joynig the Plantation Charters with Those of England* (London, 1690), 6.

[70] Randolph to the Committee of Trade, January 10, 1690. Randolph, *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers, 1678-1703,* vol. 4, 31.

colonial rights placed Boston in position as that of a conquered territory, such as Ireland and but not like Scotland, which joined itself to England.[71] John Palmer divided Great Britain's territory into two categories. The first comprised of land that he considered the "Empire of the King," consisting of England, Wales, and Scotland, which became united when the Stuarts took the throne.[72] Everything else fell into conquered territory which he considered belonged to the government or "Crown"; he made this distinction stating:

> That those kingdoms, principalities, and colonies, which are of the Dominion of the Crown of England and not of the Empire of the King of England, are subject to such laws, ordinances, and forms of government, as the Crown shall think fit to establish. New England and all the plantations are subject to the Dominion of the Crown of the Crown of England and not to the Empire of the King of England: therefore the Crown of England may rule and govern them in such manner as it shall think most fit.[73]

Palmer, representing the Crown, saw a distinction between the subjects in the core parts of Great Britain, namely England and Scotland and overseas territory like New England. Any subject leaving the core part of the empire could not expect to maintain the same rights when they moved to a colony. Hence, the reasons behind the Andros government's actions in New England turned on the fact that they were merely attempting to place the colony in its proper role, one subservient to the executive authority of the king and with limited access to rights under the legislative branch of the government.

Mather, of course, had been arguing for over a year against this view of colonial government. As noted before, New England had obtained the right to rule on its own. Even if not expressly granted, it had earned this right by being the instrument through which the British Empire expanded. In fact, the empire not only expanded, but thrived

---

[71] John Palmer, *An Impartial Account of State of New England: or the Late Government There, Vindicated,* 15-7.
[72] John Palmer, *An Impartial Account of State of New England,* 15.
[73] John Palmer, *An Impartial Account of State of New England,* 15.

because of its sales of natural resources, the support it offered to the Caribbean, especially the cash crop of sugar, and the inflow of money from these sales to the royal treasury. Mather's arguments on Massachusetts Bay's importance to trade were reinforced from an anonymous source. Relying on religious tropes, the author associated minsters under both Charles II and James II as publicans and the good people of New England with republicans.[74] He reiterated the infamous "not reasonable to expect that the English liberties could follow them to the end of the earth" comment and accused the publicans of trying to trick William and Mary into believing it also.[75] The tract writer points out that at the founding of the colony, everyone knew that it provided a plantation whereby Puritans could remove themselves from the practices of the Church of England and the government of Charles I. Most were generally pleased with their departure, arguing, "we're well rid of them; as not doubting but the sea, the savages, cold, or the country would eat them up."[76] However, to the dismay of their detractors, the 'People of New-England shewed the world, that necessity and freedom could do Wonders: for in a few years, they grew to such a height and greatness, that they brought more Spirit, Virtue, Riches, Industry, Glory, and Honour, to the English nation."[77] Foreshadowing the future, the Boston author then asks "I would fain know of our Publicans, how many cities and countries have ever revolted and turned commonwealths, for being too well used? For my part I cannot tell that I ever read or heard of any: but I can think of abundance that have fall'n away and revolted by reason of oppression and hard usage."[78] The writer argued

---

[74] *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New England to the King You Please with Some Remarks on It* (London: 1691), 3.
[75] *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New England,* 5.
[76] *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New England,* 12.
[77] *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New England,* 13.
[78] *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New England,* 15.

that the Dutch East India Company practices could provide an example of how a nation should rule their colonies. The Dutch allowed their East India Company to have much more control over its territory than New England and the enterprise thrived.[79] He asserts that the Dutch "have they had shewed the World ere this, that they could Conquer without war, and overcome without fighting; for they had in all humane appearance, been at this time dominators of the seas, and lords of the Indies. But however it is, they have done much with nothing, and we have only done little with much."[80] He ends the discourse by pleading that New England only wants what is best for the empire. They propose to expand trade and to accuse the detractors of Massachusetts Bay that they "would have King William and Queen Mary begin where the late King James left off; they would have us send an army, and a General Governor to New-England, that we might both lose the Country."[81] He too saw New England's fate as clearly aligned with England.

