GRAAT On-Line #24 – September 2020

What Role did Dutch New Netherland, Today's New York, Play in the Making of American Slavery and its Unmaking?[1]

Suzette Tanis-Plant
INRA

Manisha Sinha's masterwork, *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition*[2] became, upon publication (2016), a major reference for all those studying the struggle to unmake American slavery, and it figures at the top of the reading list for French students preparing for the 2019 *Agrégation*[3] in American civilization. Upon publication, the book was lauded in the *New York Review of Books* by James M. McPherson, Professor of American History Emeritus at Princeton. He summed up Sinha's research by stating that it "has cemented in place the last stone in the scholarly edifice of the past half-century that has rehabilitated the abolitionist's reputation."[4] In the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Steven Hahn, Professor of History at New York University, hones in on Sinha's findings which he praised as "deep and wide-ranging, and she reacquaints us with familiar historical figures and introduces us to those who may not be familiar…."[5] All these compliments are rightly earned, and John Stauffer, Professor of African and African American Studies at Harvard University, correctly insists upon the importance of Sinha's research when he writes that besides those who are interested in slavery and abolition, "*The Slave's Cause* should be required reading for every scholar in the humanities and social sciences who is concerned with the American condition."[6] Sinha herself explains why this is so: "The enduring heritage of the abolition movement is … its unyielding commitment to human rights…."[7]

Above and beyond referencing thousands of individuals who participated in the fight for abolition, Sinha offers a framework to conceptualize their involvement. She presents the history of abolition as a two-wave movement: the first wave crests upon the revolution and the slaveholding Republic and the second wave, "the golden age of abolitionism"[8] crests upon secession and the Republic at war. Maintaining that "the story of the rise of abolition is an interracial one"[9], under the label of "The First Wave" Sinha does share findings about the very powerful but long-forgotten antislavery voices and the acts of resistance those early abolitionists engaged in well before the American Revolution, with a special emphasis on Quaker abolitionists. Her first chapter is dedicated to "Prophets Without Honor"[10] such as John Hepburn, Elihu Coleman, and Benjamin Lay. In more detail, she relates how Anthony Benezet, a French-born American abolitionist and educator, was active in Pennsylvania where he founded the Society for the Relief of Negroes Unlawfully held in Bondage, one of the world's first anti-slavery in that community's settlement on the Delaware Bay. Peter Cornelius Plockhoy, a Mennonite, led the banning of slavery in that community's settlement on the Delaware Bay. The latter two date as far back as 1652 and 1663 respectively. Sinha credits this early group of abolitionists with playing "a part in laying the foundation"[11] of the first wave of abolition yet she sets them apart as having ideas that had not yet "gained currency."[12]

When Sinha writes about the pioneers of the first wave, she draws much attention to those in the British colonies. She explains the birth of slavery and resistance to it in what, at the time, were nothing other than miniscule colonial settlements a vast ocean away from the throne the King was sitting on:

> The use of various kinds of unfree labor, Indian slavery, and black and white servitude gradually gave way to African slavery. In the seventeenth century, when slavery, unknown to English common law but prevalent in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies, emerged in British America, pioneering antislavery protests appeared in the colonies.[13]

Sinha presents likewise the nascent use of slavery, and protests to it, in another publication: *Slavery in New York*. These research findings were published in 2005 to accompany the exhibition of the New York Historical Society on that subject, and she contributed a chapter entitled "Black Abolitionism: The Assault on Southern Slavery and the Struggle for Racial Equality."[14] This historical account begins in 1827 with black New Yorkers celebrating the freedom from bondage finally attained through the 1799 Gradual Emancipation Law, New York State's 28-year long, drawn-out strategy white politicians opted for, rather than immediate abolitionism. She does credit black New Yorkers with long being "at the forefront of the movement against slavery—sometimes in silent protest, sometimes in open revolt, sometimes petitioning for their own freedom, and sometimes contesting the institution itself."[15] In *Slavery in New York*, Christopher Moore reveals that long history in his chapter entitled "A World of Possibilities: Slavery and Freedom in Dutch New Amsterdam."[16] His findings did not find their way into Sinha's major work, *The Slave's Cause*. In recent correspondence about the scope of her book, the author clarified that "colonial slavery is not its focus."[17]

Abolition historians have long had their eyes on the British history of America before the revolution. Russell Shorto, historian and journalist, in his 2004 award-winning book, *The Island at the Center of the World: The Epic Story of Dutch Manhattan & the Forgotten Colony That Shaped America*, explains this tendency.

> We are used to thinking of American beginnings as involving thirteen English colonies—to thinking of American history as an English root onto which, over time, the cultures of other nations were grafted to create a new species of society that has become a multiethnic model for progressive societies around the world. But that isn't true. To talk of the thirteen original colonies is to ignore another European colony, the one centered on Manhattan, which predated New York and whose history was all but erased when the English took it over […] in 1664, … folding it into its other American colonies. As far as the earliest American historians were concerned, that date marked the true beginning of the history of the region. The Dutch-led colony was almost immediately considered inconsequential.[18]

With no one to tell its story, New Netherland, as it was called, was, in fact, almost lost to the sands of time. Yet, thanks to several dedicated people and what amounts to much chance, more early history in colonial America is starting to see the light of day. Primary source documents of life in New Netherland survived fire and mold and are now being restored and translated within the framework of the New Netherland

Project. The contents of these documents are lending importance to the Dutch colony and are contributing to the rewriting of the history of colonial America.

For centuries, stacks of the original documents laid dust covered on the shelves of the New York State Library. If their content remained a mystery, because they were written in a language almost long lost, how they came to be on those shelves was known. In 1664, English warships entered what is now called New York harbor and they aimed their cannon at the vulnerable wooden fort on the tip of the island now called Manhattan. The English demanded that the Dutch of New Amsterdam surrender all of the New Netherland colony to the English Empire, and as the English soldiers were examining their booty they came across "48 thick, leather-bound volumes of deeds, wills, the minutes of meetings, petitions, contracts and correspondence – the meticulously maintained, handwritten autobiography of America's first multicultural society,"[19] as the Project refers to this Dutch provincial outpost. Charles Gehring, a specialist in the then obscure field of the Dutch language of the seventeenth century, having just finished a doctorate in 1973, was shown these documents and undertook to translate them. In the early 2000s, those translated documents became "the center of a modest renaissance of scholarly interest in this colony."[20] Shorto was one of those scholars, and he used the documents to write the story of the Dutch in the colony of New Netherland, a huge swath of land bounded by the Delaware and Connecticut Rivers, extending from present-day Albany, New York to the north and comprising what would become New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. All that land and its inhabitants revolved around Manhattan, and Shorto's narration of that Dutch colony being at the root of American freedoms is a fascinating read. Most unfortunately, the institution of slavery and the lives of the remarkable slaves toiling under its cruelty figure very little in his recounting of that Dutch colony. Nor do their acts of struggling for freedom for that matter. Yet those documents were safeguarded in part to settle English administrative interrogations including the status of bondage or freedom of the black men and women now under their rule. Moreover, did those Blacks truly own the lands they were claiming were theirs.[21]

In addition to this general trend of historians overlooking Dutch New Netherland, it also needs noting that the African Burial Ground Memorial, the major event focusing attention on the history of slavery in Dutch New York, was only dedicated in 2007. More than 400 graves had been accidentally come upon in 1991, revealing at day's end the oldest and largest known African American burial ground in the United States. Its dedication brought back into public memory the fact that from the middle of the 1600s to 1794, upwards of 15,000 free and enslaved Africans were buried in a 6.6 acre African American burial ground outside the city limits at that time. Black history in New Netherland did gain some visibility when in 1993, the Burial Ground was awarded designation as a National Historic Landmark, although it was only in 2006 that it drew national attention by being named a National Monument. "The Burial Ground's rediscovery altered the understanding and scholarship surrounding enslavement and its contribution to constructing New York City," states the National Park Service. To date, the Park Service has produced five volumes of studies on the skeletal remains.[22]

The accidental uncovering of yet another burial site would remind contemporary historians of the presence of black slaves beyond New York City. In 2005, during sewer construction in upstate New York, workers uncovered the remains of twelve intact burials and the fragmentary remains of another individual.[23] No personal items were found in the graves but the brass pins securing the winding sheets and the wrought iron nails closing the coffins indicated that they may date to the eighteenth or early nineteenth century. "Studies identified the unmarked burial ground as a place once used by individuals enslaved by the prominent colonial Schuyler family."[24] Philip Schuyler, born into a third-generation, very wealthy Dutch family, was a general in the American Revolution. After the war he expanded his Albany estate to cover tens of thousands of acres and he added scores of slaves to toil away on them.

