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NOTE ON SPELLINGS IN SOURCES

Spellings from primary material have not been changed in general. For obsolete characters, the modern form has been substituted, as in the cases of s for ŋ.

Additionally, the abbreviations of the period have all been expanded into modern characters.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study compares the Ards colony begun in 1571, Munster plantation begun in 1583, Ulster plantation begun in 1606 (all in Ireland), and the Jamestown colony begun in 1607 (in Virginia) to demonstrate that a standard line of colonial thought, modified for circumstance and prior experience, runs throughout the period from 1560 to 1620. It supports the prevailing ideas among historians that the genesis of England’s colonial power occurred in Ireland, and that the ideas generated there were transplanted overseas because they came to define, at least in the earliest period of colonization, what a colony was in the minds of the English. These four projects are among the first English attempts at colonization and the only four from this earliest colonization period with evidence of significant preliminary planning. Additionally, the Ards and Munster projects received approval from the same administration, the Ulster

1 In general, the words ‘plantation’ and ‘colony’ are interchangeable. In the case of the Ards project alone did its planner insist on calling it a colony, whereas the Munster and Ulster projects use only plantation and Jamestown is referred to either way, though is usually referred to as a colony by American historians. The concept remains the same regardless which word is used, though plantation became the standard usage for Irish projects because it was thought to sound gentler due to its agricultural derivation.
plantation drew conscious inspiration from the Munster experience, and Jamestown came into being contemporaneously with the Ulster plantation.

These projects bridge the reigns of two monarchs, Elizabeth I (1558-1603) and James I (1603-1625). Each desired to create stability in Ireland and finally end the chances of armed disturbance and rebellion. This goal drove the formation of policy for ‘planting’ colonies, which was seen as sowing the seeds of civilization (thus agriculturally-based terminology such as ‘plantation’ and ‘planting’ became standard usage for such projects). The monarchs’ concerns differ in two major points. First, Elizabeth insisted that the status of the Irish as subjects ensured to them the same rights as her English subjects, that these rights must not be violated, and even remained hesitant to act when the law clearly favored such action if unrest might ensue. James, on the other hand, held no reservations about relocating Irish subjects in order to ensure the peace. Secondly, during Elizabeth’s reign there existed a state of war or quasi-war with Spain, creating apprehension about Spanish intervention in Ireland. James created an official peace with Spain, all but alleviating fears over Spanish attack. Concern remained in the case of Jamestown however, that Spain might attempt to prevent the English from establishing claim to American land. Regardless of these differences, the main thrust of colonial planning remained the establishment of a settlement that would create stability along the lines of English society and be secure in itself from outside threats.
In order to examine how the early English colonial idea develops in Ireland and crosses the Atlantic, I wish to further investigate and achieve a better understanding of the connections between Ireland and America at the beginning of the first British Empire. To do so, I will compare the rhetoric and planning of these projects on the basis of seven criteria. In the rhetoric category, the criteria for comparison are the descriptions of the native people, the descriptions of the targeted lands, and the manner in which each of these contributed to the justification of plantation. The criteria for comparison in the planning category are: who initiated each project, the means of funding and financial terms, the manner of establishing claim to the lands, the means of granting the lands to settlers, and the status that the natives would hold within the plantation. The projects were chosen based on their importance in terms of scale and duration, the available literature regarding their planning and justifications, and their dates of origin. The choice of criteria springs from consideration of the theory that the English had a standard conception of what a colony should be and the fundamentals on which each of these projects was built develop from that concept. The criteria demonstrate on a very basic level the English conception of a colony, that this idea had influence in both Ireland and America, and that a gulf existed between the rhetoric and planning regarding the place of the natives within colonies.
Arguing for Connections from Ireland to America

The idea that England’s colonies in America and vast colonial empire derived their roots from the English experience in Ireland has been gaining popularity, at least since D. B. Quinn began supporting it in the mid-twentieth century. The idea has such currency that it has begun to appear in some textbooks on United States history. The fundamental premise is that the difficulties faced by the English in taming Ireland in the sixteenth century generated ideas used to subdue other lands. Though the English had struggled to subdue Ireland since the twelfth century, the policies of the Tudors (primarily Elizabeth) finally spread crown authority throughout the island. In the end, the combination of warfare and plantation achieved the total subjugation of the island, despite Elizabeth’s attempts to avoid this combined method, mainly because of its expense. The transatlantic connections to be found here exist in the rhetoric, planning, and execution of the plantations.

In writing on the plantation schemes enacted during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in Ireland, historians often refer to the connections and similarities between these and the early English colonies in

---


3 Though the culmination of this subdual occurred during James I’s reign, the policies used by his government were continuations of those of Elizabeth’s reign.
America. Few historians have made an effort to explore these connections and similarities in any detail. Most, in fact, mention the considerable overlap in the men involved in these ventures, but decline to discuss the topic further. While this overlap in personnel is considerable, including such familiar names as Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, John White, and Captain John Smith, more direct connections in theory and rhetoric exist.

The following chapters will explore the connections in rhetoric and planning between the plantation projects in the Ards, Munster, Ulster, and Virginia. Comparing these projects on the criteria listed above demonstrates the connections that come about because there existed in the minds of the English planners an idea of what comprised a colony. The means, justifications, and the potential achievements of realizing this idea developed in the context of the English goal of subduing Ireland to the authority of the crown. Further, the means used in each project underwent some modification in response to both the unique circumstances under which they are founded and to failures or perceived failures of prior projects. These points of comparison and adaptation serve to illustrate that Ireland and America are connected.

Among the historians who discuss early English colonialism in these two regions, two stand out as having furthest advocated the existence of such connections, David Beers Quinn and Nicholas Canny. Though neither has produced a definitive text on the continuity between these regions, these men
have laid the groundwork and set the standard for inquiry into this area. They
discuss in significant detail the colonial nature of Ireland, the men active as
proponents and planners of colonization, and the courses that these projects ran.
Concerning connections between Ireland and America, they have painted only
with a very broad brush, pointing out such things as overlapping personnel and
similarities in the literature concerning news of Irish plantations and American
colonies. There remains room for work with a finer brush concerning specific
connections and similarities to create a more complete picture.

Quinn has written a great deal on both Ireland and early American
exploration and colonization, and edited numerous volumes of primary material
for publication.\(^4\) None of these truly delves into the trans-Atlantic connections of
interest here; rather, Quinn makes his greatest contribution in discussing
whether Ireland was colonial or non-colonial in its relationship with the English
crown. He states that Ireland has a dual nature in this respect, one part feudal
fief and another colonial province. This dual nature expresses itself in the

\(^4\) Notable among these are *The Elizabethans and the Irish* (Ithaca, New York:
Cornell University Press for the Folger Shakespeare Library, 1966), and *Ireland
and America: Their Early Associations, 1500-1640* (Liverpool: Liverpool University
Press, 1991). Additionally, Quinn’s articles include “Sir Thomas Smith (1513-
1577) and the Beginnings of English Colonial Theory” *Proceedings of the
American Philosophical Society* 89, no. 4 (December 1945): 543-60, and “Ireland
and Sixteenth Century European Expansion” in *Historical Studies* 1 (1958): 20-
32. Perhaps the broadest sounding of Quinn’s titles, “Ireland and Sixteenth
Century European Expansion,” yields some good topics for discussion, but
focuses mainly on responding to an earlier article in which Professor Charles
Verlinden suggested a scheme for comparative colonialism.
creation of two ideas for the proper policy in Ireland during this period. The first, which Quinn states was advocated by the majority, he names the “soft” or progressive policy, under which Ireland would be subjected to a largely peaceful reformation through law. Force would remain an element of policy, but would not be the primary mover of reform. The second type of thought, which Quinn calls the “tough” policy, revolves entirely around a new conquest. After this coerced submission, English law could be spread through the island.\(^5\) The differences in these policies and early resistance to the tough policy play an important role in how the rhetoric of plantation was shaped.

Others of Quinn’s works offer insights in the development of connections between the two regions. For instance, he observes that the English had a very xenophobic nationalism that led them to speak “of the Gaelic Irish and the Amerindian inhabitants of North America in similar terms.”\(^6\) This is not just an interpretation of the language used in describing each, as he makes more clear when he describes how the English turned the Irish into a standard for direct comparison when discussing savageness and barbarism. The only other mention of connections between Ireland and America made by Quinn comes in citing examples of correspondence and news sheets where the plantations in Ulster


\(^6\) Quinn, *Ireland and America: Their Early Associations, 1500-1640*, 17.
and Virginia are mentioned together, suggesting that they were “closely associated in men’s minds and regarded as identical in character.”

Quinn supports the concept of continuity between plantation Ireland and colonial America, but only pursues it in very limited ways. His most important contributions are the idea of a colonial component of Ireland and a shared rhetoric of savageness regarding the Irish and the Indians. Further, Nicholas Canny recognizes Quinn as having “established the guidelines for a full investigation” of connections between Ireland and America.

Canny’s works focus almost strictly on Ireland, and point out along the way areas that he thinks are suitable for comparison with other English ventures of the period. In his works Canny develops the case that English plantation thought grew in part from an idea of cultural evolution similar to that of José de Acosta in his 1590 book Historia Natural y Moral de las Indias. The concept of cultural evolution Canny attributes to English colonizers resembles both the more modern concepts of Social Darwinism and the “White Man’s Burden.”

---

7 Quinn, The Elizabethans and the Irish, 22-27, 121-22.

8 Nicholas Canny, “The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America,” William & Mary Quarterly 30 (1973): 575. Canny’s idea of what these guidelines includes some broader discourse on what colonialism and imperialism are than what this study is concerned with, and shall not be discussed here.

English, in this view, held a responsibility to spread civilization to those people who were less advanced, much as they perceived the Romans having done for the early Britons. Canny recognizes that, for all this theory, the talk of civilizing the “barbarous savages” became simply rhetoric after the initial effort of Sir Thomas Smith to colonize the Ards resulted in the murder of his son, Thomas, by Irish servants in 1573.¹⁰

Canny considers Ireland a part of the Atlantic World and makes some attempts to link it to other activity in that realm. His links, however, tend to be allusions to the activity and thought elsewhere in the course of discussions of Ireland. Despite this, he makes strong inferences concerning these links. Canny claims that the English experience in Ireland established “a pattern of conquest, bolstered by attempts at colonization, which was contemporaneous with and parallel to the first effective contacts of Englishmen with North America,” and that this pattern and the thought behind it is equally applicable to subsequent English activity in the New World.¹¹

A great deal of work on the two regions separately has been done and an excellent foundation laid for examining their connectivity. There is, as yet, no clear place to begin or end such a study, however, and the


limits chosen for this study are based in convenience.\textsuperscript{12} It is my hope to make clearer the continuity in the English conception of a colony during this period, by examining the basic points of planning involved in projects for the Ards, Munster, Ulster, and the Jamestown colony.

The Idea of the First British Empire

In the historiography of British imperialism, the idea that there were two British Empires has been a continuous fixture since the early twentieth century. Historians describe the first British Empire as a commercial empire and an empire of settlement. Further, historians agree that this first empire was centered in North America and the Caribbean. The period of the projects to be considered here falls at the beginning of this first empire. As one might expect, these projects all demonstrate concern by the colonizers for both commercial gain and stability of settlement, suggesting that these concerns were important from early in the development of the first empire.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12} A similar study could be done comparing later American colonies on the same points of planning, and tracing changes and developments that occur. Additionally, the British Caribbean colonies could be examined in such a study.

For years, empire was studied as two separate parts, the metropolis and the colonies. Ireland variously fell into either category depending on the topic and the historian, but never comfortably within either. The advent of viewing the first empire in a transatlantic perspective, as an integrated whole rather than two distinct and separate parts, allowed this problem with Ireland to be resolved by accepting its duality.\textsuperscript{14} This does not necessarily mean that Ireland is considered part of the first empire; though it is recognized that plantation in Ireland is contemporaneous with and connected to the early stages of founding of the first empire. These connections reveal a continuity in the mindset of colonizers, which flows through the colonial aspect of Ireland into the first empire in the New World.

The similarities between the Irish plantations and the Virginia colony exist, not because these projects were considered part of an encompassing policy or plan, but because of the number of people involved in both, similarities in how the planners viewed the two regions, and similarities in the goals for both regions. Further, historians argue that there existed in the English mind an idea of what a colony quintessentially was, that is what the purpose of colonies was, what might be accomplished by planting colonies, and how a colony should be constructed so that it might succeed. Differences between the colonies remain

\textsuperscript{14} Marshall, “The First British Empire,” 45.
due to circumstances and differing interpretations of the individuals who plan
them, but the general pattern based on classical precedent is expected to hold.

The Pre-Plantation Situations of Ireland and America

The situation facing the planners of these plantation projects largely
accounts for the English ideal of colonies and the differences in each plan. That
the situation in Ireland was much better and more widely understood by
Englishmen and of more immediate concern set the context in which the
planners reconstructed ideas of colony building from their perceptions of the
classical Roman model.

The difficulties faced by the English in Ireland derived directly from the
decline of English lordship there during the Middle Ages, and the preoccupation
of the monarchs and chief nobles with the Wars of the Roses. By the coming of
the sixteenth century only a few key lordships, their clientage, and the Pale
remained under the umbrella of English law.\(^{15}\) By this time a number of
Englishmen understood the Irish culture quite well, as well as the ways in which
it was at variance with that of the English. Further they could look back on a
time when English influence had spread across almost all of Ireland for ideas of
how such control should be reestablished.

The Englishmen who were involved in governing Ireland understood a great deal about the Irish culture and what in it needed to be changed in order to bring them into subjection. The basic Irish political organization relied on a clan structure and clan clientage, which placed significant power on a local or regional level. To further frustrate the English, the clan chieftainship was not strictly hereditary, but passed through a system known as tanistry. The tanist, who would succeed to the leadership of the clan, descended from a previous leader (possibly as far back as his great-grandfather) and was named based largely on his support within the clan. The decline of English lordship in Ireland through the latter middle ages had reduced to very few the areas in which there was a strong lord loyal to the crown to maintain the primacy of English government, which allowed the Irish to expand at the expense of English power. Further, the more recent English efforts to engage Irish chiefs as clients or to manipulate the tanistry system in their own best interests had yielded very little success.  

The concentration of power at a relatively local level derived in part from the nature of the Irish economy, which rested on a primarily pastoral foundation, relying on cattle for its main food products including milk and butter. The Irish supplemented their diet with some oats and other plant products. Other

---

16 Kenneth Nicholls, *Gaelic and Gaelicised Ireland in the Middle Ages* (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1972), 60-64, 37.
important products included wool, cowhides, and linen, which provided a significant export trade in the Middle Ages.\textsuperscript{17} This livestock based economy created a general lack of large settlements due to the mobility and space required to pasture cattle, especially in a society practicing transhumance. This more scattered, more mobile population created difficulties in governance not found with a more concentrated, static population. Also, since cattle constituted the main form of wealth, raids could easily improve the condition of an individual or clan. During these raids, the raiders took cattle, but usually burned the crops because of the difficulty of transporting them. From the middle of the fourteenth century, as the Irish began to control more of the island, these raids had begun to target English held lands more frequently.\textsuperscript{18}

From this experience, the English developed two major points of colony planning, which shall be seen in the following chapters. First, the need for strong local leadership to protect the claims of the English settlement became a pillar of plantation building. Whether in the form of a new local governing body or simply resident landlords, this point of planning can be found in each of the plans examined here. Secondly, this local leadership required the means to see to the defense of its area of influence. This generally translated into a requirement that


\textsuperscript{18} Nicholls, \textit{Gaelic and Gaelicised}, 55-6, and “Gaelic Society,” 414-15.
the settler population be composed in such a way that it would be capable of defending itself from potentially hostile neighbors, without resort to a garrison of paid troops.