A year had passed, and in an effort to move the process along, Mather used his connections again to obtain a royal favor, this time with the queen. Mather had become friends with John Tillotson, the archbishop of Canterbury. Tillotson arranged a meeting between Mather and Queen Mary on April 9 1691.[82] Mather inquired of Mary if she would ask William to grant a new charter.[83] The queen confirmed the matter had been before the council for a long time.[84] Mather, apparently concerned about the negative press Massachusetts Bay received from its detractors, asked Mary if she had seen any

---

[79] *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New England,* 22.
[80] *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New England,* 22.
[81] *The Humble Address of the Publicans of New England,* 39.
[82] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* 38.
[83] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* 38.
[84] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* 39.

pamphlets about the charter. The queen answered that she had seen a few of them.[85] She then pressed the Boston minister about the church government in Massachusetts Bay, making it clear that she and William supported freedom of worship.[86] Mather, as he had done before, assured the monarch that Boston had conformed to the laws of England and would continue to do so.[87] The agents did not have to wait long for William. He arrived within two weeks of his interview with Mary, and he again managed to get an audience with the king. Mather pressed William for a charter, and the king responded that he expected the report from the Board of Trade within the next two days.[88]

The report from the Board wanted to know if the king intended to allow Massachusetts Bay to continue to appoint their own officers, or if the king preferred to place his own governor in control of the colony?[89] William told the council he preferred to appoint his own governor, but would accept recommendations from the colonists on whom that should be. The King left the next day to Flanders, leaving it to the council to work out the final details of a charter.[90] Shortly thereafter, the details emerged much to the dissatisfaction of Increase Mather. The new charter would have a royally appointed governor, but worse, the governor had a veto power over the legislature.[91] The Board of Trade responded to Mather's protest by telling him he had to take the matter up, yet one more time, with the king.[92] Mather worked with the king's attorney general to remove the language, and they sent a letter with a draft for a revised charter to William in Flanders.

---

[85] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 40.
[86] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 41.
[87] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 41.
[88] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 41.
[89] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 43-4.
[90] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 44.
[91] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 44-5.
[92] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 45.

Mather also engaged the queen's help once again to have the governor's veto removed.[93] The agent's efforts were to no avail. William rejected Mather's requests and confirmed the draft from the Board of Trade for the new charter.[94]

## The Second Charter

All of Increase Mather's efforts, from writing tracts, to lobbying members of Parliament, to politicking, not only royal ministers, but also the monarchs themselves, led to a limited compromised document. The charter reflected the tenor of William's administration when it came to dealing with the remnants of James II's old government policies. What Mather and his fellow colonials lost in dealing with William and Mary in term of political power, they gained in territorial control – which for the time, appeared to be satisfactory. Massachusetts Bay lost political power and gained political territory. The new charter redrew the lines of control to include the province of Maine and Plymouth colony. It drew the southern boundary to Connecticut and Rhode Island colonies, but they did not gain New Hampshire.[95] They also were able to keep their land titles issued under the old charter, and cities and towns retained their incorporated status.[96] In terms of local control, the colony could continue to grant titles to land and appoint local officers. This included the election of the General Court.[97] But they could not send representatives to Parliament. The document continued to confirm their place as co-equals with England stating:

---

[93] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 46.
[94] Mather, *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Increase Mather, Andros Tract,* vol. 3, 47.
[95] United States Congress, "The Charter of Massachusetts Bay—1691," *In The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*, ed. Francis Newton Thorpe (Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909).
[96] United States Congress, "The Charter of Massachusetts Bay-1691."
[97] United States Congress, "The Charter of Massachusetts Bay-1691."

> And every of the Subjects of us our heirs and successors which shall goe to and inhabit within our said province and territory and every of their children which shall happen to be born there or on the seas in going thither or returning from thence shall have and enjoy all liberties and immunities of free and natural subjects within any of the dominions of us Our heirs and successors to all intents constructions and purposes whatsoever as if they and every of them were borne within this *Our Realme* of England.[98]

Massachusetts Bay did have some past privileges removed, namely in the area of executive power. The king would now select the governor and lieutenant governor from recommendations made by the colonists. Nonetheless, as a reminder, on an attempt to check the power of local government in the General Court, the governor now had the power of a veto over any acts of the colonial legislature.[99] This item rattled Increase Mather the most; however, he had little choice but to accept it. And as a step toward religious tolerance, any freeholder could now vote in public elections not just Congregationalists.[100] Liberty of conscience or worship became the law of the land.[101] A peculiar aspect of the 1691 charter was the absence of a reference to Parliament except in one section dealing with oaths of fidelity to the Crown.[102] In other words, the colony answered to the king, not Parliament, tying them to the executive and diminishing their representative rights.