Given the thoroughness of Sinha's research, might readers think the British colonies were the cradle of slavery and abolition? To better understand the place of Dutch slaves in the history of abolition, in this article I focus on three research inquiries. Firstly, what has been revealed about the inception of slave labor in Dutch New Netherland, today's New York, and what arguments did the Dutch use to entrench it? Secondly, what tactics did slaves under Dutch rule use to resist bondage and seek freedom? Thirdly, what are the implications and ramifications of these first strategies? The overarching question is: do these findings about the early resistance of enslaved Africans under Dutch rule in New Netherland alter Sinha's conceptualization of the history of abolition in America as a two-wave movement beginning around the time of the American Revolution?

What has been revealed about the inception of slave labor in Dutch New Netherland, today's New York, and what arguments were used to entrench it?

Most historians use the year 1619 to date the arrival of the first slaves in the British colonies, and it is the year which serves as a reference for anniversary events marking the inception of American slavery. It is used because it corresponds to the first documented arrival of Africans on soil that would become mainland U.S.A. John Rolfe, an early British colonist, is best remembered for his profitable growing of tobacco which transformed the colony's economy, in addition to his marriage to Pocahontas. Less remembered is the fact that he served as secretary and recorder general of Virginia from 1614 to 1619. In a letter to Sir Edwin Sandys, treasurer of the Virginia Company of London, Rolfe described events in the Virginia colony, and among a long list he noted (in the original text):

> About the latter end of August, a Dutch man of Warr of the burden of a 160 tunes arrived at Point-Comfort, the Comandors name Capt Jope, his Pilott for the West Indies one Mr Marmaduke an Englishman. … He brought not any thing but 20. and odd Negroes, w[hich] the Governo[r] and Cape Merchant bought for victuall[s].[25]

The presence of Africans in the colony needed explaining to company officials. They were happenstance stolen goods not of his doing. The Dutch were notorious for piracy on the high seas, and those famished sailors needed food to continue their journey. It was a highly plausible story.

More recent research findings are revealing an alternative history to the inception of slavery in the New World. It has been found that Rolfe was not telling the truth about the ship being "a Dutch man of Warr." Those 20 and odd Negroes arrived otherwise:

> On an English warship, White Lion, sailing with a letters of marque issued to the English Captain Jope by the Protestant Dutch Prince Maurice, son of William of Orange. A letters of marque legally permitted the White Lion to sail as a privateer attacking any Spanish or Portuguese ships it encountered. The 20 and odd Africans were captives removed from the

> Portuguese slave ship, San Juan Bautista, following an encounter the ship had with the White Lion and her consort, the Treasurer, another English ship, while attempting to deliver its African prisoners to Mexico. Rolfe's reporting the White Lion as a Dutch warship was a clever ruse to transfer blame away from the English for piracy of the slave ship to the Dutch.[26]

The Virginia Company of London, chartered under King James I, had not ordered the use of slaves to resolve the labor shortage in Jamestown. White indentured servants were being contracted, so slavery as an institution did not yet exist in that colony.

The 1620 census of Virginia records 32 Africans, 15 males and 17 females, a number that following censuses recorded as stable for over 5 years.[27] Slavery was the norm for these Africans but it would not be until 1640 that the status of slave would be codified through a court decision. In that year, the Virginia Governor's Council, comprised of wealthy and prominent men appointed by the Crown to advise the royal governor on executive matters, sentenced John Punch, referred to in the court papers as a black "servant," to serve as a slave for the remainder of his life as punishment for running away.[28]

The use of the term "servant" in colony documents has engendered much discussion about the status of Africans in the colony at that time. Were they servants, indentured servants or slaves?[29] Beth Austin has firmly argued:

> No evidence supports the myth that Africans were ever regarded or treated as indentured servants. They were captured in wars or raids and did not negotiate an indenture contract, unlike white servants whose practice of indenture is well documented. The only blacks that seem to have been indentured … appear to have arrived via England, where they may have had the opportunity to negotiate contract terms or enter into an indenture voluntarily.[30]

What is clearer to follow are the paper documents from 1640 onward that trace the laws which gradually closed off any loopholes in the rationale of slavery that could have been slipped through to obtain freedom. In 1705, the argument of an African being free because he/she was a Christian was struck from the books, and any ambiguity about the status of Africans in Virginia was clarified. The Virginia General Assembly declared:

> Be it enacted by the governor, council, and burgesses, of this present general assembly, and it is hereby enacted, by the authority of the same, … [t]hat all servants imported and brought into this country…who were not Christians in their native country…shall be accounted and be slave.[31]

A parallel narrative of the initiation of slavery on the shores of the North American continent emerges when history turns its eyes further north to Albany, New York and the documents now readily available via the New Netherland project. It is a story of slavery clearly documented by the Dutch and starting in New Netherland, today's New York, in 1626.[32] The Dutch had a long-standing involvement in the slave trade. From the early 1500s forward, they, along with the Portuguese, Spanish, English, and French, were competing to control the resources of the transatlantic world and one of them would be the indigenous peoples of the Americas and Africa. It is thought that the Portuguese were the first to engage in the Atlantic slave trade in the sixteenth century but the Dutch did play a role in the development of the trade in the first half of the seventeenth century by directly supplying their short-lived Brazilian colony with slaves and perhaps more importantly by stimulating the cultivation of sugar—with the consequent urgent need for slaves—in the French and English Caribbean.[33]

Sugar and slaves were not the only commodity Europeans were eager to pay good money for. Hats had long been a way to signal one's social identity and by 1580 beaver "wool" was the natural resource for the newly developed felt-hat making industry in Europe, and beaver hats would remain fashionable across much of Europe up until 1850. To supply this industry, the substantial population of the European Beaver was hunted throughout northern Europe and Siberia. Most unfortunately, by the seventeenth century, European beaver populations suffered depletion. As a result, the French, the British, and the Dutch were on the lookout for a new source of pelts.

At that time, the English really had their eyes on spices and were financing explorations for a western passage to India. Before 1600, to finance a ship for exploring, a company would be set up for the duration of a single voyage. Investment in those expeditions was a very high-risk venture because profitability could easily be undone by piracy, disease, shipwreck, and swings in supply and demand. In 1600, the English decided to outmaneuver these risks by bundling their resources into a monopoly enterprise called the English East India Company. Immediately, Dutch competitors were threatened by this maneuver, so in 1602, the Dutch government sponsored the creation of the United East Indies Company, an amalgamation of several Dutch trading companies up until then competing all sails to the wind. The government of the Republic of the United Netherlands granted it a 21-year monopoly over the Asian trade in spices.

In 1609 the company hired Henry Hudson, an Englishman, to search for the Northwest Passage to the Orient and the coveted spices found there. Sailing due west, Hudson entered a yawning harbor and tacked his way up a mighty-wide river to where thundering waterfalls brought his navigation to a stop. At that time, exploring laid the grounds for establishing ownership of "new" lands; the Dutch therefore lay claim to the region that is now New York State and much territory beyond. Along the waterway that today bears his name, Hudson traded with the Native Americans, obtaining furs, a natural resource he immediately recognized as having cash value. When he returned to Europe in 1611 to report back to the Dutch company about his findings, the navigator advocated further exploration and argued that the fur pelts could finance the expeditions. Sometime in 1612-13 Juan Rodigues, a free black sailor working for the Dutch, was left on island in the harbor of the great river, at a temporary log-cabin trading post so that he could trade with the Native Americans. In 1614 the first permanent trading post was established by the Dutch farther up the river just south of where it was no longer navigable. The Dutch by that time had a good understanding of the trade route for furs: coming out of the Adirondack foothills and down from Canada via the Great Lakes, Indians and trappers canoed the river running west-east. The trading post was located at the crucial fur-trading nexus on the Hudson/Mohawk River, and it was called Fort Nassau in honor of the Dutch House of Orange-Nassau. In 1621, looking to secure navigation, trade, and commerce in the West Indies, Africa, and the countries of America, the High and Mighty Lords the States General of the United Netherlands—as the members of the governing body of the country were so respectfully addressed—incorporated a new trading organization. This government backed financial endeavor was named the West India Company (WIC). In the Charter there is no specific mention of the goods to be traded except in one instance, salt. It does lay out what the company had the authorization to do:

> [It] shall have power to make contracts, leagues and alliances with the princes and natives of the countries therein comprised also to build any fortresses and strongholds there; to appoint, transfer, discharge and replace governors, troops and officers of justice and for other necessary services, for the preservation of the places, the maintenance of good order, police and justice, in general for the furtherance of trade, as according to circumstances they shall see fit….[34]

Under this broad grant of permission to act, the governors of the company began a fur trade in New Netherland and a slave trade operating out of Angola. In the beginning these trades were separate entities.[35]

In 1624, the Dutch directors of the WIC foresaw that people sent to the New World to develop the fur trade would find themselves in need of some type of accommodations to live in those dark woods. Consequently, the passage of 30 settlers was financed, so that they could build a bigger and safer haven up north. The settlement was called Fort Orange. Later in the year the workers went south to help construct a couple of houses on the tip of the island in the promising harbor. It was called New Amsterdam. The outpost soon became a provincial extension of the Dutch Republic, expanding the realm of the United Netherlands to across the seas. In 1625, New Amsterdam was designated the capital of the province.

Firmly establishing control over the trade route, the question arose: What needed to be done to increase volume and profits? Given some thought, it was deemed necessary to retain more people in that inhospitable territory. To do so, it needed to be rendered accommodating: land needed clearing, crops needed planting, and homes needed building. The company first thought of a colonial experiment with agricultural laborers from the United Netherlands but that plan did not pan out. In a written remonstrance to the members of the governing body of the country, the "Mightinesses" of the States General, about their negotiation of a peace treaty with Spain—the Dutch enemy at the time—WIC directors also provided a general state of affairs in New Netherland, including why the venture had failed to tempt homeland Dutch to migrate:

> the peopling of such wild and uncleared lands demands more inhabitants than our country can supply; not so much for want of population, with which our provinces swarm, as because all those who will labor in any way here, can easily obtain support, and, therefore, are disinclined to go far from home on an uncertainty.[36]

Furthermore, news was out from further south: survival rates were low due to disease, starvation and hot weather. From further north the news was that harsh winters were taking a dreadful toll. The best laid plans were up against this unanticipated lack of volunteers, although it took no time for the directors of the company to come up with a solution, for they were already involved in the trans-Atlantic slave trade.

> In 1626, a WIC ship brought 11 African slaves to the colony. Based on some of their names—Paul d'Angola, Simon Congo, Anthony Portuguese, and John Francisco—they were probably Africans from the southwest coast of Africa who were captured or purchased from the Portuguese. Two years later, three enslaved Angolan women arrived.[37]

The first crime of institutional slavery in New Netherland was thereby committed. In those early years, the enterprise was singularly corporate with the board of directors in the United Netherlands, in council with the government, deciding on how to best make profits. The slaves were the property of the company and dispatched as such at its will.

In 1629, the WIC initiated a system of patroonships to further attract the Dutch to upstate New York where there were river plains bathed in rich soil for planting. Thousands of acres of land were granted to a single Dutchman, thereby encouraging rich corporate sponsors but discouraging free immigration. But even this failed to lure enough of the wealthy into the company: agricultural development of the Hudson Valley required a Herculean amount of labor and there was a scarcity of free laborers. So soon after, the Company, ardently pursuing its experiment, "promised that each "patroon" would be allotted twelve Black men and women …."[38] For those first years, money was made solely from the fur trade, and according to the company profits were limited. In a 1633 report "Resolution of the States of Holland in regard to the Affairs of the West India Company" the Dutch Lords summed up the reasoning put forth for the failing, gleamed from discussions they had with the WIC Board of Directors. The climate in New Netherland was:

> …found to be cold […]. For this reason, then, the people conveyed thither by us have as yet been able to discover scanty means of subsistence, and have been no advantage, but a drawback to this Company. The trade there in peltries is, indeed, very profitable, but one year with another, only fifty thousand guilders, at most, can be brought home.[39]

The WIC would limp along as the colony ran into all kinds of economic and administrative difficulties. Not ones to invest without thinking, the States General ordered an audit because of the "decline of the Company's affairs." The findings were recorded in a document entitled "Advice of the Chambers of Accounts of the West India Company, Considerations of the Board of Audit of the West India Company regarding the reform of said company, drawn up pursuant to the order of the High and Mighty Lords States General of the United Netherlands and delivered to their Mightinesses' Commissioners at the Hague, the 27 May, 1647." Title included, it well reveals the company directors' thinking about how best to keep the enterprise from folding, and if possible make better profits. A third section of the document is dedicated to trade and lends itself to understanding an evolution in the company stance on slavery. After discussing Brazil and the slave trade there, the report takes up Brazil and New Netherland:

> it is notorious that all their profit and prosperity must proceed exclusively from the cultivation of the soil, and this cannot be better promoted than by population. It is, indeed, true that the supply and abundance of slaves, by whom the tillage of the soil must be accomplished, obviates the necessity of a greater number of people who would otherwise be required for Agriculture. Nevertheless, if slaves are to be properly treated, they must have their particular owners, each of whom undertakes colonies, plantations and farms according to their circumstances and means, and endeavors by slave labor to derive therefrom, either for immediate support, or for exportation whatever can be a source of profit.[40]

The logical sequence is therefore: 1. The only profit to be made in New Netherland is by tilling the land and producing crops; 2. Slaves must do the tilling; 3. Individual Dutch settlers must be allowed to own slaves. This shifted the enterprise away from a corporate model to entrenching slavery into the very lives of the colony's individual settlers.

In a section dedicated to stockholders' investments in the sole province of New Netherland the reasoning becomes more elaborate and merits to be reproduced in whole:

> The country is considered to be the most fruitful within your High Mightinesses' jurisdiction, and the best adapted to all sorts of this country produce, such as rye, wheat, barley, peas, beans, etc., and cattle; and that in more abundance than can be done here, were it suitable peopled and cultivated. The granting of Freedoms and Privileges, hath indeed induced some Patroons and Colonists to undertake some agriculture there; but as the produce cannot be sold anywhere except in the adjacent places belonging to the English, who are themselves sufficiently supplied, those planters have not received a return for their labor and outlay. What a view, then, to give greater encouragement to agriculture, and consequently to population, we should consider it highly advantageous that a way be opened to them to export their produce even to Brazil, […] and to trade it off there, and to carry back slaves in return…. By this means not only would Brazil be supplied with provisions at a cheaper rate, but New Netherland by slave labor be more extensively cultivated than it has hereto for been, because the agricultural laborers, who are conveyed thither at great expense to the Colonists, sooner or later apply themselves to trade, and neglect agriculture altogether. Slaves, on the other hand, being brought and maintained there at a cheap rate, various other descriptions of produce would be raised, and by their abundance be reduced in price, so as to allow, when occasion would offer, of their advantageous exportation hither or to other parts of Europe.[41]

As this reasoning goes, produce from New Netherland could be sold to Brazil to buy slaves who would till all the more the soil of New Netherland and there create a surplus that could be sold in Europe. Individual colonists could make money, the company would make money off levying an excise duty, and Europeans could spend less money on produce. From New Netherland, to Brazil, back to New Netherland and then on to Europe, thanks to slaves doing the work no Dutch would do, the country's Lords, the company's stockholders, the Dutch everyman, and others throughout Europe would make money from this self-fulling trade network. Beyond entrenching, this rationale placed New Netherland and its slavery at the very core of a global business venture.

In the Hudson Valley, Dutch settlers worked slaves on family farms, where they cleared the densely timbered land, tilled the rock-filled soil and harvested crops. They cut wood to heat the high-ceilinged mansions of their rich masters and the modest farm houses of homesteaders. They kept money outgoing for supplies low by doing craft labor such as blacksmithing and barrel making. They kept the household running by doing all the chores. The winters were harsh and the stacks of firewood high. The Hudson Valley slaves also ensured that the people in New Amsterdam had food.

On Manhattan Island, the WIC used slave labor to clear that densely timbered land and till those rocky soils. They constructed houses and public buildings. They erected fortifications, such as the northernmost wall (explaining the name Wall Street), for the colonists needed to be protected from Native American attacks. To sum up, that bustling entity we know today as New York was built with the bones and brawn of WIC-owned chattel slaves.