When projecting ideas for settlement in America, the English lacked the sort of cultural and social understanding that they had in Ireland. Prior to the founding of Jamestown, English contact with Indians remained brief, so that their image of what to expect remained based on the initial impressions of explorers and accounts in available literature of regions settled by other nations. The English certainly had some correct information, but even this could lead to misunderstanding. For instance, they recognized that the Indians in the area lived in small, scattered villages and engaged in a limited agriculture, which they supplemented with meat. The English, however, viewed the undeveloped lands around these villages as 'waste,' ignoring that the Indian economy relied on relatively large hunting grounds. Additionally, they described tribal chieftains as 'kings,' and acted in the belief that these men held virtually absolute governing authority over their people. Even this minimal understanding of Indian society allowed the English to draw parallels and, as Quinn points out, at times use the Irish as a comparative base when describing the Indians.

Because both Virginia and much of Ireland were viewed as largely unpopulated and unused, the English viewed them as waste in need of improvement. In Ireland, any attempt to 'improve' the condition of the country
must account for the Irish subjects, because the island had long been subject to the English crown and recently elevated to a kingdom. It was, in Queen Elizabeth’s opinion, the duty of the government to bring civilized life to its Irish subjects. In America, England had no long-standing, recognized claim to any lands. One of the priorities of any American colony, therefore, would be to establish legitimacy for itself. While many argued for colonization on the grounds that it was a moral imperative to bring civilization and “true religion” to the natives, this remained more of an ephemeral hope than anything resembling a plan of action.

Further, the long experience in Ireland had allowed for the development of established patterns of interaction with the Irish people. Thus the English had already a set of tools that they could use in treating with the Irish. The primary means by which they did so resembled the Roman practice of client-kingship. In so doing, the government would usually agree to uphold or support the claims, rights, or privileges of a clan chief in exchange for guarantees of peace or other agreements such as introducing English law to the chief’s clan. As the impetus to subjugate the entire island increased, this client-kingship-like practice shifted into the surrender and regrant scheme, in which the chief would surrender his clan’s claim to an area of land in return for a regrant of it to himself under English title. Surrender and regrant became an important part of the legal basis for the escheats that preceded the plantation projects.
Additionally, this long contact had created a degree of acculturation, which created both opportunities for manipulation and causes of concern. A number of Old English families understood the Gaelic Irish culture and lived enough within it to hold significant influence among some of the Irish. This benefited the government so long as these Old English remained loyal and could be made part of the program to extend English authority across the island. Some of these Old English, however, had been so far Gaelicized that the English saw them as practically Irish, and nearly as in need of civilizing. Further the loyalty of these highly gaelicized Old English remained greatly in doubt up to the rebellion of the earl of Desmond that prompted the Munster plantation.

When the English considered settling in America, they approached a land in which they had no long intercourse with the native people, nor any recognized claim to governance. The primary goal of any privately funded settlement would, of course, be profit for those who had invested, and secondarily to establish a legitimate claim. Finding the balance between long-term security and short-term profit proved the greatest challenge in this circumstance. When considering how to deal with the Indians, the English had to base decisions on rather shallow impressions of the character of the people and their culture that, however hopeful they might have been, always recognized the underlying possible threat. These people were not, however, subjects of the English crown and thus the colonizers had no qualms about leaving them outside of the pale of civilization.
With these factors in mind, the English could use many of the same conceptions about colonies in America as they did in Ireland. The one relatively liberating difference lay in not feeling compelled to subjugate the culture of the Indians, as they did that of the Irish. They still could not be dismissive of the local Indians when planting their colony, as they would be considered as a prime source of both trade and information as well as a potential danger should they become hostile. In both cases, the intention for the colony remained to establish a center of loyal population amongst possibly hostile natives in a land seen as underdeveloped in discord with its production potential. Once established, this center could serve as a place from which to expand ‘civilization.’ Further, this would have to be achieved with minimal financial support from the government.
CHAPTER II

RHETORIC OF THE CIVILIZING MISSION

The Englishmen who favored colonization stated their goal in planting colonies as the establishment of civilization in otherwise wild and barbarous lands. As Sir William Herbert wrote in his treatise from the 1590s on how best to govern Ireland, there did not exist any form of society or government “more distinguished or more excellent or more appropriate... than that which ha[d] brought and elevated England to the height of perfection and to exceptional happiness.”¹ In this light, they described the lands and peoples of the regions targeted for planting, and developed the rhetorical forms in which they justified and promoted colonization, both in Ireland and America. This chapter examines those rhetorical forms in order to illuminate the continuity in how the two regions were depicted.

¹ Sir William Herbert, *Croftus Sive de Hibernia Liber*, edited and translated by Arthur Keaveney and John A. Madden (Dublin: Irish Manuscripts Commission, 1992), 71. The composition date of this work is bested dated as after September 1590 and before Herbert’s death on 4 March 1593.
Sources of Commentary

The sources used to examine this rhetoric are drawn from those with which the planners of these projects would likely have been familiar. Something must be said of the men who prepared these works and what is known of their intentions. The men responsible for these works all came from the educated segment of English society. All but one of the men who comment on Ireland held positions with the government at some time, and even he had a personal involvement in Ireland as a proponent of re-opening the University of Dublin. Those writing, or translating writings, on America (for whom details of their lives are known) come generally from the ranks of scholars, and most received their patronage from men interested in establishing colonies. Each of these men published in an attempt to influence their audience, the upper classes of England, by expounding on their own point of view. They did so not simply out of a sense that their views were right, but because such was the means of drawing attention to oneself, which might open opportunities to patronage or preferment.

\[2\] These men, as a group, shall henceforward be referred to as the commentators.

\[3\] The biographical information, unless otherwise noted, has generally been drawn from Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee, eds., Dictionary of National Biography, 22 vol.s plus supplements (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967-68; first printed 1885-1900).
The earliest of the works cited concerning Ireland comes from an English Catholic priest, Edmund Campion. Campion’s *A History of Ireland*, written circa 1569-71, has been described as less a history than a pamphlet, the main argument of which is that the only effective means of taming the Irish lay in educating them. Campion had a decided interest in this matter, as he was involved in a project, supported by the lord deputy Sir Henry Sidney, to restore the defunct University of Dublin. Campion expected to have a principal part in the university if the plan succeeded, because the chief planner was James Stanihurst, recorder of Dublin, Speaker of the House of Commons, and Campion’s patron. The scheme met with defeat on several grounds, not the least of which were a secret hostility to the lord deputy in the English government and suspicion of Campion by these same Protestant authorities (in fact, orders for his arrest had been issued and he was in hiding for part of his sojourn in Ireland). Despite Campion’s trouble with the government due to his Catholicism, his work gives us a valuable perspective. Campion’s view of Ireland derived not from long experience, but from an English mindset informed by men intimately familiar with Ireland and its politics. That the argument that runs throughout his work relates to personal interest should not be surprising. More importantly, this recusant Catholic priest described cultural and moral shortcomings of the Irish.

---

4 James Ware, *Two Histories of Ireland. The one written by Edmund Campion, the other by Meredith Hanmer Dr of Divinity* (Dublin: The Society of Stationers, 1633. Facsimile reprint. New York: Da Capo Press, 1971).
people in the same tone and in much the same language as the Protestant English, in order to make his point.

Sir William Herbert composed *Croftus Sive Hibernia Liber* between 1590 and 1593. The work is primarily a treatise on government and administration in Ireland. His interest in Ireland seems to have sprung from the 1551-52 tenure as lord deputy of Sir James Croft, a distant relative and close friend. Herbert is known to have possessed significant property in Monmouthshire and served as sheriff, J.P., and M.P. for the same. In 1586, he received over 13,000 acres at Castleisland as his allotment in the Munster plantation, and in 1587/8 wrote to Sir Francis Walsingham expressing his intention to establish “a colony of my planting” and write a “volume,” which seems to be what became *Croftus*. Also in 1587, he served as J.P. and sheriff for Kerry. He seems to have remained in Ireland until 1590, when he went to court to answer charges brought by another undertaker. The death of Croft in September of that year seems to be the impetus for Herbert to write his treatise, which was certainly finished before his own death in 1593. Herbert was noted for treating his native Irish tenants with more consideration than other undertakers, though he adamantly insisted on abolishing Irish customs. Also, a zealous Protestant, Herbert insisted that local religious services be conducted in Irish and had several religious materials translated. Though he seems to have believed the Irish could be brought to an English standard of ‘civility,’ he still maintained that all the government of Ireland
should be put in English hands. Herbert intended *Croftus* to be an instructional
tool for gentlemen serving in Ireland, and a testament of his duty to God and the
crown. Whether he hoped to gain better preferment through his work remains
difficult to ascertain because it was not published until the nineteenth century.

Perhaps the best known of the discourses on Ireland from this period,
Edmund Spenser’s *A View of the Present State of Ireland*, gives an English
perspective without any sympathy for the Irish. Spenser’s view of Ireland took on
a negative aspect almost immediately on his arrival in 1580. Serving as secretary
to Lord Grey de Wilton, who had been appointed lord deputy, Spenser had to
accompany him on campaign and witnessed the massacre of the Spanish at
Smerwick. Even after Lord Grey was relieved, Spenser continued to serve in the
government of Ireland, as clerk of the chancery from 1582 to 1588, as clerk of
the council of Munster from 1588 to his death in 1598, and also as sheriff of Cork
in 1598. He supported the plantation policy in Munster, and received a grant of
3028 acres therein. He, however, felt that too many Irish remained in the
province and considered removal or extermination a better policy. This feeling
was likely reinforced by the long drawn-out series of litigation with viscount
Roche of Fermoy, who was hostile to English rule and continually accused
Spenser of encroaching on his property. Despite his holdings in the Munster
plantation, Spenser complained of lack of wealth until his death, and remained in
search of further preferment. He composed the *View* in the mid-1590s, after the
Nine Years War began in Ulster, and entered it on the Stationer’s records for publication in 1598 before the Munster plantation was overrun. Thus, Spenser can be seen writing at a time of increased tensions with the Irish and of possibility for change in Irish policy.⁵

In 1604, Richard Hadsor finished his ‘Discourse’ on the Irish state. Hadsor, an Old English lawyer from near Drogheda, maintained a legal practice in London that served a number of influential clients, both Protestant and Catholic. He also served as a crown lawyer, from possibly as early as 1598, when Sir William Cecil found his bilingual skills useful in Irish affairs. His family had a long history of loyalty to the crown administration, and Richard never came to see religious conformity as a direct measure of loyalty (though he himself was a conformist). Hadsor also supported a more sympathetic policy, which he thought an Old English leadership would be better suited to execute. He did support plantation policy as it was drawn up for Ulster, and served as the only Irish-speaking member of the 1622 commission for examining the progress of the plantation.⁶

⁵ See also, Editor’s “Introduction” in Edmund Spenser, A View of the State of Ireland, edited by Andrew Hadfield and Willy Maley (Oxford & Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers, 1997), xi-xiv.

Sir John Harrington, godson of Queen Elizabeth, published his *A Short View of the State of Ireland* written in 1605 in an attempt to secure an appointment as archbishop of Dublin. Though this pamphlet is essentially an application for the position (for which he never received serious consideration), he does linger in places on his impression of Ireland. Harrington’s only Irish experience came as part of the earl of Essex’s military expedition there in 1598, in which Harrington served as a commander of horse. Thus, Harrington is writing both from experience in Ireland and from a desire to make himself seem suitable for elevation to a high position.

Sir John Davies, of the writers to be examined the most deeply involved in Irish government, published in 1612 his *A Discovery of the True Causes Why Ireland Was Never Entirely Subdued: [And] Brought Under Obedience of the Crown of England Until the Beginning of His Majesty’s Happy Reign*. Davies received an appointment by King James as solicitor-general of Ireland in 1603, and then as attorney general of Ireland in May 1606. As attorney general, Davies established the legal basis for the escheat of the six counties following the Flight of the Earls, and co-authored with the lord deputy, Sir Arthur Chichester, the original plan for planting those counties. Davies presented the plantation plans to the Privy Council in London in October 1608 and again in February 1609-1610. In his *Discovery*, Davies covers Irish history from the period of the Norman Conquest to establishment of the Ulster plantation. The writing of his treatise in
1611-1612 occurred following the establishment of the first plantation settlements in Ulster in 1610, a time of general optimism for the success of the project.

Fynes Moryson’s *Itinerary*, which had been in the works since 1600, came to publication in 1617. This work embodied Moryson’s impressions of all the countries and peoples he had visited on his travels since 1591. In 1600, having finished his continental travels, Moryson went to Ireland on the advice of his brother, Richard, who was employed as a servitor with the Irish government. On his arrival, he became personal secretary to Sir Charles Blount, lord Mountjoy, who commanded the English forces that would bring Tyrone’s rebellion to an end. Moryson continued in his service after the end of the Nine Years War and their return to England. Moryson returned to Ireland in 1613 to visit his brother, Sir Richard, then serving as vice-President of Munster. Moryson’s impression of Ireland drew on both his wartime and peacetime experiences, as well as his close association with officials who handled Irish policy.

The final work regarding Ireland used here is an incomplete manuscript by Sir James Perrot. Perrot seems to have undertaken this project about 1619, but later abandoned it, leaving it incomplete. Whether it was abandoned before he went to Ireland in 1621, or nearer his return to England in 1624 has not been discovered. No indication exists that he went to Ireland prior to 1621, when he served on the 1622 commission. He is, however, the illegitimate but recognized
son of Sir John Perrot, who served as president of Munster 1570-73 and as lord
deputy 1584-88. He may have visited Ireland in his youth while his father was
lord deputy, though there is no solid evidence that he did so. Regardless of how
much personal experience may have influenced him, Perrot intended this work to
be a history based largely on documents in the State Paper Office and resuming
in 1584 at the point that a previous history had left off.\textsuperscript{7}

The men who recorded their views on Ireland certainly all had a personal
connection to that land on some level. Most, in fact, had served the government
in some capacity in Ireland, and most too were advocating in their work some
policy for Ireland. Similarly, those Englishmen who published material on the
New World supported exploiting these new lands by planting colonies in them.
They did not, however, all have personal experience in the New World, nor were
the materials they published necessarily their own work. The early English
materials on the New World, whether translations of foreign works or accounts of
English activities, were intended to encourage interest in overseas enterprise and
colonization.

The earliest that accounts of the New World became widely available in
English came with Richard Eden’s publication of \textit{A Treatyse of the newe India} in

\textsuperscript{7} Sir James Perrott. \textit{The Chronicle of Ireland 1584-1608}, Edited by Herbert
1553 and a translation of *The Decades of the newe worlde* in 1555. Eden is primarily known for his interests in science and exploration and the translations he did for his publications. He was, however, connected to the government through Sir Thomas Smith and Sir William Cecil. He had been a student of Smith, author of the plan to colonize the Ards in the 1570s, and served as secretary to Sir William Cecil from 1552.