The agents of Massachusetts Bay, and Increase Mather in particular, received much criticism for the charter they were able to obtain. Mather again took to the printing press to defend his actions, this time to his fellow colonists. In a pamphlet titled *A Brief Account of the Several Agents of New England,* Mather explains not only what he did and

---

[98] United States Congress, "The Charter of Massachusetts Bay-1691."
[99] United States Congress, "The Charter of Massachusetts Bay-1691."
[100] United States Congress, "The Charter of Massachusetts Bay-1691."
[101] United States Congress, "The Charter of Massachusetts Bay-1691."
[102] United States Congress, "The Charter of Massachusetts Bay-1691." The document did not denote section numbers.

why, but give us a glimpse of what the new charter would mean to Boston. He made clear that he had no choice but to go through the king and "implore royal favor."[103] He explained that he had written exhaustingly, promoting the rights of New England, but the Board of Trade did not care about his quest for political equity. Furthermore, he could not gain the help of Parliament; it was not in their best interests.[104] He laid the blame for this squarely on the House of Lords, stating:

> Although the Archbishop of Canterbury that now is, and many of the present bishops, are Friends to New-England, (as well as to all good Men,) and I have cause to acknowledge the personal respect I have received from many of them... nevertheless, when they should understand that the King was desirous to have the Country put under another form of government, which his royal wisdom judged would be better for them than what they formerly enjoyed, the Lords would be very slow in doing anything that they knew would be dissatisfactory to his Majesty.[105]

He went on to assert that had the Parliament confirmed the old charter the colony would have ended up in worse circumstances.[106] The colony would have lost the provinces of Maine and Plymouth, and New Hampshire's borders would have been enlarged to include Salem.[107] They would have ended up back in the same situation that they were under before the removal of the charter, with agents from England inspecting their trade and causing friction in London.[108] Mather then went on to extoll the virtues of the new charter. Granted, the Boston minister was trying to deflect criticism of his action but within his remarks, we find the colonial view of their place in the empire. They could appoint their own officers again but more importantly:

---

[103] Increase Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England with Some Remarks on the New Charter Granted to the Colony of Massachusetts* (London: 1691), 6.
[104] Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England,* 7, 16.
[105] Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England,* 16.
[106] Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England,* 17.
[107] Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England,* 17.
[108] Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England,* 18.

> All English liberties are restored to them: no persons shall have a penny of their Estates taken from them; nor any laws imposed on them, without their own consent by representatives chosen by themselves. Religion is secured; for liberty is granted to all men to worship God after that manner which in their consciences they shall be persuaded.[109]

Mather went on to say "The General Court (now that the Massachusetts Colony is made a Province) hath, with the King's Approbation, as much Power in New-England, as the King and Parliament have in England."[110] The legislature could, without question, tax, confirm titles, and incorporate towns.[111] Mather admitted that the veto would make the colony "more monarchical and less democratical than in former times," but he assured his fellow colonists "New-England is by this Charter more privileged than Ireland, and then any English plantation whatsoever, or than they that live in England itself are."[112]

With the new charter, the ordeal between Boston and London ended for the time being. The colony still faced the existent hostilities with the Indians and the French, but peace would eventually come. The king confirmed their charter, and replaced Simon Bradstreet as governor. Indeed a new era began for New England. Increase Mather understood that Massachusetts Bay had lost some of its privileges in the executive branch, but he also understood what they gained; relief from Edward Randolph's continual prying into their trade practices. More importantly, they gained legitimacy from a sovereign they could respect. Finally, the new charter confirmed their place in the empire and their view of what that meant.

---

[109] Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England,* 18.
[110] Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England,* 19.
[111] Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England,* 20.
[112] Mather, *A Brief Account Concerning Several of the Agents of New England,* 21.

# CONCLUSION

The various forms of British government in the seventeenth century continually redefined the Massachusetts Bay colonists' relationship with England. Initially the colony defined its identity as a dissident group that obtained rights from the Crown to leave the country and colonize North America. In this first circumstance, Charles I granted the Puritans a large amount of autonomy in their new colony. This act, however, instigated conflicting views on the rights of Englishmen living in the colony, compared to those living in the metropole. Winthrop and his followers saw the grant as a foundational document, creating a formal government. The charter's loose construction and its confirmation of English rights to those who joined the new colony, only confirmed this belief. For the Puritans, the document became as sacrosanct as the *Manga Carta*. The Crown had a more traditional understanding of the charter. The Massachusetts Bay Colony was a corporation, just as other company charters had been classified in the fledgling British Empire. As the charter stated, the Crown expected a return on the investment of any precious metals, and government levies on the new territory. Both concepts were in the document; however, the two parties to the agreement saw what suited them; nevertheless, the Puritans enjoyed as much liberty as the Crown allowed.