By 1650, New Netherland's 500 slaves outnumbered those in Virginia and Maryland. Their back-breaking work that no one else would do was driving the economic expansion the Dutch had been rationalizing for over twenty years. In 1655, the first slave was sold in auction, moving the trade in slaves away from the shadowy water fronts and clearly into the public realm. In 1657, the company officially decided colonization, in addition to trade, was to be the aim of the company. Fully understanding that slavery was the key to making this additional goal an economic success, in the 1660s the WIC decided to subsidize the cost of a slave in New Netherland.

Slowly but surely, New Amsterdam became the shipping hub and major port for trade in North America. Ships, following the arched route over from Europe, first landed in this safe and only ice-free harbor before heading to Africa and sailing back again. New Amsterdam was booming, and other nations started to eye its strategic location in the global trade of slaves and other slave-produced goods such as sugar. Moreover, it became apparent that in the great interior of the continent lay a cornucopia of natural resources. To travel north up the Hudson River and then west across the Mohawk River was the best route to access them. The English, just to the west of New Netherland, in Plymouth, and just to the south, in Jamestown, were well placed to squeeze the Dutch out.

When, in 1664, the British ships arrived in the harbor announcing friendly intentions but armed to the hilt, the Dutch negotiated the surrender of their booming city "without firing a shot."[42] King Charles granted the lands to his brother, the Duke of York and this "place of great importance of trade" was renamed in his honor.[43]

The terms of surrender were twenty-three stipulations long, including (in the original):

> […] 3. All people shall still continue free denizens and enjoy their lands, houses, goods, shipps, wheresoever they are within this country, and dispose of them as they please; […] 11.The Dutch here shall enjoy their own Customs concerning their Inheritances; […] 17. All Differences of Contracts and Bargains made before this day by any in this Country shall be determined according to the manner of the Dutch.[44]

This was thought to amount to an English recognition of the legality of all Dutch-claimed property, including slaves.[45] However, the English would start questioning the status of the other African-Dutch: Were they really free? Did they without a doubt own the plots of land they said they did?[46]

At the time of the British takeover, approximately 9,000 people lived in New Netherland.[47] It was a melting pot of a population as historians highlighting Dutch tolerance and the multiethnic model like to speak of it: in addition to the Dutch and the Africans, there were Norwegians, Germans, Italians, Jews, Swedes, Finns, and Native Americans. In all, there were about 1,500 people in New Amsterdam. "… black men and women had become an integral part of New Amsterdam society, composing one-fifth of the population."[48]

Despite the conditions of surrender, the English takeover would have dire consequences for Blacks, enslaved and free. The English soon gave port privileges and warehouse priority to ships engaged in the slave trade. Since nearby colonies, controlled by the British, no longer offered safe refuge, slaves often escaped to upstate Indian nations or French Canada. As early as 1679, New York's Colonial Assembly imposed a fine of twenty-five pounds for harboring fugitives. This was the start of a legal codification of slave status in New York State, and in its wake the British acted swiftly and without pity to close breaches in the institution of slavery that afforded them their economic prerogatives. By 1711, the city opened an official slave market. With the screw of repression tightened down to the board and with the slave trade gone so openly public, the flames of revolt were kindled and one year later, on April 6th, 1712, twenty-three slaves along with a number of indigenous Americans set fire to a building. As the local white population ran to water it down, the rebels shot, stabbed or beat to death nine whites and injured another six before they could be stopped. In all, seventy Blacks were arrested and jailed. Of these, and excluding the six who committed suicide, 27 were put on trial and condemned. Twenty one received death sentences. In a letter to the Lords of Trade in London, then Governor Robert Hunter described the slave revolt and the punishment meted out:

> Some were burnt, others handed, one broke on the wheel, and one hung alive in chains in the town, so that there has been the most exemplary punishment inflicted that could be possibly thought of.[49]

On the heels of this rebellion, ever restrictive laws were voted in to keep the slaves from having the slightest opportunity to gather clandestinely and reason rebellion. Governor Hunter forwarded to the Lords in London the minutes of the Common Council of the City of New York, February 4th, 1713, including two acts passed in subsequent council meetings, referred to as "the Negro Act". Hunter was careful in how he presented to the Lords what amounted to a coding of slave and Native American behavior in the city. "… I am apt to believe, your Lordships will still think too severe, but after the late barbarous attempt of some of their slaves nothing less could please the people…."[50] The first act was entitled "Restricting Night Time Movement." Passed at the March 3rd, 1713 Council meeting, it prohibited both Negro and Indian slaves above the age of fourteen to be out "in the night time above one hour after sun sett without a lanthorn and a lighted candle"[51] under the penalty of eight shillings. If a master so desired, "…every slave or slaves that shall be convicted of the offense…before he or they be discharged shall be whipped at the publick whipping post forty lashes…."[52]

While proof of corporal punishment of slaves under the Dutch is not readily available, there is proof of the extreme psychological and physical harshness they had to bear up under. In a document entitled "Of the Reasons and Causes why and how New Netherland is so Decayed," it is written that in 1646 "the Negroes … who came from Tamandare were sold for pork and peas, from the proceeds of which something wonderful was to be performed, but they just dropped through the fingers."[53] In these lines the practice of equating slaves with mere crops clearly reveals the humiliation the Dutch doled out. Couched in between the lines it is possible to feel an ambient resentment held by settlers and being forwarded to the States General: not enough was being done with the profits being made from the selling of slaves. Other times, contempt was untethered. When Stuyvesant was the Dutch director-general, he accused "a woman slave of theft" and denounced a man for his "laziness and unwillingness," and declared that both be sold "for a maximum profit of the Company."[54]

The bones in the African American Burial Ground tell the story of some of the physical abuse. In a document entitled "Buried Stories: Lessons from the African Burial Ground", researchers reveal that in Burial 6, the 25- to 30-year-old man was likely West African.

> He had arthritis in his arms, legs, and back, which would have made his joints swell and hurt. It came from lifting and carrying heavy loads, over and over. He may have carried some of those loads on his head, since the bones in his neck showed many small fractures. There were signs of infection and disease in his remains. He probably had rickets, a vitamin deficiency that makes bones soft and weak. He was also anemic from too little iron in his diet, which would have made him feel tired all the time. This man's ailments and injuries were common among the enslaved Africans in New York, and so was his early death.[55]

In Burial 335, the skeletal remains of a woman and an infant were found. She was around 30 years old at the time of her death. The child was a newborn or stillborn.

> The woman showed signs of infections and disease. Like most slaves, male and female, she had arthritis in her joints and spine from heavy lifting and hard work. Her teeth indicated that she was malnourished as a child… […] nothing much remained of the child's body… Scientists know, however, that many children were buried in the African Burial Ground. Children under two had the highest death rate among the enslaved people. The first six months of life were the most dangerous of all. Many, like this baby, did not survive. White children died young as

> well, but the extreme harshness of slave life put these mothers and babies at extra risk.[56]

The remains of the African Americans found at the Schuyler Flatts Burial Ground tell a similar story.

> Analysis of the Schuyler Flatts individuals shows clear evidence of musculoskeletal stress and early onset arthritis from a lifetime of hard work. They also suffered from poor dental health and some teeth show marks of habitual activities such as pipe smoking. They exhibit less evidence of nutritional stress when compared with their urban counterparts at the New York African Burial Ground possibly as a result of rural enslavement. [57]

Despite this harsh treatment, the early Dutch slaves found time and energy to resist. They lived under company rule or were owned by individual settlers who lived under the rule of law of the United Netherlands. The resistance of the slaves, as we shall see, was shaped by those immediate circumstances. The legacy of their struggle for freedom may well reach beyond that time and place and thereby change the way the movement for abolition is conceptualized.

What tactics did the early New Netherland, Dutch-owned slaves use to "unmake" their slave status?

Under the Dutch WIC rule, black resistance to slavery took many forms in relationship to there being no statutory basis for their bondage and the fact that for many it was corporate slavery. One act of resistance was the same as what whites did when they were unhappy with a WIC practice: they directly petitioned the Company.