Richard Hakluyt also prepared foreign writings for publication in English. His publications include *Divers Voyages of America* in 1582 and in 1587 an English edition of a narrative on the Huguenot colony in Florida by Jacques Le Moyne, which he reprinted again in 1591 with engravings. Hakluyt’s elder cousin, also named Richard Hakluyt, inspired his interest in geography and
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8 Richard Eden. *A Treatyse of the newe India, with other new founde landes and Ilandes, aswell eastwarde, as they are known and found in these oure dayes, after description of Sebastian Munster in his boke of universall Cosmographie: wherein the diligent reader may see the good successe and rewarde of noble and honests enterprises, by the which not only worldly riches are obtained, but also God is glorified, and the Christian fayth enlarged. Translated out of Latin into Englishe.* By Rycharde Eden. (London: 1553.) In Edward Arber, ed., *The First Three English Books on America [*?1511*]- 1555 A.D. Being Chiefly Translations, Compilations, &c., by Richard Eden, From the Writings, Maps, &c., of Pietro Martire, of Anghiera (1455-1526), Apostolical Protonotary, and Counci lor to the Emperor Charles V.; Sebastian Münster, the Cosmographer (1489-1552), Professor of Hebrew, &c., at the University of Basle; Sebastian Cabot, of Bristol (1471-1557), Grand Pilot of England: With Extracts, &c., from the Works of other Spanish, Italian, and German Writers of the Time.* (Birmingham: 1885. Reprint, New York: Kraus Reprint Company, 1971).

9 Another account of the French colony, by Nicolas Le Challeux, had been translated into English in 1566, though little is known of its publisher.
exploration by introducing him to books on the subject during his youth. Despite taking holy orders, Hakluyt’s scholarly interest remained focused on his youthful interest, and he continued to try to raise interest in overseas exploration and colonization. He became one of the chief promoters and an adventurer in the Virginia Company of London.

The three tracts relating English voyages all derive from the attempt to plant a colony at Roanoke that Sir Walter Raleigh launched in 1585. Arthur Barlowe, one of the captains of the 1585 voyage and of whom nothing else is known, wrote the first of these accounts. Another account comes from Thomas Harriot, a well-known mathematician who came under Raleigh’s patronage in 1580 when he began tutoring him in mathematics. Raleigh sent Harriot on the voyage as a sort of scientific advisor and observer. Finally, John White, who participated in both the 1585 and 1587 Roanoke voyages, recorded visual records of what he observed in watercolor paintings. Like the others, little information exists on White with the exception of his Roanoke experience and the fact that he later made his home on Raleigh’s Munster plantation lands. Each of these men, however, wrote from their personal experience. An experience they gained in the same region and with a very similar culture as that with which the Jamestown colonists would interact.

The men who published works on America, unlike those who wrote on Ireland, were not themselves usually deeply involved in the government. They
wrote only from personal experience or personal interest. They did, however, still intend to influence people with the ability to support colonization to do so, and to influence those of lesser means that participation in such attempts might yield worthwhile rewards.

The English commentators on Ireland and Virginia discussed the lack of civility in these regions on several points. They commented on the standard of living of the people, religion, government and law, and the character of the people themselves. The standard for comparison always remained Protestant Christianity and the advanced agricultural and legal systems of England. Additional topics of comment included the frequency and nature of conflict and examinations of the environment. The commentary on the environment occupies an important place in the pro-plantation rhetoric, describing what is valuable or desirable about each region and in what manner it was under-utilized. The characterizations of the peoples and the lands form two parts of the argument in favor of establishing plantations; the one being the moral justification and the other being the practical reasoning for these projects.

Descriptions of the Native People

While neither Irish nor Indian culture could live up to English standards of civilization in the view of the commentators, the approach taken in describing each differed. The Irish had, by the nearness of so much more civilized
neighbors and especially long experience with the English, every opportunity to
advance their society out of barbarism. The Indian had been isolated from
Europe until very recently, and so had not had the opportunity to learn from
more advanced neighbors or the great cultures of the past (most specifically in
the English mind would be the Romans). Additionally, the long involvement in
Ireland colored the observations of many commentators on that realm, who were
frequently deeply involved in that realm’s politics. Because of these factors, the
discussion of the native populations began from different premises. The Indians
of Virginia were undoubtedly savage, whereas the Irish should have been more
civilized. Further, though there existed no reason that the Indians must be
brought within a colony, the Irish because of their status as subjects must be
brought into submission. Despite these differences, the characterizations of the
peoples focused on two main themes, proving their civil and moral shortcomings
and examining their potential to learn civility from a civilized patron society.

When promoting methods of bringing Ireland fully under the authority of
the crown, the commentators stressed the faults that produced the reigning
situation. The barbaric and rebellious nature of the Gaelic Irish received great
emphasis from those advocating any reform for Ireland, especially those
supporting plantation. This discussion ranged from their customs, moral quality,
and religious practice as observed by contemporary Englishmen to speculation
on the ancient origins of the Irish people.
In their attempts to trace the origins of the Irish people back to antiquity, some of the commentators went to great lengths to establish a pedigree of barbarism. The most common and popular theory at the time claimed that the Irish were descended from a group of Scythians who had traveled to Ireland by sea. The Scythians were well known as barbarians from ancient writings, and some of the most learned authors took great pains in proving this ancestry. Fynes Moryson, in his account of the peoples and places he visited, gave one of the most detailed, if fantastic, accounts of Irish origins. According to Moryson, a different people, including some Spanish, settled each of the five provinces. The Scythians, in his account, settled the area around Kerry. Edmund Campion also discusses the origins of the Irish in his Historie of Ireland of 1571. He wrote “all Histories doe witnesse of the Scithians their auncient founders,” thus attributing Scythian origins to all of the Irish. While downplaying the founding myths of both Ireland (Gathelus of Spain) and of England (Brutus), Edmund Spenser espoused the idea that the Irish and the Scots descend from the Scythians.

---


11 Ware, Two Histories, 16.

12 Spenser, A View, 44-45. For the story of Brutus and the Trojan refugees settling in Britain see Thomas Bulfinch, Bulfinch’s Mythology Illustrated: The Age of Fable, The Age of Chivalry, Legends of Charlemagne (New York, Avenel Books, 1979), 379-82. The Gathelus of Spain legend is much more complex, as each source and author recreates it somewhat differently. Gathelus is most often Greek, though in some renditions Scythian or even Egyptian. The variations of
Descent from an ancient race of barbarians created a millennia long history of failure to attain a state of civilization, thus supporting the argument that the Irish needed the patronage of a more civilized culture to help them rise from barbarity.

However barbaric the ancestors of the Irish may have been, the continuance of a state of barbarity in Ireland drew greater attention. The commentators’ characterization of the Irish, often lumping the Gaelic Irish and the Old English together under this label, formed a very important part of their political rhetoric, especially when advocating plantation. To portray the Irish in a negative light, the English denigrated their socio-political system, the state of religion amongst them, and their standard of living. Regardless of what facet of Irish culture the English commented on, the underlying idea remained a lack of moral quality amongst them in general.

Moryson gave a rather lengthy, generalized account of conditions among the Gaelic Irish, which is likely prone to significant exaggeration. According to Moryson, the uncivil nature of the Irish, exemplified by a semi-nomadic nature, extended so far that “they have no tables” nor beds.\textsuperscript{13} Moryson also gave the

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{13} Falkiner, Illustrations, 231.}
impression that Irish women usually went about naked, an idea that lent itself to the popularly espoused idea of Irish licentiousness. Sir John Davies, attorney general for Ireland and one of the planners of the Ulster plantation, took this belief a step further in his 1612 discourse on the condition of the Irish state. Davies commented that the Irish “increased and multiplied unto infinite numbers by promiscuous generation among themselves,” suggesting that reproduction among the Irish never occurred within a morally acceptable familial or marital structure.\textsuperscript{14} Thus, the commentators stressed the moral degeneracy they saw in the Irish, and thus the need for a reforming influence to correct this.

English writers frequently criticized the Irish for not treating marriage as a holy institution, but simply as a private contract. Sir John Harrington observed this, saying “whyle with handfasting and devorsing they play fast and loose at theyr pleasure.”\textsuperscript{15} Davies also asserted that they neglected lawful matrimony and commonly repudiated their wives, while Sir James Perrot stated they would put away their wives on “any slight occasion without lawful cause.”\textsuperscript{16} Campion, in his
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\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{16} Davies, \textit{True Causes}, 17.
\end{flushleft}
call for educating the Irish to civility, was particularly damning on this issue saying that, in order to out reproduce other clans, the chief men of Ireland “allow themselves not only whores, but also choice & store of whores. One I heard named which hath (as he calleth them) more than ten wives.”

The Irish manner of marriage demonstrated to the English a lack of religious knowledge and dedication amongst the Irish. Though they were professed Catholics, the English viewed the Irish as not truly Christian at all. Edmund Spenser best expresses this view:

they be all Papists by their profession, but the same so blindly and brutishly informed, (for the most part) that not one amongst a hundred knoweth any ground of religion, or any article of his faith, but can perhaps say his Pater noster, or his Ave Maria, without any understanding what one word thereof meaneth.

To further emphasize this point, Spenser compared their behavior at funerals with the loud wailings of pagans and “Infidels” who had no hope of salvation. The matter of religion played an important role in the depiction of barbarous peoples, as Christianity was considered to be essentially the pinnacle of civil society. Additionally, for many Protestants, reform of the Irish Church occupied a place of almost as high a priority as subjugating the island to crown government.

The English also attacked the political organization of Irish society. In particular, they decried the heavy exactions that the Irish lords placed on their

---

17 Ware, Two Histories, 19.

18 Spenser, A View, 171.
people. Davies went so far as to claim that no man might enjoy his property, his wife, or even his life should a more powerful man wish to take such from him.\textsuperscript{19} Much of the blame for this state of affairs, however, fell on the maintenance of kern and gallowglass by Irish chiefs. The Irish maintained a number of these fighting men who, according to the English, spoiled the lord’s subjects as well as his enemies. The removal of these fighting men carried a special importance to many English commentators, as their lifestyle was commonly attributed to a cruel and bloody nature and general laziness, due to which they refused to work for a living. Spenser painted the most villainous picture of them, describing them as “licentious, swearers, and blasphemers, common ravishers of women, and murtherers of children.”\textsuperscript{20} In many English eyes, the wider abuses about which they complained were not likely to be reformed while the gallowglass population remained. This clash was compounded, according to Spenser, by the glorification of what the English considered lawless and licentious behavior in bardic poetry, especially when such acts benefited the bard’s Irish patron at the expense of the English.\textsuperscript{21}

The laziness, which many claimed led the kern and gallowglass to lead a mercenary lifestyle and oppress the populace for their support, was attributed by

\begin{footnotes}
\item[19] Davies, \textit{True Causes}, 163.
\item[20] Spenser, \textit{A View}, 74.
\item[21] Spenser, \textit{A View}, 76-77.
\end{footnotes}
some authors to the Irish as a whole. Moryson claimed that the Irish were given to excessive drunkenness and exhibited a slothfulness and “barbarousness” that made them “apt to seditions, and so unwilling to enrich their prince and country.”

The laws and customs of the Irish also drew a great deal of criticism from the English. Davies, in a section entitled “The Irish Laws and Customs, Differing from the Laws and Customs of All Civilized Nations,” took issue with a wide range of Irish practices, but none more so than that even the highest offenses were punished only by payment of an eiric. Moryson gave brief accounts of several Irish customs, amongst which tanistry features prominently, describing them as “corrupt customs.” While the English derided many facets of Brehon law, tanistry found itself the most frequent target. The practice resembled, in many aspects, the system of election from among the throne-worthy candidates found in many ancient Germanic tribes. Many English believed this system caused “much bloodshed and rebellion by contencion for the seignorie every discent.” Davies considered this situation the result of the Irish not having been

22 Falkiner, Illustrations, 224 & 249.

23 Davies, True Causes, 163. An eiric is a payment made from the offender to the injured party.

24 Falkiner, Illustrations, 243.

brought under English law, claiming the Irish had no choice but to cling to their ancient law because they had been refused admission to English law. Thus Davies placed the responsibility for civilizing the Irish into the hands of the English.

The barbarous state of the Irish being well established, the commentators needed to examine their potential for becoming civilized. To this end, not all the reports on the Irish were of such a negative aspect. Harrington acknowledged that many claim the Irish were ill affected toward the English, but says himself that the gentry and townspeople of Ireland were as civil and kind as any to be found in the remote shires of England. He also found the mean sort “more loving and servisable” when treated honestly, though he believed they were seldom treated thusly. Robert Payne considered the greatest number of the Irish to be “inclined to husbandrie, although as yet unskillful, notwithstanding, through their

---

26 Davies, True Causes, 136. Davies claim that the Irish were barred from English law is based on incomplete information. Jocelyn Otway-Ruthven, in her article ‘The Native Irish and English law in medieval Ireland’ [Irish Historical Studies VII, no. 25 (1950): 1-16], tells us that in 1331 a statute ordered the English and Irish to be held under one law, and that this was almost immediately pleaded in the courts with at least some success. Additionally, when Henry VIII’s Irish parliament proclaimed him King of Ireland, all inhabitants of the island became subjects of the crown, and in theory answerable to a single law. Davies assertion seems to indicate that, to 1612, these legalities had had no wide, lasting effect on the legal treatment of the native Irish, at least where the courts are concerned.

27 Harrington, A Short View, 9.
great travel many of them are rich in cattel.”

Payne was naturally positive in this tone, as he was writing to encourage the partners of one Nicholas Gorsan to contribute their promised shares of an investment in a Munster seignory. Even Spenser was not entirely derisive, stating that the baser sort of the Irish were “fit for labour, and industriously disposed.” The singling out of the baser sort from those who ruled over them came naturally to English writers of the time, but also indicates a hope that only a portion of the Irish population was responsible for their situation, and the rest might be brought to a civil and productive state. How deep this hope ran after the failure in the Ards in the 1570s is difficult to tell, as both writers were commenting at a time in which the current monarch was quite insistent about the status of the Irish as subjects.

28 Robert Payne, A Briefe Description of Ireland: Made this yeare, 1589. by Robert Payne unto XXV of his partners for whome he is undertaker there. Truly Published Verbatim, according to his letters, by Nich. Gorsan one of the sayd partners, for that he would his countreymen should be partakers of the many good Notes therin contained. (London: Thomas Dawson, 1589. Facsimile reprint edition, New York: Da Capo Press Inc., 1973), 3.

29 Spenser, A View, 22.

30 After the 1541 act creating Ireland a kingdom, the Irish were legally subjects. Therefore Irish who raised arms against the English government from this point were considered rebels, whereas they had before generally been regarded as foreign enemies. The treatment of rebels and foreign enemies rests on different legal premises (for example, rebels’ lands may be confiscated). Hadsor, as a lawyer might be expected to do, points out that “Irishmen borne are denizens by birth in England and may beare office and inherytt Landes in England as ys to be seene, withouth Charters of denizacion, as Englishe men are and doth in Ireland, And also Irishmen doe paie only such Customes and duties in Englande as Englishmen paie.” (McLaughlin, “Hadsor. II. Select Documents,” 347-48).
The English writers consciously took pains to stress the shortcomings of the Irish to their ideal of civilization. Creating the image of barbarity around a people with a recognized political system and culture, which most of the commentators understood, formed an important part of the justification for plantation. By attacking that political system on the grounds that it created more strife than peace, these authors struck at the basic purpose of government, which in their minds was the creation of stability and prosperity. In case this were not enough to invoke the spirit of reform, the commentators also railed against the immorality of the Irish people and their ignorance of religion. Because of the nearness and interaction with civilized neighbors such as the English, the continuance of these shortcomings came to be seen not as missed or lacking opportunities but as an active choice by the Irish. Additionally because Ireland was a realm subject to the English crown, the responsibility of being ‘benefactor’ to the Irish fell to the English.