At first it appeared that London left Boston to its own devices and indeed, in the early years of the colony, they did not seek help from England. The Puritans sought to expand their new homeland and brought many of their fellow co-religionists to New England. This in itself made Massachusetts Bay different from the other colonies, because the people that arrived were families leaving England, not primarily to seek their fortune in a new land, but, to settle in a place that represented their personal values. By

1635 Charles I realized this, and made the Crown's first attempt to remove the charter. He took the colony to court, much like he would a commercial enterprise. This only confirmed to the colonists that they were the same as an Englishman in London. The Crown had to go through the proscribed legal proceedings to act against them. Charles ultimately obtained the revocation of the charter, but the English Civil War prevented him from acting on it.

The war also ushered in the next change in the relationship with Massachusetts Bay. This era still needs more attention; however it does demonstrate the fluctuation in the political connections between London and Massachusetts Bay. The commonwealth that emerged in the aftermath was much more akin to the government in Boston. Both derived from the same ideological background of the Puritan concepts of republican government. Oliver Cromwell, the new leader of the commonwealth defined the executive's relationship with the colony through their shared religious beliefs. Cromwell kept personal contact with the Puritan leaders of the colony and used this influence to expand both the empire and Puritanism. His use of New England clergy to proselyte among the Catholics in Ireland demonstrated how he used indirect influence on the colony. This influence, although limited, did continue to reinforce the notion of Massachusetts Bay being co-equals with the core of the Empire.

The relationship with England changed again after the Restoration. Charles II did not immediately delve into colonial policy when he became king. For the first fifteen years they were free of Stuart interference. In the mid-1670's Charles II began his attack on colonial charters. He made some attempt at colonial organization by placing the Southern and Caribbean colonies under Blathwayt and New England under Randolph.

In both instances, the king wanted the colonial legislatures to conform to English law, but more importantly to pay their taxes. If possible, Charles II would have liked to have arrived at some sort of arrangement with the colony to settle the tax issue as he did in the case of Barbados. The Caribbean and Southern colonies, however, had something that New England did not—marketable commodities in the form of tobacco and sugar. Massachusetts Bay's contribution to the empire rested in supporting the Caribbean with food and horses as well as the carrying trade business, none of which were a quick cash product. This drawback, lack of high – profile – saleable – goods, as well as their ties to Charles II's political opponents kept them from accommodating the Crown, which led to the removal of their charter.

Charles II, like his father, followed standard-English-legal practices in trying to revoke Massachusetts Bay's charter. As his case went through the courts, the Boston government took every legal advantage they could. They were able to delay the removal for nearly seven years. On his third attempt to nullify the charter, Charles II used a legal technicality in his favor, causing the Massachusetts Bay government to argue they had been wronged in the court system. As this process moved upon its painfully slow pace, it demonstrated the difficulties the Crown encountered in trying to control its overseas possessions, as well as their own ambiguity of colonial rights. The avenue used by Charles II reconfirmed the colonist's position that they retained their rights as English citizens in New England. We do not know exactly how Charles II would have arranged the new government in Massachusetts Bay, because he died before the transition took place. Certainly, Randolph, among others, called for drastic action in the colony. Most of this came from Edward Randolph who argued that the colony was in a state of rebellion

and in league with the king's enemies. These lower level political connections also require more study, but it does illuminate the ill will between monarch and colony. In some ways, this enmity could be considered latent hostility from the English Civil War. Charles II's last order in council on the subject only approved a new governor and gave him the power to have an assembly if needed. By putting a royal governor in place, Charles was willing to concede; however, his brother James did much more.

James II departed from any kind of accommodation with the colonists. He apparently agreed with Edward Randolph's assessment of the attitude of Massachusetts Bay toward the Crown, as well as the remedy for it. With the most liberal charter in New England gone, James II not only reorganized the territorial boundaries, but the society as well. He removed all pretenses of English liberties, starting with the de facto cancellation of the Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Plymouth charters, and combining them with Massachusetts Bay. Maintaining a façade of concern, James followed through on the motions of going to court in the cases of Connecticut and Rhode Island, only to have his royal governor intimidate them into surrendering their charters, but Plymouth did not even receive the semblance of legality; it was simply removed. All New England colonial representative government disappeared. He replaced it with an appointed council by the executive. He did not stop there. James II's governor, Edmond Andros went much further in reshaping the Puritan's society by launching political, social and economic blockades to induce further changes.

One of Andros's first actions in New England was enforcement of James II's Liberty of Conscience Act. The enforcement of freedom of worship reduced the power of the Puritan establishment, thus giving the minority Anglicans more influence in society.