> In 1635, black workers petitioned for wages…. Challenging the still undefined status of black people in New Netherland, five black men—slaves who had been receiving some payment for their labor—memorialized the Company's headquarters at The Hague for an increase in their wages, demanding the same pay as white laborers. The Company granted the request. [58]

By the 1640s, New Netherland had already seen come and go five directors appointed by the WIC. In 1638, Willem Kieft was designated and he subsequently formed a local council, a citizens' advisory board, so that a certain number of "remonstrance" or grievances could be settled locally and in a representative way. The members of the board would eventually write the States General of the Netherlands, blaming governor Kieft for the declining economic condition of the nascent colony and its warring with the Native Americans, but the council worked with him for nine years. In that period, Kieft and the council would oversee several events important to this discussion. Firstly, in 1644, the council of eight men turned its attention to a petition from ten black men. They were asking for their freedom as well as freedom for their wives and children. The minutes of the Council meeting held on the 25th of February reveals the arguments for manumission and officially read as follows:

> We, Willem Kieft, director general, and the council of New Netherland, having considered the petition of the Negroes named Paulo Angolo, Big Manuel, Little Manuel, Manuel de Gerrit de Reus, Simon Congo, Antony Portuguese, Gracia, Piter Santomee, Jan Francisco, Little Antony and Jan Fort Orange, who have served the Company for 18 or 19 years, that they may be released from their servitude and be made free, especially as they have been many years in the service of the honorable Company here and long since have been promised their freedom; also, that they are burdened with many children, so that it will be impossible for them to support their wives and children as they have been accustomed to in the past if they must continue in the honorable Company's service; Therefore, we, the director and council, do release the aforesaid Negroes and their wives from their bondage for the term of their natural lives, hereby setting them free and at liberty on the same footing as other free people here in New Netherland…. [59]

We have no document expressing any degree of elation in the minds and hearts of these men. We can imagine it grand. Tempered, then again, by the long list of conditions.

> … in return for their granted freedom, shall, each man for himself, be bound to pay annually, as long as he lives, to the West India Company or their agent here, 30 schepels of maize, or wheat, pease, or beans, and one fat hog valued at 20 guilders…. With the express condition that their children, at present born or yet to be born, shall remain bound and obligated to serve the honorable West India Company as slaves. Likewise, that the above mentioned men shall be bound to serve the honorable West

> India Company here on land or water, wherever their services are required, on condition of receiving fair wages from the Company.[60]

The conditions made such a long list that the status would be termed "half free." For those with a family, we can imagine there would be no true freedom knowing their children would remain the property of the company.

The New Netherland Institute has documented a list of other manumissions granted while the WIC was trying to tame those forests and rivers. Individual Africans, owned either by the company or individuals, braved asking for their freedom. In 1646, Johannes Megapolensis requested manumission for Jan Francisco under the condition that Francisco would pay yearly dues. It was granted. In 1649, Manuel de Hispanien requested manumission from Philip Jansz Ringo.[61] Reading the document reveals the corporate nature of the logic that prevailed over all agreements, and for this reason merits quotation in full.

> Before me, Cornells van Tienhoven, secretary of New Netherland, appeared Philip Jansz Ringo, who declared that of his own free will he released and liberated from servitude and slavery, as he hereby does [release and liberate], Manuel the Spaniard, promising that he shall nevermore molest him on account thereof, provided that the above named Manuel promises to pay the aforesaid Philip Jansen or his heirs for said freedom the sum of three hundred Carolus guilders within the term of three consecutive years, one hundred guilders on the 15th of February of each year during the three years and no longer, in seawan, grain or such pay as is current here and can be raised by him, Manuel. For the fulfilment of this contract he, Manuel, binds his person and, in case he fail in the payment, Philip Jansz shall have power to reclaim and command him as bond-slave, as if this had never been executed. But in case of payment as above mentioned, Philip Jansz shall, as he hereby does, relinquish all right of ownership. In testimony whereof this is signed this 17th of February1649 in New Amsterdam, New Netherland.[62]

Another group of Blacks was manumitted in 1650 with no number being specified. In the January 27th document answering a petition of the West India Company to the High and Mighty Lords States General of the United Netherlands, in point number 43, it was granted, in passing, that "The Company's negroes, taken from the Spaniards, being all slaves, were, on account of their long services, manumitted on condition that their children serve the Company whenever it pleased…."[63]

Three black women petitioned the company in 1662. They were granted freedom under the condition that they would return to the Director's house on a weekly basis to clean it. One of them, Mayken, soon after petitioned for full freedom.

> She explained that the other women had since passed away, which left the weekly cleaning tasks to her. In her petition, she explained that she had trouble keeping this obligation since she was old and weak. She also pointed out that she had been a slave since 1628 and really wanted to live the final part of her life as a free woman. This time round The Council granted her full freedom.[64]

When English ships approached New Amsterdam's harbor and the threat of change filled their sails, eight black men living under conditional freedom understood all too well what was at risk. On September 4, 1664 they requested full freedom. New Netherland's Council quickly took it into consideration and granted them exactly what they were asking for.[65]

Parents whose children were held under bondage against their expressed wishes did not simply sit on their wishes denied. Several of them as well as other caretakers petitioned for freedom for this second generation of slaves. In 1661, Emanuel Pietersen petitioned the Council to grant freedom to Anthony, son of half-free parents. In 1663, Domingo Angola petitioned the court for the freedom of Christina, the daughter of his deceased wife, Anthonya.[66] In this document, the name of de Reus appears, one of the slaves who petitioned for freedom in 1644. Domingo Angola claimed that Groot Manuel, Simon Congo, and Emanuel Reus had overheard Director General Kieft say that the children of half-free parents who were born after 1644 would be free. Apparently Angola thought de Reus would pass as a credible witness.

Scholars at the New Netherland Institute have followed the petitioning and court life of Manuel de Gerrit de Reus van Angola which says much about this man's worth and astuteness. By the time he petitioned with others for freedom for themselves and their wives and won half-freedom, he had acquired the experience and the standing to negotiate with those in power. He appeared in a New Netherland court document as early as 1639 when he sued Dutch settler Henric Fredericksen van

Bunninck for the 15 guilders that he had earned in wages but had not yet received. In 1643, he and Groot Manuel appeared in court to testify:

> on behalf of Cleijn Manuel, a fellow Company slave. De Reus and Manuel stated that Jan Selis (also spelled Celes), a free colonist, had struck Cleijn Manuel's cow with a knife and chased away other animals. Their testimony must have been convincing because the court resolved that Selis pay Cleijn Manuel for the damages he had done.[67]

Another case that sets the life of de Reus dramatically apart took place in 1641. A company slave, Jan Primero, was found beaten to death, and nine slaves were charged with the murder. The accusation clarifies well the degree of indignation of the community the law was representing, an indignation the accused must have been felt way before the accusation was drawn up. It reads as follows in the "Council Minutes, Court Proceedings, 17 January 1641":

> Cornelio vander Hoykens, fiscal, plaintiff, vs. little Antonio Paulo d'Angola, Gracia d'Angols, Jan of Port Orange, Manuel of Gerrit de Reus, Anthony the Portuguese, Manuel Mlnuit, Simon Conge and big Manuel, all Negroes, defendants, charged with homicide of Jan Premero, also a Negro. The plaintiff charges the defendants with manslaughter committed in killing Jan Premero and demands that Justice be administered in the case, as this is directly contrary to the laws of God and man, since they have committed crime of lese majesty against God, their prince and their masters by robbing the same of their subject and servant.[68]

It is clear to all that the accused slaves had committed a crime against God, against the prince, and against their own masters who had responsibility over them. It is less clear what the ties that bind were: the crime is decried as robbing the community of a subject (as if the dead slave, Jan Primero, were equal before the country's magistrates), while in the same breath, he is a servant, thereby whitewashing in the eyes of history his true status of slave.

The Council Minutes also reveal the judgement:

> after mature deliberation resolved, inasmuch as the actual murderer cannot be discovered, the defendants acknowledging only that they jointly committed the murder and that one is as guilty as another, to have

> them draw lots as to who shall be punished by hanging until death do ensue….[69]

And so… the lot of death fell to de Reus. A scaffold was installed. He was to be hung. It surely looked as if his fate was sealed, but, as the Council minutes go on to reveal"… being a Negro, having around his neck two good ropes, both of which broke, whereupon the inhabitants and bystanders called for mercy…."[70] God's hands had surely torn at those ropes and if God thought mercy should be granted, so be it. Shortly following, when de Reus called for freedom before the Council, he was also heard.