Descriptions of the American Indians follow a different pattern. That the Indians were savage never came into doubt. The Europeans concerned themselves very much with the customs and lifestyles of the Indians. This results in the early reports on America taking a much more observatory tone regarding the native inhabitants, though often with an eye toward how colonizers would interact with them. Once English settlement began in Virginia in 1607 and
interaction occurred with the Indians on a more long-term and political basis, the
tone of the reports becomes more like those on the Irish.

When the English began to seriously consider the planting of colonies,
they possessed already a number of sources from which to draw information
about the Americas. Richard Eden had published his *A Treatyse of the newe
India* in 1553 and a translation of Peter Martyr’s *The Decades of the newe
worlde* in 1555. In 1566, there followed an English version of Nicolas Le
Challeux’s narrative on the French Huguenot colony in Florida. Richard Hakluyt
published *Divers Voyages of America* in 1582 and in 1587 an English edition of
another narrative on the Huguenot colony in Florida by Jacques Le Moyne, which
he reprinted again in 1591 with engravings. Once settlement activity began in
Virginia, multiple accounts of each voyage there became available.\(^{31}\)

The earliest accounts of the Indians come, of course, from voyages
sponsored by Spain, with the narratives of Columbus’s voyages being the most
readily available. While these are not the same Indians that would be
encountered in Virginia, Spanish experiences certainly influenced the
expectations of the English. The Spanish explorers painted a picture of a people
lacking civility who “goe about as naked as they came forth of their mothers

\(^{31}\) For narratives and pictures of the Huguenot colony, I have used Stefan
Lorant’s *The New World: the First Pictures of America, Made by John White and
Jacques Le Moyne and Engraved by Theodore De Bry with Contemporary
Narratives of the Huguenot Settlement in Florida 1562-1590 and the Virginia
wombe…. [and] use no lawful conjunction of marriage, but every one hath as many women as he listeth, and leaveth them again at his pleasure.” There existed, however, the possibility of friendly relations with these people for Columbus’s party found that “at the length perceiving our good wyll and liberalitie towarde them, they came to us by heapes, and joined frendshyp with us without feare.” The Spanish expedition also commented how dangerous the native people could be, reporting that they ate no flesh except that of men whom they had killed in their wars.32 The Spanish accounts also make frequent mention of the islands of giants and of the nearby cannibals who prey on the Indians with whom they had traded.

Le Moyne’s and Le Challeux’s accounts of the French expedition to Florida33 are rather less fantastic than the early Spanish writings, making no mention of cannibals or giants. They seem, rather, to attempt more accurate descriptions of their experiences and observations to their best understanding. Both French writers found the Indians to be very kind and friendly, but Le Challeux finds their manners lacking. He reported that they do not instruct their children in manners and will steal without conscience, though they “keep the


33 In relation to modern geography, the settlement was actually in what is now South Carolina. At the time, Florida was a regional term with vague boundaries, not just the lands that make the state of the same name today.
marriage bond with all rigor.” More importantly perhaps, both also recognized that these Indians had some form of religion. Le Challeux even expressed the thought that they might “become civilized and made honest” and “converted to holiness and sound religion” under certain circumstances. Conversion to Christianity would be an important part of attaining a state of civilization, and became a standard plank in moral justifications of planting colonies among the natives of America.

While the Spanish and French narratives could give the English some idea of what they might encounter in the New World, the reports written by Englishmen once they began frequent trips to Virginia certainly shaped English ideas all the more. The initial friendliness of the Indians received the praises of most English commentators. Arthur Barlowe, one of the captains on the 1584 exploration of Virginia, made the claim that “a more kinde and loving people there can not be found in the worlde, as farre as we have hitherto had triall” and that they were “void of all guile, and treason.” Barlowe expresses the opinion that these people live life much as in “the golden age,” that is before the fall of

---

34 Lorant, *The New World*, 36, 94.

Adam and Eve.\textsuperscript{36} To him, this likely accounted for much of the seeming simplicity of their lifestyles.

Very specific descriptions of the Indians dress seem to reinforce these perceptions. Unlike the reports of the Spanish, the Indians of Virginia are not reported to go about entirely naked. Rather they dressed in hides and furs, covering at least their loins in the warm months and dressing for warmth in the winter. In addition to the descriptions of dress, John White created watercolor drawings of the Indians, as well as the flora and fauna, he saw in Virginia. His pictures, and DeBry's engravings thereof, show the Indians wearing a skin folded double over a cord tied at the waist for men, or just below the breasts for women. This skin covered their front side down to near the knees, but left them bare behind and above.\textsuperscript{37} Variations are recorded from one tribe to another, but

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[37] Lorant, \textit{The New World}, 195, 200, 241, 245. Also, for the original captions for the DeBry engravings of White's pictures see Quinn, \textit{Roanoke Voyages}, 418, 423-24. Lorant's book “rephrases” the original English sources, while Quinn always uses the original language. The same description of their clothing is found from 1607 in Philip Barbour, ed., \textit{The Jamestown Voyages Under the first Charter 1606-1609. Documents relating to the foundation of Jamestown and the History of the Jamestown colony up to the departure of Captain John Smith, last president of the council in Virginia under the first charter, early in October, 1609}, 2 vols. (Publications of the Hakluyt Society, 2\textsuperscript{nd} Ser., no.s 136 & 137. Cambridge, 1969), 102.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
mostly in ornamentation. In all cases, this display of a degree of modesty impressed the English.

The English also commented on the religion of the Indians, though such commentary is generally less descriptive and more derisive in nature. Barlowe reported that they prayed before an idol, which he found to be “nothing else, but a meere illusion of the Devill.”\textsuperscript{38} Hariot observed them making offerings of powdered tobacco for a variety of occasions from narrowly escaping imminent danger or disaster to the setting of a new weir for fish trapping. The manner in which these offerings were made struck Hariot as most uncivilized, as they were accompanied by “strange gestures, stamping, sometime dauncing, clapping of hands, ...and chattering of strange words and noises.”\textsuperscript{39} Though Hariot considered their religious practices heathenistic and “farre from the truth,” he thought they might serve as a basis for educating them to Christianity.

Hariot also expressed the opinion that their religion, however crude it seemed, gave them a greater respect for their governors. Barlowe had earlier claimed that no people more respected their nobles and governors than did the Indians of Virginia.\textsuperscript{40} Despite this, Hariot reported a system of punishment ranging from fines to beatings to death depending on the seriousness of the

\textsuperscript{38} Quinn, \textit{Roanoke Voyages}, 113-14.
\textsuperscript{39} Quinn, \textit{Roanoke Voyages}, 345.
\textsuperscript{40} Quinn, \textit{Roanoke Voyages}, 103.
transgression. Though he was not specific on what crimes correspond to the more severe punishment, his statement indicated the existence of some form of legal system, if a primitive one. The concept of social order amongst the Indians made them seem potentially more amenable to civilizing from the English viewpoint.

When English writers described the Gaelic Irish and the American Indians, they began at opposite ends of the spectrum to come to similar conclusions about the level of civility of their subjects. To these commentators, there never existed any doubt that the Indians were savage, whereas the Irish should have been more civilized considering their long association with Christianity and proximity to England and the Continent. The writers took pains to establish how uncivilized were the Irish and how much more civilized than might be expected were the Indians; yet in both cases, the emphasis was on how much these peoples stood to learn from a civilized patron society. In Ireland, because the Irish were subjects of the crown, there would still remain the debate whether to conquer then civilize or to place civilizing influences in the region. For Virginia, however, the planners never realistically discussed conquest, but hoped that the Indians would be friendly neighbors.

41 Quinn, *Roanoke Voyages*, 374-75.
Descriptions of the Lands

Regardless of how the native peoples might affect the plantation plans, the planners recognized a need to motivate settlers to make the journey. Additionally, the primary financial backing for all the projects of this period, whether private or government initiated, came from private investment, which must be made attractive to potential investors. In order to attract both of these types of people to the projects, the commentators and planners stressed the ways in which these lands might be put to profit.

The difficulties of the English in Ireland and that country’s continued drain on the treasury might have seemed to some English to be products of the environment. The commentators of the time, especially those promoting plantation, stressed the goodness and fruitfulness of the land, and what commodities might be readily extracted from it. Additionally, these authors made great claims about how profitable Ireland would be once planted with productive and loyal subjects.

The most basic quality of the land, to the English planter’s mind, revolved around its arability. A civilized society would require a civilized agriculture to support it. Fortunately, the English found Ireland to be “a Lande so fertile as wanteth nothinge for the necessary use or pleasure of man.”42 Any perceived lack of productivity in Ireland could be quickly remedied, for though “much of it

be wast by fault of lack of manurance, no parte will be unprofitable to inhabitants of industrie."\textsuperscript{43} Payne assured his readers that the "soyle, for the most parte is very fertile, and apt for ...al other graines and fruitees that England anywise doth yeeld."\textsuperscript{44} The English thought the Irish soil well suited to yield the common grains and fruits of their civilized homeland, as well as service as pastureland.

In addition to the quality of the soil, Ireland had a number of resources ready to generate profit. One anonymous author, writing circa 1599, observed great quantities of cattle, horses, sheep, swine, and fowl in Ireland.\textsuperscript{45} Timber, a greatly demanded commodity in England at the time, abounded in parts of Ireland. Spenser commented that Ireland was "adorned with goodly woods even fit for building of houses and ships, so commodiously, as that if some Princes in the world had them, they would soon hope to be lords of all the seas, and ere long of all the world."\textsuperscript{46} The descriptions of Ireland by these English authors creates an impression that no reasons exist why that land cannot be put to the profit of both individuals and the government.


\textsuperscript{44} Payne, \textit{A Briefe Description}, 8.

\textsuperscript{45} Quinn, “A Discourse on Ireland,” 160.

\textsuperscript{46} Spenser, \textit{A View}, 27.
The natural ports and harbors of Ireland also received much attention. Spenser commented that the eastern Irish ports opened on England as if “inviting us [the English] to come unto them.” Additionally, Ireland lay open to the ocean to the west and south. This opened the island to the potentially profitable trade lanes of the Atlantic. Sir William Herbert thought that Ireland’s westerly location would have given “much support and assistance … in carrying out our vast enterprises in the Atlantic and West Indies – if in times past and in our own day it [Ireland] had an abundance everywhere of strong and prudent men.” In all, the English commentators make Ireland out to be ideal for prosperity, provided it were peopled with industrious people. This, combined with the expositions of Irish barbarism, placed the blame for the condition of that realm squarely on the Irish themselves.

When describing the lands and resources of Virginia, the English had a slightly less political agenda. Virginia had not been a long-term drain on the government’s coffers as Ireland had, but there still existed the necessity of showing the potential for profit in the new lands. As with Ireland, the basis of prosperity in Virginia would rely on agriculture. The English observers not only reported that the soil there was very good, but also gave some experimental evidence. On Barlowe’s expedition, the English planted some of their peas that

---


48 Herbert, *Croftus*, 29.
had escaped damage during the voyage and found that “in tenne daies they were foureteene ynches high.” Hariot claimed that planting an English acre at Roanoke with corn, beans, or peas yielded at least two hundred bushels, whereas in England forty bushels was considered an excellent crop on the same amount of land.  

Virginia also had a great many resources from which the colonists might make not just their livelihood, but possibly a profit. For the sustenance of the settlers, Hariot provided a great listing of native commodities to supplement what crops might be brought from England. He listed native varieties of grain, beans, peas, herbs, roots and tubers, and fruits. Were this not enough, he also reported that the area was rich in bear, deer, various fowl, and fish. Barlowe had reported much the same manner of beasts in his earlier voyage and included rabbits in the list.

In addition, the explorers reported on a number of commodities that could profit both the colonists and the investors. Barlowe observed at least fourteen

---

49 Quinn, *Roanoke Voyages*, 105-106.

50 Quinn, *Roanoke Voyages*, 342. There is some skepticism voiced by Quinn in the footnote to the accuracy of this claim. Whatever the accuracy or methods used in Hariot’s experiment, the impression it made on him is clear and is of greater import here.


variety of fragrant timber and oak trees that were much like those in England but “farre greater and better.” The size of these trees may have been of great importance in the making of ship masts, especially considering the shortage of old growth timber in England at the time. Hariot’s commodity list included oak, walnut, fir, cedar, elm, willow, beech, maple, holly, sassafras, and “many other strange” trees under the heading of timber. All the English expeditions noted the copper used as ornamentation by the Indians, though the mine was always rumored to be held by another tribe nearer the mountains. Additionally, many Indians used pearls as decoration, and the English found some themselves in collecting mussels for food. Hariot also enumerated a number of more common commodities such as pitch, tar, turpentine, fur, dear skins, civet cats, and a variety of dye making materials. He also believed that flax and hemp would grow well in the region.

Both Ireland and Virginia had all the necessary qualities of nature to provide for a civil society. The writers of these various reports left no doubt that these qualities could be turned to the profit of industrious people. Ultimately,


55 Civet cats are found in Africa and Asia in different varieties and are valuable for perfume making due to a musk gland that produces civet. They do not exist indigenously in North America, and this was likely a mistaken identity of a skunk.

they are pitching the projects for peopling these lands on the foundation of improvement of wealth, for both the individual and the state.

Conclusion

In considering the environment that settlers in a plantation would be faced with, the commentators discussed both the native inhabitants and the lands. As a practical measure, the lands themselves had to be made attractive to those who would settle and hold them, as well as those who would invest money for the settlement. The availability of commodities for a ready profit, in combination with the ability to grow traditional English crops, provided for the possibility of a smooth transition for potential settlers. That neither territory had been used to its full potential gave the English all the more reason to pursue settlements there. So long as any potential threat from the native populations could be controlled or averted, the potential for gain continued to appear greater than any risk. Ideally, the plantations would serve as centers of acculturation for the natives, and so be a deterrent to any threat in themselves. Additionally, having shown the barbarous nature of the native peoples, proponents of plantation could claim that their favored course of action was a moral imperative. They would after all be spreading to the natives not only a better way of life but also the knowledge of “true religion.” In this way, the commentators provided the moral justification that freed the colonizers to proceed. The rhetoric used by
the English to establish their arguments for planting colonies in both Ireland and America is thus based on similar qualities found in the lands and peoples of each. These two parts appear co-equal in the rhetoric, but they are not so in the plans for the plantations, as shall be seen in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III

PLANNING AND EXECUTION

All of the English plantations under examination proceeded with the goal of establishing a model of English civilization in ‘wild, untamed’ lands and amongst a ‘wild, barbarous’ people. The methods used in each plantation can be evaluated on the basis of several elements including: who initiated the project, how it was funded, what additional financial inducements were allowed, how the lands to be planted were acquired, and how such lands were disbursed. Examination of these basic points demonstrates the degree to which these plantations were experimental, as well as the degree to which continuity of thought existed. Such an examination also demonstrates that greater attention was given to the economics of colony building than to means of civilizing the native peoples, thus showing that providing for the internal stability of the colony was more important in the minds of the planners.

Initiation and Funding of Plantations

During the period when all of these colonization projects were initiated, the English government found itself struggling with budgetary issues. For the government to back a plan, it needed to incur no additional cost and show potential to increase revenue over the long run. While this certainly influenced
the rhetoric examined in the previous chapter, it had a more profound effect on
the schemes themselves.