The changes in culture continued. Not satisfied with the right of freedom of worship, the Dominion government intruded into Puritan beliefs. The new administration required oaths to be taken on a Bible and authorized the image of the cross on the militia's standards. Both actions were highly offensive to Puritan beliefs. They continued the changes with the celebration of religious holidays and royal occasions, such as James II's ascension and the birth of his son. All of these things were part of English life, now placed in New England to attempt to bring them to conformity. This forced them to tolerate, at least, the state religion, although they could not accept it.

On the political front, not only did the legislature cease to exist, but Andros' restriction of town meetings to once a year hampered the accustomed practice of republican government. In one case where Andros allowed a meeting to appoint a tax collector, the men of Ipswich refused to comply. In their trial for their insubordination, the Andros government revealed its views of the status of New Englanders to them. The colonists complained that they could not raise taxes without a vote from an assembly, while the government told them that English rights did not travel with them. This interchange clearly defined the problem and the Andros government gave notice that the colonists were not co-equals with the metropole; that James II intended for them to become subordinate to London and to make them more dependent on the Crown. The privilege of representative government did not extend to all parts of the empire, especially those controlled by the monarch. In other words, the colonials were virtually represented by the Crown.

All of these actions helped to change in culture in New England, but economics would be most effective  The difficulties with the Crown started with economics, and for

more than a decade Edward Randolph had fought to enforce the Navigation Acts, only to be stymied by local authorities. Now with a government in harmony with London, he could carry out his duties. However, the Andros government went much further. They attacked property ownership by stripping all land titles, not only in terms of private property but of the township's commons, as well. They justified their actions by claiming the local governments were incorporated illegally under the old charter. This changed the relationship with the Crown the most because in order to reinstate a title, the Crown required the owner to apply to the governor appointed by the king. The colonists did not accept the idea that the monarch held all the land in New England, as evidenced by the conversation between Reverend Higgson and Edmond Andros. Making land available only through Royal approval drew the citizens of Massachusetts Bay to the monarch.

The attacks on the society of New England amounted to cultural imperialism designed to reduce the status of the colony to that of a subordinate of England. The power of the state to intimidate the colonists was reinforced by the arrival of regular troops and the issuing of writs of intrusion against landowners for being on their own property. The English subjects of Massachusetts Bay put up some resistance. They disrupted Anglican meetings, refused to comply as the men of Ipswich did, moved stakes of surveyor's trying to map out the land but held back from outright rebellion. They managed to dispatch Increase Mather to London to appeal to James II. Although the king met with the Boston minister, he did not have a substantive discourse with him. Mather's audiences proved unfruitful. The limited resistance efforts did not amount to much and despite initially refusing to reapply for their land grants, settlers such as Samuel Sewell eventually came to the governor's office to get legal title to their land again. Had the Dominion

government remained in place, Massachusetts Bay most likely would have become the dependent colony James II wanted. Fortunately, for the Puritans of Boston, James II did not remain on the throne.

Once again, actions in London created changes in Boston. The passive resistance of the colonists to the abuses of the Andros government gave way to open rebellion, once they received the news of William of Orange's invasion. New Englanders saw an opportunity to remove the representative of an unfit monarch. William's pro-republican position and promise to restore charters that the Stuarts removed, gained him the loyalty of the Puritans in Massachusetts Bay. He became an acceptable king whose policies reflected the Puritan's beliefs. The news that England had overthrown James II gave Bostonians the confidence that they could do the same to one of his governors. Once they seized Andros and his cronies, the administration of the colony fell back into the hands of the colonists. They now faced the problem of legitimacy. Most agreed that Charles II removed the charter in a legal manner and therefore, it must be restored in the same way. They had to look to London as the only authority that could reinstate the nullified charter. The leaders in Boston had to follow the law. Increase Mather in England, also shared this concept, as evidenced by his efforts to restore the charter months before he had heard of the rebellion in Massachusetts.

Mather's quest to regain legitimacy became intertwined in the struggle between the executive and legislative powers in England. William promised a restoration of charters and naturally, Mather went to him first, only to find out that the new king had deferred the issue to the Parliament. William seemed unsure of the extent of his authority. He also did not seek to make changes to standing colonial policies, preferring to leave the

current appointees in place. By convincing William not to reconfirm Andros, Mather did affect the retention of Andros, but in the effort to shape the new charter, he had limited success. Richard Johnson argued that Mather used the political process to his advantage, but despite his pamphlets, and lobbying members of Parliament in behalf of Massachusetts Bay, the politics of London held more sway than his arguments. The Parliament could have tied itself to Massachusetts Bay through the Corporations Bill and enhance the legislature's influence in colonial policy, but it did not. The Parliament treated New England as any other incorporated entity in England and just added them to the bill. They did not consider Massachusetts' situation as different from anybody else, missing the opportunity of establishing a relationship with the Boston government. The eventual demise of the bill had nothing to do with Massachusetts or any other corporation; it resulted from Whig overreach by trying to punish their political opponents. This forced Mather back to the executive branch for legitimacy.