Another means of gaining freedom was through willingness to serve in a militia. In the New Netherland documents, the fear of Indians is abundantly annotated over the lifetime of the colony. From 1641 to 1643 the settlers suffered an unending number of attacks from Native Americans that undid much of the settlers' accomplishments. A plantation was burned, communities were decimated. "Small groups of Indians made sudden strikes on the outlying farms on Manhattan, hacking cattle, burning crops, killing anyone with a white face…."[71] The governing Director at the time, William Kieft, turned to the slaves to protect the lone settlement on the tip of the island. He armed them with axes and pikes. They took them up, knowing their service would be acknowledged, knowing that militiamen or their widows were often granted freedom.[72]

The fight for freedom can also be read and understood through church documents. There are registers of baptisms in the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church which reveal the names of black children.[73] There are records of Blacks getting married in the church.

> The earliest recorded wedding of a black couple occurred in 1641, uniting Lucie d'Angola…with Anthony van Angola…. During the next decade, black marriages composed more than one quarter of those recorded for New Amsterdam.[74]

Sending their children to the church-sponsored school was also an avenue of resistance. Black slaves must have been well aware of the prevailing rationale held by the church and the law, one clearly announced in the July 28th 1649 "Remonstrance of New Netherland and the Occurrences There addressed to the High and Mighty Lords States General of the United Netherlands by the People of New Netherland".

> There are yet sundry other Negroes in this country, some of whom have been manumitted on account of their long service; but their children continue slaves, contrary to all public law, that any one born of a free Christian mother should, notwithstanding, be a slave, and obliged to remain.[75]

They persisted at attending church, and as time went on, there was more widespread integration. Blacks joined the Protestant Dutch observance of Pentecost. It became known as *Pinkster*, an annual Afro-Dutch festival in parts of the Hudson Valley and New Jersey. Africans would develop their own institutions such as the Negroes Burying Ground.

During Dutch rule, integrating the community was not the sole trend in achieving freedom: running away was another, and when done, it severed all ties. Black slaves from New Amsterdam fled to surrounding areas and into Canada to gain their freedom. Slaves from the rural farmsteads fled to the city hopefully to mix in with the free Blacks on the waterfront and there go undetected. The Dutch were aware of this flight to freedom so in 1648 and 1658, well before New York City took action, the local New Netherland council instituted a fifty-guilder fine against any person who sheltered or fed a runaway.[76]

These fight and flight tactics and what they achieved surely strongly affected the lives of the first and second generations of Blacks living under Dutch rule. As we have seen, for a given number of slaves it led to freedom. It led to their children gaining freedom. It allowed two generations of slaves to integrate the community. It remains to be seen if the tactics and the men and women who thought them out, and put them into practice, had a lasting impact on the fight for abolition in America.

What are the implications and ramifications of the strategies honed by Dutch-owned slaves to free themselves?

One hundred years before cries for American Independence were in the air and the arguments for its declaration were down on paper, two generations of slaves living in New Netherland, today's New York State, had elaborated numerous arguments and put into action numerous strategies to liberate themselves from the yoke of Dutch bondage. Before fully taking into consideration these early struggles of Africans with the Dutch West India Company and individual Dutch owners, it is first necessary to ask: Of what importance are they to the events that followed and which are documented so well in Sinha's *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition*?

Anonymous slaves and those precisely named in the company and United New Netherlands documents—such as Paulo Angolo, Big Manuel, Little Manuel, Manuel de Gerrit de Reus, Simon Congo, Antony Portuguese, Gracia, Piter Santomee, Jan Francisco, Little Antony and Jan Fort Orange—set a long list of precedents. When Blacks first petitioned the Dutch West India Company in 1635 for wages like those of white indentured servants, they traveled from New Amsterdam to corporate headquarters in the United Netherlands. This itself set a precedent for acquiring negotiating skills, first with their overseer to be granted time away from their slave work under the company, and for honing argumentative competence, to be heard with conviction by the Board of Directors. The winning outcome reinforced their statute as paid laborers and at the same time set another precedent, this time for equal pay for identical work. This was not simply establishing a strong bargaining position from a corporate point of view. It also established work equality lived in the community.

Entering into a debate with the corporate board anticipated later debates. Sinha writes of those over the enslavement of labor and

> the abolitionist critique of capitalism. […] The labor and abolitionist movements shared a discourse of oppression: working class reformers adopted the term *wage salary* to describe the abysmal conditions of workers, as slavery remained the benchmark of oppression.[77]

When arguments were proposed and enacted upon by the English to keep Blacks enslaved under harsher conditions because they could revolt, the descendants of the Africans in New Netherland could argue they had living proof that Blacks could be responsible wage earners in the community at large. Moreover, such living proof must have buttressed convictions held dearly in the hearts and minds of those who were struggling for freedom: looking their elders in the eyes, there could be no doubt it was a just cause.

The strategy of petitioning for freedom would remain in use in years to come. Sinha writes that "…the number of slaves petitioning and suing their masters for freedom on various grounds increased dramatically during the revolutionary era."[78] She cites 28 recorded freedom suits in colonial and revolutionary Massachusetts. Why not consider the Africans of New Netherland as their precursors? According to Sinha, these African American petitioners also raised the question of compensation. She cites another case, again in Massachusetts, in which Blacks asked the General Court to "give and grant to us some part of unimproved land, belonging to the province, for a settlement […] Their demand fell through."[79] They may not have had the same success in obtaining lots as their slave counterparts in New Netherland, but they were advancing along the same path of logic and action their Dutch counterparts had paved with much success more than a hundred years earlier.

The sole life of petitioner Manuel de Gerrit de Reus set many a precedent. Firstly, for his single right to petition the company starting out as he did as an individual the first time round. His show of persistence in doing it several times over must have influenced others. Thanks to him and the others that followed suit, Blacks in the community had a right to voice their grievances as Whites did and the grievances were heard, by the company and the States General across the ocean in the first cases. When a local council was established, Blacks had their place in the meeting room, setting precedents as recognized legal persons in the community; they were no longer just the property of white community members that could dispose of them at will or on a whim. Of greater importance, the arguments laid down by the Africans could win out. When you read the air-tight logic and social deference deftly exercised in the Dutch documents, it is easy to image how exhilarating an experience it must have been to know you had found a means to break through to the winds of freedom.

De Reus's murder trial raises many a question. What alternatives were hammered out between the eight accused slaves? How did they come to the conclusion that it was best to stand as a group to face the charges? Who weakened not one but two ropes so that de Reus might live? We most likely will never know. What we do know is that the eight men had to spend much time discussing how they might outwit the system and keep from death the greater number of them. It must have been another occasion to feel if not the exhilaration of being truly free, at least the heady sensation of going free of punishment.

De Rheus is also important as he was a family man and he had many children. No matter how swampy the land, no matter how rickety the house, we can imagine he told stories of his corporate and council battles to the youngsters, and passed on to them the arguments he put forth and what he won by wielding them. Blacks would continue to harness the logic and power of the law to prove the discrepancies in the British and American social and legal system, asking for judicial justice. From this point of view, the legacy of de Rheus and the other petitioning slaves is grand, and to this day Blacks continue to challenge the many racial and economic injustices of the American judicial system.

The enslaved Africans under Dutch rule petitioned for wages collectively. Moore highlights the collective feature of the action as "certainly … one of the first organized job actions by workers in North America."[80] Above and beyond thinking of it as a precedent for collective bargaining action to gain wages, it was a lesson learned in struggling collectively to right injustices across the boards. In his contribution to *Slavery in New York*, Craig Steven Wilder explains that after New York State passed its Gradual Emancipation Law in 1799, Blacks came together in numerous ways to "to fight for … economic and political rights."[81] For example, in 1808, they founded the New York African Society for Mutual Relief. That organization was soon "… the center of social and political life in antebellum black Manhattan. […] In 1920…the Society purchased land and constructed a meetinghouse. Thereafter, the Society continued to invest its money in New York real estate."[82] Craig points toward the importance of lessons learned when he states that "black Manhattanites united with other free black communities. The origins … drew on traditions that enslaved Africans brought to New Amsterdam and later to New York…."[83]

In 1644, when the ten slaves petitioned and obtained their freedom, it created a first set of semi-free Blacks. Later, under company rule, they petitioned again and again for full freedom. There had to be power in numbers for the fully free. A hundred years later when there was the rise of a revolutionary ideology, and New York was very much the epicenter of its elaboration, these Blacks and three generations of their offspring had been living as equals on colonial soil under the British since 1664. Albeit small in number, this group of free Blacks was concrete, historical proof of slavery's incompatibility with the ideals of the nation the revolutionaries were struggling to create: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal…"

This group of free Blacks also provided the foundations for the establishment of a larger community after the Revolution.