In 1571, Sir Thomas Smith and Thomas Smith, father and son, initiated a
project to colonize the Ards with a petition to the Privy Council. A member of this
council himself, Sir Thomas certainly had insight into the issues facing the
government and under what conditions his colonial theory might be put to the
test. To address the financial needs of planting a colony, Sir Thomas took the
innovative step of forming a joint stock company. Trading companies organized
on the joint stock principal were experiencing great success at that time, but this
was the first instance in which the principle was applied to colony building. Sir
Thomas devised two forms of subscription, that of the horseman amounting to
£20 and the footman amounting to £12. He derived these amounts from the
expected cost of maintaining the settlers, all of whom would serve in a military
capacity for their own defense during the initial period of the settlement. The
return on the adventurer’s investment would come in the form of grants of Irish
land from the Smiths. Once the colony was established, an annual levy would
provide for the further funding of community needs such as defensive works and
arms.¹

¹ David B. Quinn, “Sir Thomas Smith (1513-1577) and the Beginnings of English
Colonial Theory,” Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 89, no. 4
(December 1945): 548-49.
Sir Thomas encouraged his son to take measures for the stability of the early colony. First, he promoted the founding of a strong town to serve as a center for governance as well as “a magazine of victuals, a retreat in time of danger and a safe place for merchants.” About this stronghold, two parishes might be established for the tenants, farmers, and laborers. Sir Thomas desired that these should be very near each other, so that the settlers share more common profit and peril and thereby be brought to greater civility and obedience. Sir Thomas also wanted to allow “that for building or other necessary use of the house, for ten years each man might take what he would of any wood or timber” to provide for the establishment of the settlers. For the government’s part, the grant freed the Smiths from paying rents for the first four years, after which they would owe rates upon the acre to the Irish Exchequer. Similar inducements to early success will be seen in the provisions for later plantations.

The land grant in the Ards covered a relatively small area, and the Smiths were the only point of contact with the government. This left the government with little control over the project. This lack of control coupled with the Smiths’ difficulties in raising funds led the government to pursue a different type of organization in the later, much larger plantations it initiated in Ireland.

---

2 *CSPF, Elizabeth 1583 and Addenda*, 491. Also, p. 468 for more of Sir Thomas’s comments on a strong town.

3 *CSPF, Elizabeth 1583 and Addenda*, 490.
When the plantation scheme for Munster was announced in 1585, the government believed the amount of land available would not be manageable by a single individual or company. The planners therefore decided to offer parcels of land, called seignories, to men with the wealth and influence to improve the lands and bring over English settlers. These men were known as undertakers because they were undertaking responsibility for their grant. They received their seignories at generous rent rates payable to the crown. To help further along the plantation process, the government completely abated these rents for the first four years, and halved them for a further three.  

If the rent conditions were not attractive enough to potential undertakers, the government offered further inducements to aid in the establishment of the settlements. One condition, which would likely appeal to settlers as well as planters, forever freed the lands granted under the plantation project from paying cess, though they would be subject to general subsidies passed by acts of parliament after the seven year probationary period. Also during the seven-year period, the planters could transport from England to Ireland without payment of custom any goods that were normally prohibited so long as they were for the use and establishment of the settlers. To help the planters and settlers prosper, the government allowed them to transport all commodities

---

4 SP 63/123/24 and Cal. State Papers Ireland, 1586-1588, 84-89.

5 Cess is a term used to refer to a number of government impositions.
produced on their Irish lands to any other nation then “in amity with the Crown of England” without paying custom, even if such goods were otherwise normally prohibited from export.\textsuperscript{6} The government partially abrogated this final provision when the undertakers requested in 1587 that it be forbidden to remove “any corn or other victual” from Munster until Michaelmas the year following.\textsuperscript{7}

While the conditions offered the undertakers and settlers were certainly generous, the new inhabitants supplied all real finance themselves. The government, in fact, considered these terms as cutting the cost of maintaining peace in Munster. By planting a sizable loyal population in the province, a much smaller garrison could ensure the peace of the province. Additionally, the low rents and long abatement of the same could not, from the point of view of the planners in the government, be counted as a loss from the crown coffers. The numerous reports between 1583 and 1585 describing Munster as virtually depopulated and the lands wasting for want of people had led most senior officials to accept that such was the state of things. This conception arose based on perceptions during the war, and was based on a kernel of truth. The fighting had certainly effected the deaths of many people and many more had fled to return once the fighting had ended, leaving the country in which the army operated seemingly empty. So widely was this view accepted in the government

\textsuperscript{6} SP 63/123/24 and \textit{Cal. State Papers Ireland, 1586-1588}, 84-89.

\textsuperscript{7} \textit{CSPI, 1586-1588}, 249-50.
that official documents always refer to this plan as “the repeopling and inhabiting of Munster.” Thus it seemed unlikely to the planners within the government that much of the escheated land would produce revenue without bringing in new residents to inhabit the province. While the rents from the escheated land would be delayed under this scheme, the projection for reduced costs in the short term and greater revenue in the long term certainly appealed to Elizabeth’s frugality in governance.

The Munster plan attempted to create stability in the province without having to stretch the government budget. Some aspects of this plan remain evident or influential on the later plans for extending English ‘civility,’ especially granting lands to undertakers in Ulster. The reliance on private persons for finance and extension of privileges to promote prosperity also became standard points of policy.

Like the Munster project, the Ulster Plantation received its real financial backing from the undertakers. Almost the entire government outlay went toward the preliminary work needed before the undertakers could begin settlement. This covered the initial survey, division into proportions, and assignment of the proportions. Later, the government formed commissions of survey, as it did in Munster, to examine what progress the undertakers had made. Aside from these expenses, the government intended to rely on the undertakers to execute the plantation with their own funds.
From quite early in the Ulster project, the government actually expected a better revenue than Munster had yielded. The seizure of land in Ulster resulted from the exodus of only about ninety people and a small rebellion, leaving most of the province’s population in place. Due to a native Irish population that lived in much more settled villages than traditionally Gaelic areas and their uninterrupted presence as had not been the case in Munster, the lands were not considered lying in waste until the settlers could be planted. The natives would provide rents until their relocation, and then the abatement period for the plantation would begin. This left only one year in which rent incomes would be non-existent and a second in which they would be greatly reduced.8

In order to provide for the undertakers and settlers, the government offered terms similar to those offered in the Munster project. For the first five years of the plantation, the undertakers could take into Ireland "out of Great Britain, victuals, and utensils for their Households, Materials and Tools for Building and Husbandry, and cattle to stock and manure the Land as aforesaid, without paying any Custom," though this did not extend to commodities categorized as merchandise. They also received the right, for seven years, to "transport all Commodities growing upon their own Lands... without paying any

Custom or Imposition for the same." An additional privilege, not specifically granted in the Munster plan, allowed the undertakers and their tenants to take timber from the king’s forests in Ulster without paying for it, but only in sufficient quantity for the building of houses.⁹ These measures aimed at helping the undertakers to transport and settle the requisite number of English and Scottish families on their proportions, by reducing the cost of transport and opening an avenue for quick profit to help offset expenses.

The Ulster plantation rested on the same essential financial foundation as the Munster project. The Jamestown plan, however, bears a greater resemblance to the Smiths’ Ards venture in its initial structure, though there are certain aspects of continuity with the larger plantations. Like the Ards project, the venture that became Jamestown began on entirely private initiatives. The ‘first colony of Virginia,’ as it was called in the original letters patent, received its breath of life from a company of gentlemen who petitioned the government, much as Sir Thomas Smith had, for the right to settle a colony in the southern portion of Virginia. Because of the projects private origins, the crown placed very few conditions on the project, instead leaving it largely in the hands of the company formed by the gentlemen petitioners. This did not grant the company entirely free reign as they were bound in the first letters patent to govern "according to such laws, ordinances, and instructions as shall be in that behalf,

⁹ ‘Orders and Conditions,’ 83-85.
given and signed with our hand or sign manuel. Even with this proviso, little came down directly from the government. Most ‘government’ policy was actually created by the royal Council for Virginia, whose membership consisted of men selected from the colonial company.

The letters patent incorporated the gentlemen petitioners as a company, which operated on the joint-stock principle and served as the financial foundation of the colony. While some change occurred in the make-up and rights of the company with the various charters, the basic premise of a return based upon shareholding remained constant. A person accumulated shares in one of two basic ways. First, every £12.10s subscribed equaled one share. Additionally, a ‘personal adventure,’ that is going in person to reside in Virginia, equaled at least

---


11 Two councils are created in the first charter. The difference between the two is distinguished by capitalization. The ‘Council’ is His Majesty’s Council for Virginia in London. The ‘council’ is the local ruling council in Virginia.

12 It is impossible to determine if this amount was set at the first charter or during a later drive for new subscriptions. It is certain that this was the amount in effect by the time of the third charter, and was the basis for land grants after 1616. It is also useful to note that £1 equals 20s and 1s equals 12d.
one share or possibly more if one had a trade, a unique quality that might better
the colony, or performed some outstanding service.\textsuperscript{13}

The company planned initially to keep all of its resources, including land
and labor, in a common stock and to employ all of the colonists toward the
common goals of the company. Once the colony was on a solid footing, the
company could consider paying dividends and making land grants. In order to
encourage the prosperity of the colony, the government included privileges
similar to those seen in the Irish plantations. First, the company could transport
to Virginia any subjects of the crown who would go willingly. The government
also allowed all supplies needed by the colony to be transported out of Britain
and Ireland without payment of normal customs or duties for seven years.
Furthermore, the company could collect a duty from any traffic with the colony
amounting to two-and-one-half percent from any traders who were crown
subjects or five percent from foreign traders. The letters patent reserved these
duties to the use of the colony for twenty-one years, after which they were to be
paid to the crown. In 1609, King James issued the company a second charter,

\textsuperscript{13} ‘Instructions to George Yeardley, November 18, 1618,’ in Susan M. Kingsbury,
The Records of the Virginia Company of London, vol. 3 (Washington, D. C.:
which doubled these duty rates and restarted the seven and twenty-one year exemption periods.\(^{14}\)

The financial allowances for these projects demonstrate a willingness in the government to plan for their long-term success, despite an unwillingness to directly fund them. In the case of the government-initiated plantations of Ireland, the planners encouraged individual undertakers by linking the potential for personal gain directly with the goals of the state. In the privately begun ventures, the planners were promoting activity they felt to be in the interest of the state, but that the state was unable to undertake of itself. They certainly appealed to patriotism and duty in attempting to gather adventurers, but they also used the potential for personal profit to encourage subscriptions. In 1613, several defendants to suits for non-payment of subscriptions to the Virginia Company cite the lack of return on previous investment and little hope of future returns as reason for not fulfilling the remainder of their obligations.\(^{15}\) The potential for profit certainly played an important role in creating support for plantations, and the government policies reflect recognition of this fact.


Acquisition of Lands for Plantation

Before a plantation could be established, the organizers of the project needed lands on which to place the settlers. The early plantations received grants from the crown based on ancient title. In the case of the Ards project, the grant could be made because the crown held title to these lands via the defunct earldom of Ulster, a title with origins stretching back to the initial Anglo-Norman conquest of Ireland. Title at English law and control of the lands were not one in the same, hence the need for plantation. The Munster and Ulster plantations also traced land titles to Anglo-Norman roots, but the taking of the lands into government hands for plantation took different legal routes.

In Munster, the lands came to the government via the attainder of the earl of Desmond and his compatriots in rebellion. Not all of these men were named in acts of attainder, and many of those who were named had received pardons or submitted to the government on promises of retaining their lands. Those who participated in Desmond’s rebellion included both Old English who held by ancient Anglo-Norman title, which fell fully under English law, and Irish chiefs who held their lands by Irish custom, which was outside the scope of English law. The usual procedure in English law for settling escheats involved an inquisition of local jurors for determining the extent and valuation of the property. In this case, the government created a special commission to perform these inquisitions. Records and documentary evidence could play a large role in
these inquisitions, but in Munster there existed no master records that spelled out which lands were held by whom or in what capacity they were held. Some lords, such as Desmond himself, had kept records and these greatly influenced the determination of what lands he held, from which arose several difficulties.¹⁶

Like many Gaelic Irish chiefs, Desmond exerted rights and extracted tribute from lands to which he had no legal claim under English law. Many labeled this extortion in an attempt to prevent their lands from escheating along with Desmond’s. In the case of Irish chiefs, however, lands were not held by title or by the individual. In answer to this, the government adopted a general policy of attributing to the chief ownership of all the surrounding land over which he exercised such rights and privileges, typically ignoring claims of minor men in the area.¹⁷ Though this policy proved expedient in the short term, it did introduce some problems.

Desmond’s case is perhaps the best example, mingling both title in English law and privilege by Irish custom. The earl had the best records, covering both his own lands and those over which he claimed rights and privileges. A great deal of territory owed services or payments to Desmond, much of which he had no right of title over. Significant effort was put into determining who were


tenants-at-will and who freeholders. The lands of the freeholders subject to such exactions came to be known as chargeable lands. Though the chargeable lands sparked much debate over how they should be handled, the final decision of the government translated the dues and services formerly rendered to Desmond into a yearly composition paid to the government. Being recognized as a freeholder on chargeable lands often entailed a lengthy legal battle, some cases still being heard well into the seventeenth century. Similar to the chargeable lands, though much less legally troublesome, were the chief rents. Chief rents consisted of various dues and exactions that the lord placed on lands that were unquestionably held by freeholders. The government converted these into an annual payment due the crown, just as had been done for the chargeable lands.\textsuperscript{18}

The existence of these freeholders in Munster created two significant complications for plantation. First, the lands marked for plantation did not lie contiguous to each other. This interspersing of seignories between lands of native Irish and Old English may have seemed ideal to those who thought it would serve as an example and convert these people to civility, but its essential effect was to make management difficult. Also, the difficulty in determining who held title to certain lands created a glut of legal suits by pre-plantation landholders claiming to be freeholders. These cases continued to work through

\textsuperscript{18} MacCarthy-Morrogh, \textit{Munster Plantation}, 71-81.
the courts into the second decade of the next century. By 1611, over one-third of the original plantation land had been returned to the pre-plantation owners.19

One of the primary arguments for planting in Munster and the Ards was that the lands were under-populated and under-utilized. According to Anthony Pagden, this argument extended from the Roman law *res nullius*, by which all unoccupied or under-utilized lands remained common property to mankind.20 Under English legal tradition, such lands within a kingdom would be property of the crown and nothing could be more natural than for the crown to seek to make them profitable. This line of thought held significant appeal in settling North America where the lands were largely uninhabited and unused in English eyes, and not possessed by another ‘civilized’ nation. In Ireland, the claim to lands resided at its root in ancient title and dominion of the crown over the island, with the concepts behind *res nullius* supporting plantation of these lands.21 In Virginia, however, the crown had no pre-established authority, so any claim to dominion had to rest almost entirely on the ideas of *res nullius* or rights of conquest.


21 Elizabeth held reservations about engaging in settlement based on rights of conquest. The idea of settlement on the *res nullius* principle, however, avoided the issues related to conquest. See Nicholas Canny, *Making Ireland British 1580-1650* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 133-34.
The Virginia grant to the adventurers of London and the adventurers of Plymouth limited the area in which the colony could be planted to between 34° and 45° north latitude and lands not “now actually possessed by any Christian prince.” While this last stipulation primarily reflected a desire to avoid war with European neighbors, it also creates the implication when considered in light of a res nullius philosophy that under-utilized lands in possession of a ‘civilized’ nation were reserved to that nation. Without clearly defined boundaries in the New World, possession essentially translated into the area in which military force could be projected. In this matter, the Indians generated more immediate concern for the colonizers than the European nations.