Here too, internal English politics stymied Mather's goal of a full restoration of the old charter. William maintained a policy of conciliation that included keeping intact many of James II's appointees. This meant leaving the same Board of Trade who helped install Andros intact. The king left it to this committee along with a few of his advisors to confirm a new charter. Mather had limited influence with this body. He found this out first hand from the intimidation he received during the Andros hearing, causing him not to sign the charges; resulting in Andros' exoneration. Likewise, he saw limited success in the pamphlet war between himself and Andros' council members. As the Board of Trade considered the new charter, Mather laid out his case that the people of Massachusetts Bay were co-equals with England. Rights, liberties and the culture of England traveled with

them. Randolph and Palmer made the distinction between what a citizen in the metropole could expect, rather than one in the periphery; essentially saying rights do not travel. Despite all of Mather's efforts to regain the old charter, the Board came back with a compromised charter. Massachusetts Bay ended up with divided government. The new charter tried to strike a balance between the coveted representative system that the Puritans wanted, and one that entailed some kind of royal oversight. They regained their legislature in exchange for a royal governor with veto powers. In addition, the new rulings forced the old Puritan community to expand the electorate to non-Congregationalists, and accept the king's religious tolerance policy. However, their rights as Englishmen were reconfirmed; and their local government and land titles were restored.

The reissuing of the charter gave to the Puritans legitimacy of government. This bestowal came from a monarch that was acceptable to them; who unlike the other Stuarts, had respect for republican government. They were even able to accept his religious tolerance policy. This now tied them to the monarchy in a way they had not under the Stuarts. Before the Glorious Revolution, they had always been at odds with the king over either religion, taxes, or local authority. This reconfirmed to the colonists their co-equal status with England because William continued allowance of a legislature, and even the expansion of the electorate reconfirmed republican ideology in New England. Therefore, Bernard Bailyn correctly argued that the colonies favored elected government and expanded liberty, as did McConville, as far as adoration for the monarch is concerned, because William reconfirmed legitimacy as an acceptable king. Increase Mather confirmed this view in his defense of the 1691 Charter.

At no point under the first charter did the Crown, regardless of who it was on at the time, and the colonists of Massachusetts Bay share the same understanding of their place in the empire. The closest it came may have been under Cromwell. Both Charles I and II did not consider the Puritans as having the same rights as their subjects in England, but they gave the colonists the impression that they did. The only one who left the people of New England in no doubt of their standing was James II. The settlement of the government in New England after the Glorious Revolution solidified the colonist's errant view of their standing. The Crown unwittingly created a new line of representative government in North America. While England would consolidate executive power into the legislature, in America it remained separate. The North American version relied more on local control than national. The issue came down to perception of where they fit into the empire. Perhaps Thomas "Tip" O'Neill, a son of Boston some nearly three hundred years later, put it best stating, "All politics is local."[1]

[1] American Experience, "Biography: Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill," http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/biography/carter-oneill/

## PRIMARY SOURCES

### ARCHIVAL

*Andros Tracts.*

*Calendar Series of State Papers.*

*Massachusetts Historical Society.*

### DIARIES AND JOURNALS

Bradford, William. *Of Plymouth Plantation 1620- 1647.* Edited by Samuel Eliot Morison. Newark: Rutgers University Press, 1952.

Cromwell, Oliver. *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches.* Edited by Thomas Carlyle. New York: Harper & Brother, 1868.

Mather, Cotton. *Diary of Cotton Mather.* Boston: Massachusetts Historical Society, 1911.

Mather, Increase. *The Diary of Increase Mather.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: John Wilson and Son University Press, 1900.

Randolph, Edward. *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers from the New England, Middle, and Southern Colonies in America, with Other Documents Relating Chiefly to the Vacating of the Royal Charter of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay1676-1703.* Boston: John Winslow and Sons, 1899.

Randolph, Edward. *Edward Randolph: His Letters and Official Papers from the New England, Middle, and Southern Colonies in America, with Other Documents Relating Chiefly to the Vacating of the Royal Charter of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay, 1678-1700.* Boston: John Winslow and Sons, 1909.

Sewall, Samuel. *The Diary of Samuel Sewall, 1674-1729, Vol. I.* Edited by M. Halsey Thomas. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1973.

Winthrop, John. *Winthrop's Journal: A History of New England.* Edited by James Kendall Hosmer. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1908.