> African Americans, having tasted and seen the fruits of liberty during the American Revolution, sought them … eagerly…. […] Slavery still prevailed in New York County, but over a thousand free blacks appeared on the first census of 1790. Human bondage was entrenched in the agricultural counties, especially in Dutch ones, around New York, but within another ten years, 3,300 free blacks lived in New York City. The city became the center of a thriving black community that would eventually produce a sturdy African American artisanship and some of the most important black political figures in American history.[84]

The impact of the Dutch slaves' fight for freedom had yet more ramifications. The outcome of the initial 1644 petition was not only the statute of freedom: the 11 Blacks were granted land. It was one facet of William Kieft's well-thought out plan to protect the settlement from Indian attacks.

> The bloody warfare had driven Dutch settlers from the farms north of the fort, creating a desolate no man's land. The withdrawal left the town open to attack. Drawing from the experience of the Dutch in Brazil and elsewhere in the Americas, Kieft created a strategic buffer between New Amsterdam and the marauding Indians by replacing white farmers with black ones.[85]

The half-free blacks were obliged to farm their lots: one of the conditions of their freedom was a payment in produce to the WIC. Additional produce allowed them to feed their families. Keeping a family together proved to be a singularity to slavery in New Amsterdam, keeping in mind it did not hold for the majority of slaves. Having a house and land created bonds within the household and beyond. Moore's research indicates that between 1643 and 1664 over 25 men and women were granted land. "

> By mid-century, free black farmsteads spread over 130 acres—100 square city blocks—of Manhattan. […] On this forsaken land emerged the first legally emancipated community of people of African descent in North America.[86]

When the British took over the settlement, Moore writes: "The thirty free black farmsteads—about 200 acres—were the most striking reminder of the presence of the free black population on Manhattan Island."[87]

While many other Blacks suffered family separation under slavery and found themselves isolated as one or two domestic slaves in a town house or as a small set of laborers on a remote farmstead, these freemen and women had a safe haven to love and care for each other. They had a safe haven where—without immediate fear—they could speak up about their experiences of injustice. They could elaborate means and arguments for community-based action to free others. Together, they could build an independent moral conviction.

Being granted land was also highly important because it created a precedent of free, property-owning Blacks. When the British seized this province of the United New Netherlands, they found such a reality hardly possible. To ensure that the status of the free Blacks as property owners continued as such, in

> Therefore, the following parcels of land were granted and given to the underwritten in free and true ownership, which land they have cleared and cultivated since this time, and they have owned and possessed unmolested….[88]

Leaving no room for the slightest doubt, Stuyvesant brought the certificate to a close with equally clear wording. "All of these parcels of land were given to the aforesaid "Negroes" in true and free ownership with such privileges as all tracts of land are bestowed on the inhabitants [of this] province."[89]

Later, the fact that the Blacks had had to pay a tax on the land to the Dutch company must have stood out when the revolutionary discourse of no tax without representation was the basis for liberating the colonies from the King. When the discourse turned to the right to vote based on property rights, Blacks owning property would turn out to be an infecting thorn in the side of New York State politicians. As Patrick Rael explains:

> The original state constitution had drawn no racial distinction in voting rights, requiring only that voters possess sufficient property to render them independent of the designing men who might corrupt the political process. Now, the very same political coalitions demanded the franchise be extended to all white men and argued for completely denying it to black men….[90]

That was in 1821, when the New York State constitution was being revised, and the final liberation of all slaves in the state was only six years away. "The convention removed all property restrictions on white men only to impose a $250 property requirement on black voters."[91]

Owning property had another important ramification for the freemen under Dutch rule. Black children were inheriting land, setting a precedent for the legality of such documents and therefore a recognition of the rights of blacks within the rule of law. Land transactions opened up, and Blacks moved to better farming lands, leading to better fed families and upward mobility. "In 1661, free black "Francisco the negro" was among the twenty-three founders of Boswijk [Bushwick] in Brooklyn."[92] Francisco was one of the original slaves brought to New Netherland. He had worked his way to freedom and then across the river to never tilled soils so much riper for cultivation in comparison to the swampy plots initially granted freed Africans.

Upon death of the father, only the oldest child could inherit any land, therefore getting educated in trades took on greater importance. Moore attributes this to another fact: "No longer facing a bleak future in bondage children of free blacks became craftsmen, tanners, carpenters, ship caulkers, sail weavers, surgeons, merchants,"[93] all negotiating in a bi-lingual or trilingual world. They fanned out across the city when working and would be initiators and enablers to others still fighting for their personal freedom and abolition under the British, because slaves too spent "a good deal of time waking the streets, conducting errands, and picking up bits of news," writes Jill Lepore.[94] She relates an insightful study of a walk "described by a slave named Pedro in 1741…."[95] He walked from the east to the west side of the city, across the width of New York, meeting up with four other slaves and most likely many more at the market and tavern they said they visited.

Moore has calculated that "by the end of Dutch rule in 1664, about 75 out of a total of some 375 blacks in New Amsterdam were free."[96] These numbers may appear small; however, if considered as a percentage, it is close to one-fourth of the black population. That is significant, and as we have seen, the first Africans and their offspring used very well the possibilities this freedom offered them before and after the British takeover. This holds especially true in terms of one particular strategy Blacks used to gain freedom: many looked fear in the face, took courage in hand and ran for it. Under Dutch rule, the free, landed Blacks could more readily shelter fugitive slaves. Black farmsteads on the northern edge of New Amsterdam were well known for this, "nearly two centuries before the Underground Railroad,"[97] that is to say long before Harriet Tubman. Free Blacks helped despite the risk of having to pay a heavy fine, revealing by their acts the discrepancy between justice, as recognized and acted upon by corporate and common law, and the injustices of lived lives. According to Sinha: "Fugitive slaves became abolition's most effective emissaries."[98]

To harbor fugitive slaves, one needed a safe and sound network. The early Dutch slaves built them outside the law, and the bonds that tie in resistance must have persisted. When the colonies became a nation, networking within the realm of the law was the way state abolitionist societies moved forward with the struggle to bring slavery to an end. New York State was a prime example of this. From Albany and Troy to Elmira and Utica and Syracuse and Rochester, black abolitionists had contacts they could rely on when they travelled, and in each city anti-slavery proponents welcomed those from other cities when on an anti-slavery lecturing tour. Frederick Douglass' successful abolitionist career is but one example of this. His newspaper, in addition to his lectures, depended on the networking skills of his community.

The depth and breadth of networking slowly expanded from the local to the state and then to the nationwide level. In 1793 the New York Manumission Society called for all the abolition societies to meet in a convention in Philadelphia and nine societies gathered at the American Convention of Abolitionist Societies. Its plans were to replicate at the national level the way to work of the state societies. In 1843, the American Anti-Slavery Society set up its "Hundred Conventions" project, a tour of speakers planned over a six-month period. Douglass was one of several who ardently railed against slavery and demanded abolition throughout the Eastern and Midwestern United States. At the University of Delaware professor P. Gabrielle Foreman has created the Colored Conventions Project to illuminate the long history of black organizing.