In the initial instructions from the Council in London to the colony founding expedition, much of the ‘advice’ describes how to pick the location for planting the colony. Aside from selecting a position inland and defensible from assault via the sea (from which the Spanish would be most like to come), much of the instruction reflected on how to situate the colony amongst the natives. First, the colony should place itself such that no natives inhabited the area between the colony and the sea. Additionally, the instructions encouraged the colonists to trade with the Indians for a store of corn before choosing a seat, that they might have provisions before the Indians knew of their intent to settle.

---

among them. Also, the colonists were to take measures to disguise their vulnerability and keep the Indians in some degree of awe of them and their weapons. The members of the London Council certainly viewed the Indians as a potential threat to the success of the colony, and a significant one at that. There seems to have been apprehension that the Indians would be less than willing to accept a colony in their neighborhood, whatever legalities it may have rested on in the English mind.\(^{23}\)

Despite the appeal of *res nullius* in the previous plantations, the idea held no real applicability in Ulster. Unlike the Munster project, the escheated lands in Ulster were not viewed as depopulated and waste. As mentioned above, most of the province’s inhabitants remained. Additionally, the earl of Tyrone and his predecessor had engaged in the ‘anglicization’ of agriculture (i.e. an enforced adoption of English methods of agriculture) in portions of their lordship in order to be capable of maintaining larger military forces and keeping such forces in the field longer.\(^{24}\) This project had resulted in both a denser population than in other


\(^{24}\) This is one of the reasons that the Nine Years War lasted so long. Toward the end of the war, as government forces moved into Ulster, their leaders commented on how rich in corn the province was compared to other Gaelic regions of Ireland. See ‘By the Lord Deputy and Other Commissioners at Armagh’
Gaelic parts of Ireland and a more settled, static type of land use. The decision to put the escheated lands to plantation stemmed from a desire in the government to settle the province without reliance on chief men, which had caused them trouble previously with the likes of Tyrone and Tirconnell. Following the flight of these men with their followers in 1607 and the suppression of the O’Doherty rebellion in 1608, the government was able to confiscate most of the six northern counties as escheats by way of treason. These escheats proceeded without the legal tangles that affected the Munster project for several reasons. First, very few freeholders existed in this region due to the Gaelic reoccupation of defunct English lordships such as the earldom of Ulster. Most of the landholders in Ulster had obtained their lands due to this Gaelic resurgence, and those who had title had been awarded such via the ‘surrender and regrant’ schemes. Surrender and regrant had been the choice for a low-cost, minimum force method of bringing Irish chiefs to terms with the government under Henry VIII and Elizabeth. Because the relationships of the

---


For the maneuvering involved in the creations of these earldoms and the inheritance of the Tyrone title see Canny, *Making Ireland*, and Ellis, *Ireland in the Age of the Tudors*.

chief men and some of the land holding were ruled by Irish tradition, the
government attributed ownership based on rights and privileges of that tradition
where title was otherwise unclear. This was essentially a broader form of the
practice used in Munster, but was able to avoid concerns over chargeable lands
and freeholders. In the end, almost the entirety of six counties, sans
ecclesiastical lands, came into the hands of the crown.27

In all cases the government’s claims to the land rested on a legal
principle. The principle used in North America was a simple extension of that
used to overcome Elizabeth’s reticence to impose a plantation within her own
realms, despite that clear title had been established in the Ards and Munster
through English law. The application of the res nullius principle certainly satisfied
any doubts the English might have had about the morality and legality of
occupying lands that otherwise might arguably belong to the Indians or be in the
actual, though not legal, possession of the Irish. This principle remained popular
throughout the seventeenth century, receiving perhaps its most famous iteration
with respect to modern politics in John Locke’s description of the origin of
property in his The Second Treatise of Civil Government.28 The move away from

---

27 Nicholas Canny, Making Ireland, 185. Also, Robinson, The Plantation of Ulster,

28 John Locke, Two Treatises of Government with Filmer’s Patriarcha, edited by
Thomas I. Cook (New York: Hafner Press, 1947), 133-46. Locke claimed that no
property existed in the state of nature. Property was created by man when a
use of the *res nullius* principle in Ulster reflected not only the difference in the character of the province, but also in the principles of the monarchs involved. Elizabeth had always maintained that the status of the Irish as subjects be respected and so hesitated to take any action that might abridge their rights or create disaffection. James’s primary concern in Ulster was to settle the province in such a way as to prevent future unrest; thus he held no reservations about relocating Irish to achieve this goal once title at law had been established.

**Lands Grants and Usage**

Because these plantations all aimed at extending ‘civilization,’ the employment of the land comprised an important part in the various plans. Each plan aimed at recreating the English model of agriculture and town-life in a different setting. The difficulty each plan attempted to surmount lie in how to affect this transplantation.

Sir Thomas Smith based his plan heavily on Roman precedent. Ideally, Sir Thomas wanted those who adventured money to go in person and become resident landlords. Such landlords would receive, at the least, a plowland containing 250 English acres of arable land plus incidental lands.\(^{29}\) The tenants, man mingled his labor with what nature provided. Beyond this, the laws of property were created by man.

Sir Thomas hoped, would be comprised mostly of those Irish who would peacefully till the ground. For those Englishmen who wished to subscribe to the joint stock but not go in person, their money would be used to fund transport of a settler who could not pay for a share. These settlers, who were not landlords themselves, were to be English laborers and craftsmen, who would help transplant the English way of life and agriculture. Sir Thomas believed this plan would bring enough Englishmen to the colony to see to its protection from aggressors, while simultaneously teaching the ‘gentle Irish churl’ to live a ‘civilized’ life.\(^30\)

Smith’s project proved a dismal failure in the end. Aside from the difficulty of raising money and gathering colonists, the plan to establish English landlords never succeeded. In the end, the colony fled before a significant local rising of Irish against the government. In planning the Munster plantation, the government determined that a broader settlement with smaller individual responsibilities provided the best possibility for a successful settlement.

The seignories granted to the Munster undertakers nominally consisted of twelve thousand acres (called a full seignory), or smaller parcels of eight thousand, six thousand, or four thousand acres, which they would hold directly

\(^{30}\) Quinn, ‘Sir Thomas Smith,’ 548. CSPF, Elizabeth 1583 and Addenda, 490.
of the crown in free and common socage with an estate in fee farm. The full seignory served as the basic unit on which the conditions were written, with smaller seignories to meet the conditions “ratably after their proportion.” The acreage calculation did not include ‘waste,’ such as mountain, bog or scrub, though such lands as fell within a seignory’s boundaries were included in the grant and could be improved. The actual sizes of the seignories varied widely from these prescribed allotments due to the adoption of a “speedy and superficial sort” of survey. The government adopted this rather uncertain method in February 1587 after the survey commission suspended work on a more exact survey the preceding October due to weather and the short length of winter days. Because the settling of the undertakers in seignories had already been delayed a year, the government thought the further delay resulting from the survey would be prejudicial to any hope of success in the project. As part of their commission for this speedier survey, the surveyors received the power to send warrants to the Lord Chancellor of Ireland for letters patent for seignories.

---

31 Free and common socage is a condition of land tenure in which the tenant owes a rent and fealty, but not homage or other incidents (including wardship) to the landlord. This form of tenure was the most common type of tenure in England by this period, and in 1660 became the only form of tenure with the Tenures Abolition Act. Its popularity with tenants is attributable to its freedom from feudal exactions. An estate in fee farm is one in which the grantee and his heirs hold their lands in perpetuity for a pre-determined rent.

32 SP 63/123/24 and CSPI, 1586-1588, 84-89.
assigned by agreement between any six or more of the undertakers in a county.  

Two additional factors led individual allotments to vary from the planned seignory sizes. First, some undertakers had already agreed amongst themselves to take certain seignories as yet unsurveyed, provided that their rents be abated or increased proportionately were it found they had less or more than the designated acreage. Second, some court favorites had received seignories directly from the crown, circumscribing what the survey commission could grant. In the most significant case, Sir Walter Raleigh received a grant of three and one half full, contiguous seignories with specific directions on where the grant should be made.

Once the seignories were in the hands of the undertakers, they held the responsibility to further the project by settling English families and creating an English society on Irish soil. On a full seignory, the government expected undertakers to settle ninety families, in addition to their own. The plan called for six tenants to be freeholders with 300 acres each, six more to be farmers holding 400 acres each in fee farm, and forty-two copyholders to hold 100 acres each. The remaining thirty-six tenants, including cottagers and tradesmen, would hold

---

33 *CSPI, 1586-1588*, 271-73.

34 *CSPI, 1586-1588*, 271-73.

35 *CPRI, vol. 2*, 131-32.
fifty, twenty-five, or ten acres at the discretion of the undertaker.\textsuperscript{36} An additional 600 acres could be reserved for parkland, which the undertaker could use for breeding horses, keeping deer, or building a warren.\textsuperscript{37}

By bringing over English families to achieve this planned settlement, the government sought to ensure the creation a society modeled on that of England. The plan itself mirrored the manner in which land was commonly used in England. The expected result was the creation of a stable, static population that could be controlled through the standard means of English government and produce revenue for the crown. Though the practice did not live up to the hopes of the planners, many elements of the plan were considered to be sound and employed by the framers of the Ulster plantation.

The Ulster plantation plan resembles the Munster scheme in several ways despite the prevailing view of the time that the latter was a failure. The most significant differences in the Ulster plan emerged directly from the perceived causes of the 'failure' in Munster. Perhaps most striking, the lands in Ulster would be granted out in 'proportions' of one thousand, one thousand five

\textsuperscript{36} MacCarthy-Morrogh, \textit{The Munster Plantation}, 30-31. Not all copies of the conditions include the explicit instructions on number of families. MacCarthy-Morrogh mentions four copies that do include this, none of which are available in print or microform.

\textsuperscript{37} \textit{CSPI, 1586-1588}, 86.
hundred, or two thousand acres. The inability of the undertakers for Munster to fulfill the goals of that plantation stemmed, in the minds of the Ulster planners, largely from the size of their grants. Additionally the terms under which these lands would be held differed significantly from the Munster terms. Firstly, there existed three categories of grantee: “1. English or Scottish, as well as servitors as others, who are to plant their portions with English or inland Scottish inhabitants 2. Servitors of the kingdom of Ireland, who may take meer Irish, English, or inland Scottish Tenants at their Choice 3. Natives of Ireland who are to be made freeholders.” The Ulster undertakers still received their proportions with an estate in fee farm, but their tenure would vary by proportion size. The two larger type proportions would be held by knight’s service in capite for the large proportions and knight’s service as of the Castle of Dublin for medium proportions. Those who received the one thousand acre proportions received

38 Orders and Conditions of Plantation,’ 80. The ‘Orders and Conditions’ and the ‘Project of Plantation’ (see below) specifically use the term ‘proportions’ as opposed to ‘seignories’ as used in Munster.

39 ‘Orders and Conditions of Plantation,’ 80.

40 The difference between knight’s service in capite and knight’s service as of the Castle of Dublin are significant from two points of view. From the point of view of the king, holding in capite was more honorable as it was a tenure directly from the crown. Holding as of the Castle of Dublin was a slightly less honorable tenure from this perspective because it was held via an intermediary body. From the undertaker’s point of view, both were unattractive due to the incidences of knight’s service. The tenure in capite, however, was even less attractive because greater expense would be required to meet the feudal incidences.
the benefit of holding in free and common socage. The greater burden of knight's service tenure made the larger proportions initially unattractive to many potential undertakers, and the undertakers were eventually exempted from the incidences attached to knight’s service. The same scheme of tenures applied to the natives, except that forfeiture in case of rebellion was specifically mentioned in the clause.\footnote{‘Orders and Conditions,’ 79-81. Also, Canny, \textit{Making Ireland}, 201. Hill includes in a footnote the objections of Sir Arthur Chichester, Lord Deputy of Ireland, to the use of tenures in knight’s service. Hill holds the opinion that these objections did much to sway this decision. ‘The Project of Plantation’ reiterates the sizes of the proportions and elaborates on how they will be made up and divided, but it makes no mention of the estate or tenure through which they will be held.}

The ‘Revised Articles’ published in 1610 changed the terms of holding a proportion such that each undertaker would hold his grant in free and common socage with an estate in fee simple, though the land was still to be held as of the Castle of Dublin rather than directly from the crown.\footnote{T. W. Moody, ed., ‘The Revised Articles of the Ulster Plantation, 1610,’ \textit{Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research} 12 (1934-1935): 180-81. These articles were probably published in April 1610, though Moody states that the most certain we can be is to say “between 25 March and 24 June 1610.” The original ‘Orders and Conditions’ were finished in March 1608.}

Unlike the Munster project, the escheated lands in Ulster were not viewed as depopulated and waste. As mentioned above, there existed in Ulster a denser population than in other Gaelic parts of Ireland and a more settled, static type of land use. Because most of this population remained, the survey of the escheated Ulster land proceeded more quickly and via a new method, which utilized the
lands pre-existing divisions among the current inhabitants. The sizes and names of the divisions varied from one county to another, such as balliboes in Tyrone and Coleraine and tathes in Fermanagh, and the commission held inquests to determine their equivalents in English acres. For example, the balliboe of Tyrone and Coleraine equaled approximately 60 English acres, and 16 balliboes were used to compose one proportion of the lesser size. In some counties the divisions were not of equal amounts of land and so the lands were surveyed by the English acre. Also, as in Munster, each proportion included adjacent lands that had been labeled as waste or unprofitable at no additional rent. Neither did this land count toward the total acreage of the proportion, even though much of it was upland pasture or scrub. This survey proceeded much more quickly than that of Munster and did not cause the delays that had discouraged so many settlers and undertakers there.

‘The Project of Plantation’ proceeded to describe, county by county, how proportions were to be laid out and distributed to undertakers. Each proportion

---

43 Note that this only amounts to 960 acres. The acreages of the proportions did not come to exactly the prescribed amounts, but as near as the divisions could approximate.

44 ‘The Project of Plantation’ in Hill, *Plantation in Ulster*, 90-116. Hereafter cited as ‘the Project.’ ‘The Project of Plantation’ is not a revision of the ‘Orders and Conditions,’ but a very detailed account of what quantity of land lay in each county and how this land was to be divided. The ‘Orders and Conditions’ were finished in March 1608 and ‘the Project of Plantation’ came about a month later, either in late March 1608/9 or April 1609.
was also a parish, for which a church was to be constructed. The incumbents to these churches received a grant of glebe lands consisting of 60 acres in the smallest proportions, 90 acres in the middle proportions, and 120 acres on the largest proportions. Additionally, ‘the Project’ secured the lands that appertained to the bishoprics of Ulster. The plan also created ‘precincts,’ which were groups of proportions clustered together. Undertakers were assigned to precincts according to nationality and possibly region of origin. For example, the proportions of one precinct might all be granted to undertakers from the west of England and the next adjoining precinct to Scottish undertakers. By creating these precincts, the planners sought to place undertakers in neighborhood with others of the same region and customs.45

The one thousand acre proportion served as the base for describing the terms of the Ulster plantation, with the charges increasing “rateably for the greater proportions.” The rents due the crown varied, but unlike the Munster project the variation was based on which type of undertaker and tenants were on the proportion rather than the ‘quality of the ground.’ British undertakers, who were allowed to settle only English or inland Scots, owed a rent of 6s 8d per sixty English acres, which was fully abated for two years due to the cost of

transportation. Servitors, whose rents were also abated for two years, owed 10s per sixty acres if they inhabited them with Irish, but only 6s 8d if they settled English or Scots tenants. The native Irish received only a one year abatement and were to pay 13s 4d per sixty acres. The government certainly intended the rent rates to promote a greater settlement of English and Scottish tenants than the conditions required. The Ulster rents compare favorably to the Munster rents, being perhaps slightly more generous for those who settled English or Scottish families on their proportions but less so for the Irish freeholders.