## GOVERNMENTAL DOCUMENTS

Massachusetts Bay Colony. *The Massachusetts Body of Liberties.* Boston: 1641.

Massachusetts Bay Colony. *The General Court's Answers to Joseph Dudley.* Boston: 1686.

United Kingdom, *Charter Granted by Queen Elizabeth to the East India Company* London: 1600. http://www.sdstate.edu/projectsouthasia/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfile&PageID=857407.

United Kingdom. *Commonwealth Instrument of Government.* London: 1653. Fordham University. http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1653intrumentgovt.asp.

United Kingdom, *Journal of William Blathwayt, Surveyor and Auditor General of American Revenues (copies of letters).* London.

United Kingdom. *Petition of Right.* London 1628. British Historical Documents http://www.britannia.com/history/docs/petition.html.

United Kingdom, *The Parliamentary History of England from the Earliest Period to the Year 1803: From which Last-Mentioned Epoch it is Continued Downwards in the Work Entitled,* "The Debate on the Corporation Bill" vol. V 1688-1702 London: T. C. Hansard 1809.

United States Congress. "Charter of Connecticut 1662". In *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*, Edited by Francis Newton Thorpe. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909.

United States Congress. "Charter of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations- July 15, 1663" In *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*, Edited by Francis Newton Thorpe. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909.

United States Congress. "Commission of Sir Edmund Andros for the Dominion of New England April 7 1688," In *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America,* Edited by Francis Newton Thorpe. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909.

United States Congress, "First Charter of Massachusetts" in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America.* Edited by Francis Newton Thorpe. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1909.

United States Congress, "The Charter of Massachusetts Bay--1691" in *The Federal and State Constitutions Colonial Charters, and Other Organic Laws of the States, Territories, and Colonies Now or Heretofore Forming the United States of America*. Edited by Francis Newton Thorpe Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office 1909.

PAMPHLETS/ BROADSHEETS

Bradford, William *Of Plymouth Plantation 1620- 1647*. Edited by Samuel Eliot Morison, Newark, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press 1952.

Coke, Edward. *Judges Judged Out of Their Own Mouths or The Question Resolved by Magna Charta & C. Who Have Been England's Enemies, Kings Seducers, and Peoples Destroyers, from Henry 3 to Henry 8 and Before and Since.* London: W. Bently 1651.

Dudley, Joseph. *The Speech of the Honorable Joseph Dudley, May 17, 1686.* Boston: Pierce for Phillips, 1686.

Dudley, Joseph. *A Proclamation the 28th day of May 1686.* Boston: 1686.

Gershom, Berkeley "The People's Right to Election of Alteration of Government in Connecticut." William Bradford Printer 1689, Evans Collection 459 wing, 2nd ed., B5401.

Mather, Cotton. *Memoirs of the Life of the Late Reverend Increase Mather.* London: John Clark and Richard Hett, 1725.

Willard, Samuel. *A Brief Discourse Concerning that Ceremony of Laying the Hand on the Bible in Swearing.* London: J. A. 1689.

Wood, William. *New Englands Prospect: A True, Lively, and Experimentall Description of that part of America Commonly Called New England.* London: Thomas Cotes, 1634.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

### MONOGRAPHS

Adair, John. *Founding Fathers: The Puritans in England and America,* London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd. 1982.

Bailyn, Bernard and Lotte Bailyn. *Massachusetts Shipping 1697-1714: A Statistical Study.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press, 1959.

Bailyn, Bernard. *The Origins of American Politics* New York: Vintage Books 1967.

Cellineri, Louis E. *Seaport Dynamics: A Regional Perspective.* Lexington Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1976.

Conzen, Michael P. and George K. Lewis. *Boston: A Geographical Portrait*, Cambridge. Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1976.

Demos, John. *A Little Commonwealth: Family Life in Plymouth Colony,* London: Oxford University Press 1970.

Games, Alison. *Migration and the Origins of the English Atlantic World.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Games, Allison. *The Web of Empire: English Cosmopolitans in an Age of Expansion.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Guy, John. *Tudor England.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Hill, Christopher. *The Century of Revolution: 1603-1714.* New York: W. W, Norton & Company, 1961.

Howe, Stephen. *Empire: A Very Short Introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Johnson, Richard R. *Adjustment to Empire and The New England Colonies 1675-1715.* Piscataway, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1981.

Kishlansky, Mark. *A Monarchy Transformed: Britain 1603-1714*. London: Penguin Books, 1996.

Lovejoy, David S. *The Glorious Revolution in America.* New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

McConville, Brendan. *The King's Three Faces: The Rise and Fall of Royal America 1688-1776,* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006.