Though the original ‘Orders and Conditions of Plantation’ did not set specific quotas on the number of families that the undertakers were to bring over, the articles indicated that such conditions would be forthcoming. When the ‘Revised Articles’ were published in 1610, they included these stipulations. Within three years, the government required each undertaker, on a proportion of 1,000 acres, to settle twenty-four English or ‘inland’ Scot men of at least eighteen years of age. This quantity must also comprise at least ten families. The plan for dividing land among these settlers included two 120 acre plots to be granted in fee farm, three 100 acre plots to be leased, and an additional 160 acres to be divided among at least four other families who were to be cottagers,

46 ‘Orders and Conditions,’ 80, 85, 86.
husbandmen, or craftsmen. The balance of 300 acres was to be reserved for the
undertaker to hold in demesne.\footnote{Moody, ‘Revised Articles,’180-81.}

Additionally, the articles stipulated requirements for building. The
undertakers on the largest proportions had three years to complete a stone
house with a court or bawn around it for defense. For middle proportions, the
house could be either stone or brick with the same requirement for a court or
bawn, and smaller proportions required only the court or bawn. The tenant
families were to build houses for themselves and situate them about the
undertaker’s house to aid in defense and create towns and villages.\footnote{Moody, ‘Revised Articles,’ 181.}

Like the previous projects, the Ulster plantation began with a very specific
plan for the settling of a ‘British’ society on Irish lands. Each of these projects
began and ended with the same premise. The projects each began with a region
in which the Dublin government’s authority was weak and often more a
technicality than a reality. From this, the planners of each project sought to
extend and solidify government authority by settling a loyal population that
would be bound by and help to extend English law, while providing the
manpower to defend of the region from rebellion.

The Jamestown colony had no such detailed plan. The intention remained
to plant a new English civilization where none had existed before, but the
starting premise was different than in Ireland. There existed no local center of
government at the initial stages. The settlement in Virginia was to be an entirely
new expansion of English authority. Additionally, the vast distance between the
colony and its support network in England made it impossible to establish, with
any immediacy, the sort of agricultural model used in Munster and Ulster.
Realizing that the colony would need to be supplied from England for at least a
year before there was any chance of sufficient food being available locally, the
Virginia Company intended that all supplies, labor, and land be used for the good
of the colony as a whole and kept in a common stock. Land would eventually be
granted to individuals when the colony had been established with a solid
foundation, but no more details than that were specified.

Initially, the company had no system by which it would grant land to
individuals. That such grants were to be ultimately made is evident, however, in
the eighteenth article of the first letters patent. The council in Virginia could
‘nominate and assign’ persons for grants from “the lands, tenements, and
herditaments, which shall be within the precincts limited for that colony” to be
held in free and common socage.\(^49\) Despite this allowance by the crown, no
record exists of grants made prior to the second charter in 1609. In the second
charter, the company received the lands under the same tenure, but with a

\(^{49}\) ‘Letters Patent to Sir Thomas Gates and others,’ in Brown, *Genesis of the
United States*, 62.
significant difference. The government would require payment of one fifth of all
the ore of gold or silver the company collected for holding these lands. These
metals were normally considered ‘royal’ ores, and any such mines found were
reserved entirely to the crown. Under these terms, the company not only
received an inducement to search out mines, but the lands were freed from all
other rents, except what the company would charge on grants to individuals.

The Virginia Company announced the division of lands as payment of
dividends in 1616, by which time the colony was well enough established to have
several population centers of which one served as the seat of government. The
lack of a land division plan at the outset stems in part from the need for a
militaristic organization for the early colony, which would be forced to defend
itself without aid due to distance from England. Once the division scheme was
conceived, it seems to have been delayed for planning, and was not clearly laid
out in writing until the November 1618 instructions given to the new governor,
George Yeardley. Under Yeardley’s instructions, all persons sent to Virginia at
their own cost before Sir Thomas Dale left the colony (approximately June 1616)
were to receive a grant of one hundred acres for each share they held in the
company, once they had completed at least three years of service on the
company’s common land. The same was to be granted to those who had gone at
the company’s expense during the same period, once they had completed their
seven-year service on company land. The colonists who had arrived in Virginia after Dale’s departure received only fifty acres per share with those who came at the company’s expense owing seven years of service. All of these grants were made reserving a rent of only one shilling per year per fifty acres.

The grants of land were to extend out from the four existing settlement centers in the Virginia colony at the time. The initial grants parceled out land already cleared about these towns, with 6,000 acres reserved about Jamestown. Of these 6,000 acres, half was to be the Governor’s Lands and the other half the Company’s Lands. On these lands, tenants in service would work out their terms for half profits from their labor. On the Governor’s Lands, the other half would be reserved to support the governor, council, and other public officers. On the Company’s Lands, the reserved half was to be sent to London for employment by the Company itself. Additionally, within each city or burrough, the Company set out 100 acres as glebe lands to support parish ministers and 1500 acres to be City or Burrough land for the support of local officials. In the territory of Henrico, a 10,000 acre plot was to be set aside for building a “College for the Children of

---

50 The terms of service on Company lands consisted of working these lands as a tenant with half the profit reserved to the Company.


the Infidels” to educate Indian children in English language, customs, and religion. For tradesmen and artisans who did not wish to hold agricultural lands, grants could be made of four acres and a dwelling to be held at an annual rent of four pence on condition that they continued in their trade.\(^{53}\)

Like the Irish plans, this project demonstrates a clear intent to establish a model of English society. The bulk of the land remained in agricultural production, but the grants were all centered around established population centers. Aside from the usual benefits of ease of communication and governance, the English preference for concentrated populations in static towns and villages proved convenient for coordinating defense from potential attack. The larger grants per share to the settlers who had arrived earlier compare very nearly in size to those set out as fee farm tenancies and leases in the Ulster plan. Of course, only those who came at the company’s expense and held no other shares received this size portion. Anyone who had paid their own way received land for at least two shares, one for going in person and the second for paying their own way. For those who came later, the grants are certainly smaller, but the same method of determining shares held true. Additionally, there were portions of land available from individuals who did not wish to personally farm their grants.

\(^{53}\) ‘Instructions to George Yeardley,’ 101.
Marked differences exist between Jamestown and the Irish plantations. For example, the rents are significantly lower than what the undertakers in the Irish plantation owed the crown, a cost that the undertakers passed onto their tenants with an increase for profit. The difference in Virginia stemmed from a need to encourage prosperity among the colonists, which was made the more difficult by their distance from profitable trade partners. Once the Virginia economy came to rely on tobacco, the Company collected a percentage on all tobacco trades in order to control the market and maintain stable prices and to collect a profit for itself. Additionally, the settlement and improvement of land grants received direction from a central authority on the scene, as had been planned in the Ards venture. In Munster and Ulster, the government made demands and placed conditions on the undertakers, who were then responsible for seeing such conditions met with little further government oversight or enforcement of conditions. In Virginia, the entire colony was centrally directed from the beginning, giving the local authorities the ability to dictate directly to the people who held and worked the lands. This localized government provided a greater degree of control to keep the colony running in line with the planner’s ideas.
Status of the Native Peoples

Aside from the economic and property concerns that surrounded plantation, the most significant issue facing the planners concerned the place of the native peoples in these projects. To ensure the success of the goals of these plantations, the plans needed to address the potential threat posed by the native inhabitants. Additionally, if these natives could be brought into civil order and obedience, it could only serve to strengthen the English position.

Sir Thomas Smith’s Ards colony plan proposed to take in a number of Irish. Smith’s plan relied on the assumption, popular at the time, that the Irish churl or laborer was quite gentle and amenable to peaceful and civilized life, but that the Irish chiefs oppressed them and took advantage of their ignorance. Sir Thomas had instructed that the colonists should “cherish, maintain and defend such as will till the ground or do any other honest labour,” and that these Irish would be welcome within the colony as tenants under the English landholders. 

In putting aside Lord Burghley’s concerns that all the ‘wild Irish’ were fleeing the region, Sir Thomas commented:

But are the wild now afraid, doth their heart fail them, it is the best token that can be that God will prosper this doing when he casteth his fear in them before, whom he would have reduced in good order. He that is contented with his own and will live quiet, and much more he that will labour for his living, shall be defended,

---

54 CSPF, Elizabeth 1583 and Addenda, 478.
cherished, yea, and enriched if he will. What hurt is offered them if the desolate and desert grounds be made inhabited and plentiful.\textsuperscript{55}

Hopes of easily bringing the Irish into the English style of living were dashed with the murder of Sir Thomas’s son by two of his Irish servants. Sir Thomas did make another attempt to proceed with his colony under the leadership of his brother, but this too failed.\textsuperscript{56} The last sentiment in Smith’s above passage, however, retained its value in some later colonization schemes.

The articles of the Munster plan essentially excluded the native Irish. Those Irish who already held lands with “an estate of inheritance” within the boundaries of a plantation seignory would henceforth owe their rents to the undertaker of that seignory. Aside from this, the undertakers and their undertenants were forbidden to make any estate to any Irish. The number of Irish in the province who were freeholders or held an inheritable estate within a seignory were few enough, but the scattered, discontinuous nature of the escheated lands left a number of Irish living between the seignories.\textsuperscript{57} Because of this close proximity with the native population, the articles contained strict restrictions. The head of every household being settled by the undertakers were required to be of English parents, and none of their heirs female could marry

\textsuperscript{55} CSPF, Elizabeth 1583 and Addenda, 469.

\textsuperscript{56} Quinn, “Sir Thomas Smith,” 553-54.

\textsuperscript{57} MacCarthy-Morrogh, Munster Plantation, 79-80.
with any who were not of English parents or descended from the original settlers. Each of these stipulations attempted to prevent the Irish from gaining possession of any land within the plantation. A further clause forbade any “mere Irish in to be permitted in any family there.” Because servants and laborers were considered a part of their employer’s household, this essentially prohibited the employ of any Irish person by any Englishman within the plantation, if interpreted in its strictest sense.\(^{58}\)

Despite these prohibitions, a number of Irish were reported to be on plantation lands in the 1589 survey. Some even held leases from the undertakers. Most, however, were listed as ‘labourers,’ which several undertakers seemed not to consider a violation of their covenant. Thus the strictest interpretation was not generally applied. The primary goal of the prohibition seems to have been the prevention of taking Irish as household servants, who might have a hand in rearing children and thus dilute their national identity at an early age.\(^{59}\)

The Munster plan recognized a shift in opinion about the Gaelic Irish amongst the English. Rather than an oppressed people yearning for liberation from tyranny and desiring to learn civilized living, the Irish had come to be seen as content in their way of life and loyal to their chiefs. Still, the English thought

\(^{58}\) CSPI, 1586-1588, 86-7.

\(^{59}\) MacCarthy-Morrogh, Munster Plantation, 35-36.
that once the framework of civilization was in place, the Irish could not but be absorbed into that style of living.

The situation in Ulster did not allow for such restrictions due to the presence of a large Irish population in the province. Indeed, one of the government’s first concerns involved relocation of a large number of Irish to clear the way for contiguous plantation without interspersed pockets of Irish. The plan created two primary means of resettling the Irish. First, the plan earmarked a number of proportions to be granted to Irish chiefs whom the government deemed of sufficient loyalty. Those who received such grants could take their people as undertenants. Additionally, the servitor undertakers could take Irish undertenants. Some too would be removed from the province into Connaught. By resettling the Irish in this manner, the plan would create relatively small pockets of Irish population clusters surrounded by larger numbers of British settlers.

While the pattern of relocation aimed primarily at the security of the province, it also indicates a continued currency of the idea on which the Munster project had operated. That the less civilized natives would recognize the obvious superiority of the English and adapt their lifestyles seemed obvious to plantation thinkers. This was the logical conclusion to a line of thought that began with the premises that all men sought to improve their lives and that the English ways of

---

60 See the details of the Ulster Plantation on p 78-82 above.
doing everything were the best. There exists here no small sense of national and
cultural hubris.

The English carried this arrogance with them to the New World, and much
of the instruction given the Jamestown colonists on how to deal with the natives
reflected this. These instructions involved much less suppressive action than
seen in the Irish plantations, however. In the ‘Instructions given by way of
Advice,’ the London Council tells the leaders of the initial settlement they “must
have Great Care not to Offend the naturals,” lest they create another danger to
their colony and deprive themselves of a source of trade and information. This
stipulation also sets a more favorable foundation for converting the Indians to
Christianity, though there is no related directive in these instructions.61

In his orders concerning the government of the Virginia colonies, King
James had instructed that “the true word, and service of God and Christian faith
be preached, planted and used, not only within every the said several colonies,
and plantations, but alsoe as much as they may amongst the salvage people.”62
The Council did not address this issue in instructing the original colonists. In
1609, they did direct Sir Thomas Gates to see to the conversion of the Indians, if
possible by securing a number of their children to be reared and educated within


62 ‘Instructions for the Government of the Colonies,’ in Brown, Genesis of the
United States, 67-68.
the colony.\textsuperscript{63} This means of converting the Indians received a renewal in interest in first House of Burgesses meeting in 1619.\textsuperscript{64} Further, as mentioned above, the 1618 instructions to George Yeardley set aside lands for a "College for the Children of the Infidels."\textsuperscript{65} Neither of these two methods of converting and educating the Indians came to anything, and no evidence exists of any concerted attempt at conversion. Some conversions seem to have occurred, as demonstrated by the report of Edward Waterhouse, a Virginia Company secretary, that the 1622 massacre would have been an "utter extirpation" had it not been revealed "by means of some of themselves [Indians] converted to Christianitie."\textsuperscript{66}

Aside from discussions of conversion and raising some Indian children in the colony, the Indians had no official place within the colony. Even if children had been reared by colonists and the college established, there was no clear indication of what their status would be afterward. Neither did the Company discuss what should be done if the Indians were to adopt the English style of

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{63} 'Instructions Orders and Constitutions to Sir Thomas Gates Knight Governor of Virginia,' in Kingsbury, \textit{Records of the Virginia Company}, vol. 3, 14.

\textsuperscript{64} H. R. McIlwaine, ed., \textit{Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia 1619-1658/9} (Richmond: 1915), 10.

\textsuperscript{65} 'Instructions to George Yeardley,' in Kingsbury, \textit{Records of the Virginia Company}, vol. 3, 102.

\textsuperscript{66} 'A Declaration of the State of the Colony and ... a Relation of the Barbarous Massacre,' in Kingsbury, \textit{Records of the Virginia Company}, vol. 3, 550.
\end{flushleft}
living. The status of the Indians generally resembled that of foreign neighbors or that ambiguous status which the Irish had held prior to becoming subjects. In different times and situations, they were allies, enemies, trading partners, tributaries, and guides. Always though, they were outside the colony, separate and distinct.

Thus we see that despite the importance placed on the civilizing effects of colonies stressed in the rhetorical justifications, the plans only made desultory allowances for such a goal. Bringing civilized life to the native peoples took a secondary place to providing for the internal stability of the colony itself.

Conclusion

These plantation plans demonstrate both continuity in and evolution of thought on how to establish such projects. The evolution arises from the fact that the founding conditions and motivations for these projects show some variety. Additionally, these plans were influenced by perceived failures of the early projects and a shift in royal priorities. Most markedly, the Virginia colony differs from the Irish schemes in political and geographic conditions. Additionally, its founding is initially driven by a primary motive to profit, whereas the Irish plantations were primarily conceived as instruments of stability in their respective provinces.
Each of these projects aims, as a part of their program, at the establishment of a standard of land use and ownership based on the English agricultural model. To achieve this, each scheme finds a legal argument on which to base claims to the lands, though the particular arguments differ for the political situation of each. Once the lands were legally in hand, the planners sought to distribute them such that small workable plots would ultimately come into the hands of tenants who would work them. In all cases, the government granted rights and privileges intended to speed the projects on their way to stability and prosperity.

Surprisingly, more significant differences do not exist concerning the prospects of the native peoples. The projects in Ireland were all intended to bring the Irish into their ‘proper’ subjection to the crown as part of their stabilizing mission, while in Virginia the English remained satisfied to push the Indians aside, dealing with them as foreigners. In either case, the native people were considered as likely threats and enemies to the plantation projects, but also as capable of learning ‘civilized’ life. The plans did not, however, place emphasis on means for civilizing the native people. Both the Irish and the Indians were relegated to a place outside the colony. Only in Ulster were some Irish placed on proportions, but they remained sharply divided from the settlers.

Reflecting on these major points of planning in light of the rhetoric used to champion and justify plantation demonstrates that the economic concerns of
colony building received much more attention in the plans than did attempts at civilizing the natives, despite their co-equal treatment in the rhetoric. This derives from the very root of the problem faced by the English in Ireland, that they could not govern the Irish. The plans are quite detailed in laying the foundation for the colonies, the area and population for which governing will be possible, in the English legal tradition, the means by which it would be ruled. The area and people outside the colony would not be immediately under this rule, and so are dealt with less precisely. This imprecision can also be accounted for by accepting Canny’s argument that the English of this period had a notion of cultural evolution, in which all people strove to better their way of life. With this presupposition, the conclusion could be reached that, because the English way of life was the best imaginable in their view, any less developed peoples exposed to close contact with it would desire to emulate it. In this case, the lack of planning for how a plantation would civilize the natives resulted from the perception that their ‘evolution’ would be an automatic, natural occurrence, and therefore required no planning.

Certainly, some of the planners honestly believed that these plantations would encourage the growth of civility among the native peoples. It would, however, be too simplistic to take all such justifications at face value. The base issue that led to the development of the plantation policy was the lack of stability in Ireland. The most basic goal of plantation, therefore, was the establishment of
a population that would recognize and extend the government’s authority, and the bulk of the planning reflected that. Further, these men must have been cognizant of the fact that acculturation might work against them, as the earlier Gaelicization of many of the Old English demonstrated. Thus, the schemes for plantation drew a sharp division between the settlers and the natives. Even the Ulster plan, in which some Irish could be said to be within the plantation, assigned the natives to a limited number of proportions surrounded by precincts of Scottish and English. Still, the rhetoric of the civilizing mission, supported by legal land claims and the res nullius principle, provided the moral justification for the English colonizers.

The English idea of a colony contained economic and social components in its rhetorical form. When the plans for colonies were laid, however, the economic factors became the foci. Though the ‘civilizing mission’ remained the moral portion of the rhetorical justification, in practical application establishing legal title to the lands became sufficient justification to proceed. The practical concerns of the planners focused very much on the internal stability of the colony, leaving other factors planned for only cursorily.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The concept that the English experience in Ireland had a definite influence on further English colonization, particularly in America, has gained a resounding popularity. No historian to date, however, has undertaken to compare these regions in detail. Connections in rhetoric and actual planning certainly exist, as the previous chapters have discussed concerning Irish plantation and the colony at Jamestown. These connections emerge from the English conception of what comprised a colony.

Examining the Jamestown colony in light of the Irish plantations provides a convenient first step in exploring the early period of English colonial thought. Its planning and execution occur contemporaneously with the last Irish plantation, and has left sources very similar in nature to its Irish counterparts. Additionally, the English exploration of America, including expeditions intending to found colonies, coincided with the earlier Irish plantations. Each of the topics needed for such an examination have been of such interest that a plethora of secondary sources and a significant number of published primary sources are available.

A number of criteria have been used here to explore the connectivity of the various projects the English engaged in through this period: the rhetoric used
in describing the lands and native people of the areas to be planted, the funding of plantations, the legality behind claiming lands, the disposal of land in the plantations, and the role of the native people in the plantations. These points of inquiry show us that, though the period was one of experimentation and adaptation in colony planning, a line of continuity can be traced from one project to the next. They also demonstrate that though the rhetoric and planning show a measure of consistency in crossing the Atlantic, there is also a gulf between the ideals of the justifications and the realities of the plans.

The most direct thread of continuity runs through the descriptions of the lands and native peoples. The English developed a standard rhetoric of improvement regarding these topics. The people, whether they be Irish or Indian, lacked civility. The Irish maintained a primarily pastoral economy. They practiced transhumance with some supplemental farming and considered land rights to reside with the clan rather than the individual. The Indians engaged in a primitive agriculture, supplemented by hunting and gathering, but maintained no livestock. The natures of these economies were reflected in the settlement patterns of the people who used them. The Irish had few towns or villages of any size and the population was very mobile. The Indians lived in widely scattered villages, such that the surrounding wilderness served their hunting needs. Neither system could support the type of population that the advanced agricultural system of the English could, nor were these systems conducive to
government beyond a very localized system. Once colonies were founded near them, these people, according to the proponents of colonization, would have the opportunity to improve themselves by learning civility from the English. There were no missionary plans, however, for direct action by the colonists to advance this learning process.

The English described lands on which colonies might be founded in lavish terms. The commentators unfailingly praised the lands as among the most fertile they had ever seen. Aside from being suitable for growing all the common crops of England, these lands contained a number of commodities for ready profit, including some not readily available in England, such as timber. The only things these lands lacked were ‘industry’ and ‘manurance.’ Because they considered these lands under-utilized, the English could take it as their prerogative to improve and make use of them to their own profit. That it should be the English who undertook the improvement of these lands and people was never doubted.

The planning and execution of these projects demonstrates further threads of continuity and at the same time reveals a degree of experimentation and adaptation. Based on their medieval experience in Ireland, the English had developed the ideas that a strong local government and a strong, loyal local population were necessary components in subjugating any region. Each plan aims at the establishment of both of these standards to turn the targeted lands to civility and profit. Each also takes into account the financial issues facing the
English government, and its inability to provide sufficient funding for such projects.

These four plantation projects can be divided into two types: privately initiated and government initiated. In each case, private individuals would provide the necessary funds to carry the project out. In the case of the privately organized projects, the Ards and Virginia colonies, funds were to be collected and pooled in a joint stock. Contributions to this joint stock entitled the subscriber to dividends to be paid out in the form of land grants within the colony after the venture was firmly established. The government organized plantations, however, made grants immediately to a private individual, called an undertaker who would be responsible for bringing over tenants to his new lands. Both the undertaker and his tenants applied funds directly to the improvement of the lands on which they settled, with the undertaker having additional responsibilities for mills and other important large works. The same premise applies in each case, that private individuals would fund the project because the government could not foot the bill despite its support of the project, but the two different solutions were found for the circumstances of each.

In either case, the government expressed its support through indirect financial backing. Such indirect support included the abrogation of rents on lands, exemptions from customs, and other extraordinary privileges. These measures usually expired after a number of years and were intended to help the
colony reach a level of stability and prosperity, which would not only make them profitable once the terms expired but also encourage their long-term success.

Another commonality amongst all of these projects lie in the English need to base claims to land on a legal principle. In each of the three Irish projects, the ultimate claim to the lands traced back to Anglo-Norman title and an escheat to the crown. In the case of the Ards and Munster, however, there existed some moral hesitancy that was overcome by reports that the land lay waste and unpopulated. This *res nullius* principle, in which all 'empty things' were free to be taken by those who would improve them, made the North American continent appear as a fruit ripe for the plucking. In the areas targeted for settlement by the English, the Indian inhabitants generally lived in small, widely scattered villages surrounded by large areas of wilderness or 'waste.' Because the English had no pre-existing claims, and were actively arguing against the right of conquest, their claims to the wilds of the New World rested solely on the *res nullius* principle. Though the most basic principles on which the English based their land claims differ from Ireland to America, the principle applied in America can be seen as a reflection of justifications used in Ireland when simple legal title was not enough.

The English government granted out the lands to which it had established claim in fairly large parcels. These parcels were to be further sub-divided into plots of reasonable size for an individual tenant to farm. The government
organized plantations made the large grants to individual undertakers, who received specific instructions on how to subdivide. Within Munster, the largest subdivision by an undertaker was to be a three-hundred-acre freehold, while in Ulster it was to be only 120 acres held in fee farm. In the privately organized colonies, the officers of the joint stock determined how parcels were to be granted. In both the Ards and Virginia, each share held by an individual entitled him to a single grant. These grants would include 250 arable acres in the Ards and in Virginia 100 or 50 acres, depending on date of arrival. Each project also included stipulations that parish churches should be founded for the settlers, but only in the Ulster plantation were glebe lands specifically mentioned. In each type of plantation, the individual parcels decreased in size from the first attempt of the type to the next, much as did the grants to undertakers in the government planned projects. The increasingly smaller acreages specified by the government certainly derive from a perception that earlier projects failed due to too much responsibility placed on too few individuals. The decision to make relatively small grants in the Virginia colony, however, probably took its cues from the recent example of the Ulster plantation and more practical concerns, such as the amount of land under the control of the colony and the number of shareholders with multiple shares.

Planners of each project had further to contend with what place the native people of the area would occupy in the settlement. In the Ards, the Smiths
wanted Irishmen to enter the colony as laborers and learn the English way of life. In Munster, the Irish were to be excluded from living within the plantation, but were to live as neighbors to the English so that they could learn by their example. The Ulster planners created special divisions, which were to be resettled by Irish along the same pattern as were the British settlers within their proportions. Additionally, the planners relocated a large number outside the province. In Virginia, the colony intended to maintain a relationship as friendly neighbors to the Indians so that they could be an example to them. Further, the Virginia Company entertained the idea of teaching young Indians the English way of life by having some of their children raised by colonists and establishing a college for them as well, though they never acted on either. In general, the natives were to remain a separate people outside the plantation boundaries.

Though civilizing the native inhabitants and bringing Anglican Christianity to them played an important role in the rhetoric of colonization, the planning for such conversions remained sparse and rarely acted upon. Consequently, results in these areas remained minimal. In Ulster, some of the Irish were incorporated into the plantations, though on separate proportions, and came to adopt an English type of agriculture. This achieved the essential goal of the English by making the population relatively static, taxable, and less able to engage in rebellion or otherwise disturb the peace. Though Anglican clergy were established in many places throughout Ireland, it affected little overall change,
and most Irish maintained their Catholic faith. In Virginia, Indian children were never brought to live within the colony, nor was any progress made in developing a school. Neither did the colonists ever pursue a serious program of religious education. Some Indians became regular visitors within the homes of colonists, but most of these participated in the 1622 Massacre. The hopes of colonial theorists and planners that the native populations would look in awe at the English way of life and adopt it for themselves proved to be idle fantasy. Because no course of action developed for civilizing these ‘barbarous natives,’ the only real ‘success’ occurred in Ulster where a significant portion of the population already engaged in an English style agriculture and were made further reliant on it once constrained to smaller parcels of land.

Though the plans differ from one another in many ways, the basic underlying premise remains the same, to spread the power and increase the revenue to the English government by settling a loyal population that would adhere to the English way of life and be able to provide for its own defense. The continuities between these plantation projects exist precisely because the underlying premise remained the same. The planners of each enterprise attempted to set forth conditions that would promote the success of the colony by maintaining the rule of law in the claiming of land, granting this land on familiar property terms, and granting financial incentives and allowances. These
means of creating internal stability for the colonies were the focus of each plan examined above.

This examination provides significant support for the idea the English had a standard conception of what a colony should be. In the rhetorical justifications for colonization, the economic factors and the civilizing mission were presented as co-equal motivators for the establishment of colonies. Despite this, the actual plans focus on the economic factors, and virtually ignore the civilizing mission. Yet even this gap between the rhetoric and the planning remained consistent as it crossed the Atlantic. This comprises only the first chapter in the story of the Virginia colony, however, and neglects the later colonies founded in North America. Though the preceding chapters have been but a small step in connecting Ireland and America, they take a positive first step in examining the transatlantic application of early English colonial thought.
APPENDIX A

MAPS
All maps in this section are based on the public domain blank map of Ireland found at www.wesleyjohnston.com/users/ireland/maps/base_map.gif
APPENDIX B

GENERAL TIMELINE
GENERAL TIMELINE

Because the nature of much of the text is non-chronological, I have thought it fit to provide a timeline of events here.

1571, 5 October  The English Government accepts the petition of Sir Thomas Smith and his son, Thomas Smith, for planting a colony in the Ards, Ireland.

1571, 16 November Letters patent issued to Sir Thomas Smith and son for his project in the Ards.

1572, September  Thomas Smith (the son) lands in the Ards with approximately 100 men.

1573, 18 October  Thomas Smith murdered by 2 Irishmen in his service. This is immediately followed by a general rising by the Irish of the region under Sir Brian O'Neill.

1574, August  Sir Thomas Smith dispatches another colony of 150 men under his brother, George Smith.

1575, January  Sir Brian O'Neill, already pardoned for his earlier rebellion, is slain by the earl of Essex, resulting in another rising under Niall Faghtertach O'Neill. This effectively ends Sir Thomas Smith's Irish projects.
1579 2 November  The earl of Desmond proclaimed traitor.

1583 11 November  The earl of Desmond killed.

1584 19 June  Commission granted to Sir Valentine Brown and others to
               survey the lands in Munster that escheated to the crown due
               to the late rebellion of Desmond.

1585  Scheme for the plantation of Munster. This plan was altered
      and finalized over the course of several months.

1585  First settlement attempted at Roanoke under Sir Richard
      Grenville.

1586  Sir Francis Drake brings the Roanoke settlers back to
      England

1587  Second settlement at Roanoke with John White as governor.

1590  John White returns to Roanoke after delays in gathering a
      new supply. The settlement is abandoned. No trace is ever
      found of the colonists.

1593 May  Maguire enters rebellion in Ulster, initiating the Nine Year’s
          War.

1594 June  O’Donell joins Maguire in rebellion. The earl of Tyrone comes
           to Dublin, promises to restore peace in Ulster.

1595 May  Tyrone joins in rebellion, despite his earlier promises.

1595 June  Tyrone proclaimed traitor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1598 October</td>
<td>Rebels move into Munster, where many local Irish join them. Plantation of Munster overthrown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603 March 24</td>
<td>Elizabeth dies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603 March 30</td>
<td>Tyrone submits to Lord Mountjoy. Mountjoy rushes to make terms with Tyrone before he learns of the Queen’s death and the accession of James, with whom he had long corresponded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606 10 April</td>
<td>Charter issued for the Virginia Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607 13 May</td>
<td>Jamestown established in Virginia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1607 4 September</td>
<td>The Flight of the Earls. Tyrone and Tyrconnel flee Ulster with over 90 family and followers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1609 23 May</td>
<td>Second Charter issued to the Virginia Company of London.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1612 12 March</td>
<td>The Third Charter issued to the Virginia Company.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1622 22 March</td>
<td>Surprise attack by the Virginia Indians kills over 300 colonists in Jamestown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1624 June</td>
<td>Culmination of the <em>quo warranto</em> case which results in the loss of the Virginia Company of London’s charter. Virginia becomes a royal colony.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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