Miller Perry, *The New England Mind From Colony to Province.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of the University of Harvard Press, 1953.

Mintz, Sidney W. *Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History*. New York: Penguin 1985.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. *The Maritime History of Massachusetts: 1783-1860.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921.

Nash, Gary B. *Red, White, and Black: The Peoples of Early America.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1974.

Rutman, Darrett B. *Winthrop's Boston: Portrait of a Puritan Town 1630-1649*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1965.

Pincus, Steve. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Sherwood, Roy Edward. *Oliver Cromwell: King in all but Name 1653-1658.* New York: St Martin's Press, 1977.

Stanwood, Owen. *The Empire Reformed: English America in the Age of the Glorious Revolution.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.

Webb, Stephen Saunders. *1676: The End of American Independence.* New York: Knopf, 1984.

Winship, Michael P. *Seers of God: Puritan Providentialism in the Restoration and Early Enlightenment.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.

Whitehill, Walter Muir. *Boston: A Topographical History.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Belknap Press, 1950.

Writers Program Work Project Administration. *Boston Looks Seaward: Story of the Port 1630-1940.* Boston: Bruce Humphries Inc., 1941.

BIOGRAPHIES

Airy, Osmund. *Charles II.* New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1904.

Gaunt, Peter. *Oliver Cromwell.* New York: New York University Press, 2004.

Hall, Michael G. *The Last American Puritan: The Life of Increase Mather.* Hanover, New Hampshire: Wesleyan University Press, 1988.

Lustig, Mary Lou. *The Imperial Executive in America: Sir Edmond Andros 1637-1714.* Danvers, Massachusetts: Rosemont Publishing, 2002.

Miller, John. *James II.* London: Wayland Ltd., 1978.

Ogg, David. *William III.* New York: Macmillan, 1956.

Reeve, L. J. *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

ACADEMIC JOURNALS

Burnard, Trevor. "Making a Whig Empire Work: Transatlantic Politics and the Imperial Economy in Britain and British America." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 69 (2012): 51-6.

Dale, Elizabeth. "Conflicts of Law: Reconsidering the Influence of Religion on Law in Massachusetts Bay." *Numen* 43 (1996): 139-156.

Dunn, Richard S. "John Winthrop Writes His Journal." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 41 (1984): 185-212.

Games, Alison. "Beyond the Atlantic: English Globetrotter and Transoceanic Connections." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 63 (2006): 675-92.

Lewis, Theodore B. "Land Speculation and the Dudley Council of 1686." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 31 (1974): 255-72.

Miller, Guy Howard. "Rebellion in Zion: The Overthrow of the Dominion of New England." *Historian* 30 (1968): 439-59.

Simmons, Richard C. "The Massachusetts Revolution of 1689: Three Early American Political Broadsides." *Journal of American Studies* 2 (1968): 1-12.

Smith, J. C. "The Concept of Native Title." *The University of Toronto Law Journal,* 24 (1974): 1-16.

Stanwood, Owen. "The Protestant Moment: Antipopery, the Revolution of 1688-1689, and the Making of an Anglo-American Empire." *Journal of British Studies,* 46 (2007): 481-508.

Stilgoe, John R. "A New England Coastal Wilderness." *Geographical Review* 71 (1981): 33-50.

Webb, Stephen S. "William Blathwayt, imperial Fixer: From Popish Plot to Glorious Revolution." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 25 (1968): 3-21.

Winship, Michael P. "Godly Republicanism and the Origins of the Massachusetts Polity." *The William and Mary Quarterly* 63 (2006): 427-62.

ENCYCLOPEDIAS

*Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.*

ELECTRONIC DATABASES

MASSACHUSETTS HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Clough, Samuel C. "Map of the Town of Boston 1648" drawn by Samuel Clough April 10, 1919.

Clough, Samuel C. "Map of the Town of Boston 1676" drawn by Samuel Clough 1920.

OTHERS

The American Experience. "Biography: Thomas P. "Tip" O'Neill." Accessed March 2, 2014, http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/biography/carter-oneill/.

Celebrate Boston "Massachusetts Bay Colony: A Brief History." Accessed on April 12, 2014, http://www.celebrateboston.com/history/massachusetts.htm.

Encyclopedia Britannica Online. "Act of Oblivion." Accessed April 21, 2013. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/423890/Act-of-Oblivion.

Encyclopedia Britannica Online. "Board of Trade." Accessed April 19, 2014. http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/601629/Board-of-Trade.

The National Archives "Britain and the Trade." Accessed April 22, 2014, http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pathways/blackhistory/africa_caribbean/britain_trade.htm.