> This project seeks to not only learn about the lives of male delegates, the places where they met and the social networks that they created, but also to account for the crucial work done by Black women in the broader social networks that made these conventions possible."[99]

When abolition became a national issue, New York had the North's largest free black community. New York City replaced Philadelphia as the "capital" of free Black America, and black institutions flourished—fraternal societies, literary clubs, and many black churches, all based on the use of social skills. Blacks in the city and across the state would kindle the fire of abolition on the national level which became in the 1830s, as Sinha expresses it: "a "movement emergent."[100]

Blacks' interest in Christian theology and churches reaches back to under the Dutch. It might have been motivated by the freed slaves' plight to get their children out of the grips of slavery. If the children were baptized would they fall under the laws of the church and as saved souls be freed from bondage? When marriages were blessed by the church, the same arguments arose. If this was the motiving factor, it would be based on a long-term strategy: becoming a member of the church required knowledge of the Bible before hopes of freedom could play out. Jaap Jacobs writes that "conversion to Christianity… met with two obstacles: the theological question of whether a Christian could be a slave, and the rising demands for the religious knowledge made on prospective converts."[101] The great black theologians to follow would tackle black commitment to the church, and breaking free from white religious institutions became the practice. Black religious liberationists joined the ranks of other great abolitionist thinkers as black abolition became a "coherent movement."[102]

For the Dutch slaves and those freed, for decades, schooling went hand in hand with integrating the church. Education was deemed important and its importance blossomed in the following generations. From gaining freedom through the church, schools became centers for full-blown abolition activism. John Teasman, a black educator at the New York African Free School turned it into "a site for training black youths as leaders and activists."[103] The importance of schooling spread out over the state. The Onedia Institute of Science and Technology, a Presbyterian institution, was founded in 1827 by Rev. George Washington Gale, a white abolitionist, in Whitestown, not far from Utica, New York. When Beriah Green, a white abolitionist, took over its leadership "the Oneida Institute thereafter became a beacon of progressive education and led the struggle in the country for immediate emancipation."

> Here debates were held and an abolitionist newspaper, *The Friend of Man*, was published. […] And it was here that, on July 1833, students banded together to form New York State's first anti-slavery society dedicated to immediatist principles, meaning slavery should be abolished rather than gradually over a long

> period of time. The Oneida Institute quickly became a station on the Underground Railroad."[104]

It must not go unsaid that anti-abolition sentiment ran deep in the North, in New York State and in the New York City itself. When abolitionists stepped up to the lectern to speak, violence reigned. Preachers were stoned. Effigies were burned. The homes of white abolitionists were ransacked. This was nothing new. Under the Dutch racial ugliness ran deep. Most telling is to read the words of the Reverend Jonas Micharlius, the first clergyman of the Dutch Reformed Church in America: the black women who had worked in his house were "thievish, lazy, and useless trash."[105] Governor Stuyvesant never wavered in his agreement with the Lords of the States General and the directors of the West India Company that trading in slaves was the key to profitability.

The British too knew the trade in slaves made for big money. By 1711 an official slave market opened in New York City. The buying and selling of slaves would become a flourishing business unto itself and New York City would soon become the Slave Trade Capital of the New World. In just the four years between 1700 and 1774, "the British imported between 6,800 and 7,400 Africans to the colony of New York."[106] Even after the end of gradual abolition in New York in 1827, slavery was the basis for the city becoming, in the 1800s, the financial center of the New World: its banks, insurance companies, and rum distilleries were all based on slavery as plantations needed to be bankrolled, crops needed to be insured, and alcohol production needed sugar cane. By 1860, New York was notorious as the hub of an international illegal slave trade, a crime too lucrative to stop. For the record, if Lincoln carried the electoral votes of the State of New York, he never carried New York City, and it harbored such anti-abolition sentiment that in 1861, New York City Mayor Fernando Wood suggested the city secede with southern states.

> New York's secessionist debate echoed across the crumbling nation. Southern observers took heart in the words of Mayor Wood and other New York secessionists. […] Initial public discussion of secession quickly provoked a firestorm of controversy among New Yorkers.[107]

Conclusion

The Dutch initiated and entrenched slavery as a corporate and community institution in New Netherland. They reasoned to a fault that slave labor was the means to making substantial profits from the fur trade and to implanting whites in those merciless woods. People in the home country accumulated enormous wealth if not from the fur trade then from the slave trade, and Holland had a « glorious » seventeenth century of erecting wind mills to drain its shores and constructing dikes to keep the waters at bay. Palaces were built and art collections made. The Dutch and its Royal family are still having problems coming to terms with their involvement in the slave trade.

The African slaves under Dutch rule inaugurated emancipation for themselves and their children by elaborating and putting into practice a wide array of tactics. They set precedents within the company structure and local courts which paved the way to establishing a community of free Blacks. They gained a foothold in New Amsterdam and from their plots of land acted as a beacon of freedom in practice. Overall, they proved themselves a match for the Dutch slaveholding régime and thereby became models of the fact that no matter the entrenchment of the institution, it was possible to outthink the master and set oneself free. The advances they made also set precedents for the arguments and practices New York Blacks would refine under British and American rule right up to the American Civil War and beyond. Their activism needs to be fully acknowledged in writings on the history of abolition.

If it is acknowledged, it would impact the conceptualization of the abolition movement in America. It could no longer be told as a two-wave movement of "revolutionary antislavery" and "radical abolition." Indeed, we might no longer be talking about "waves." Sinha herself affirmed that her historical narrative of American abolition "stresses continuity rather than rupture;"[108] however, the organization of her findings supplants that stance. I hold that this concept of continuity should prevail. The documents now readily accessible from the New Netherland Institute and the published research of a handful of scholars show that the struggle for abolition on the shores of what is now America was initiated little time after the slaves in New Netherland got their bearings and understood the system they were ensnarled in. Then freedom was relentlessly pursued, and as I have shown, the success of their activism could very well explain why New York, under the British and the Republic, developed into such a hotbed of abolition activity. The slaves under Dutch company rule set the course and paved the road. That road needs to be seen as the first few miles of the longer road laid down to abolish slavery across the nation. And then again, continuum onward, to the abolishment of other abuses of civil rights, for there is no end to it.

NOTES

---

[1] This title was inspired by the famous lines from the *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass*: "It was not color, but crime, not God, but man that afforded the true explanation of the existence of slavery […] what man can make, man can unmake.…"

[2] Sinha, Manisha. *The Slave's Cause: A History of Abolition*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2016. Hereafter the book is referred to in short: *The Slave's Cause*.

[3] The *Agrégation* is the highly competitive French National Teaching Certification Exam.

[4] McPherson, James M. "America's Greatest Movement." *The New York Review of Books*. October 27, 2016. Retrieved March 30th, 2019.

[5] For Steven Hahn's praise and those of numerous others, see the opening pages of *The Slave's Cause*, *Op. cit*.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 591.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 9.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 11-12.

[14] Sinha, Manisha. "Black Abolitionism: The Assault of Southern Slavery and The Struggle for Racial Equality." In *Slavery in New York*, Ira Berlin and Leslie M. Harris, eds. New York, London: The New Press, 2005, pp. 239-262.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 241.

[16] Moore, Christopher. "A World of Possibilities: Slavery and Freedom in Dutch New Amsterdam." In *Slavery in New York*. *Ibid.*, pp. 29-56.

[17] Personal communication from Manisha Sinha to the author of this article dated April 23rd, 2019.

[18] Shorto, Russell. *The Island at the Center of the World: The Epic Story of Dutch Manhattan & The Forgotten Colony That Shaped America*. London: Abacus, 2004, pp. 2-3.

[19] The New Netherland Institute. "*Uncovering America's Forgotten Colony: The New Netherland Project*." At http://www.nysl.nysed.gov/newnetherland/video/transcript.htm. Retrieved April 4th, 2019.

[20] Shorto, *Op. cit.*, p. 5.

[21] A chance encounter of two historians, one from the New York State library and the other from the New York State University at Albany would change the course of history of the documents and our understanding of early slave history and abolition in the north. Charly Gehring was a young linguist specialized in German and Dutch. He was hired by the New

---

York State Library for one year in 1974 to begin the task of translating the documents into English from their original seventeenth-century Dutch. He remained tethered to the task and over the decades has painstakingly translated some 12,000 of the surviving, handwritten documents created three and a half centuries before by the rulers of New Netherland. To this day, the New Netherland Research Center continues to provide groundbreaking insight into the colony of New Netherland and the Dutch in colonial America. As the Project highlights: "the vital story of the New Netherland colony has remained for centuries the great untold tale of America's history." For further information see http://www.nysl.nysed.gov/newnetherland.

[22] For further information, see the website of the National Park Service at https://www.nps.gov/afbg/learn/historyculture/index.htm. Retrieved April 4th, 2019.

[23] One other individual whose remains were found during an earlier construction project in 1998 was already in the care of the New York State Museum.

[24] Anderson, Lisa. "Schuyler Flatts Burial Ground." Albany, N.Y.: New York State Museum. At http://www.nysm.nysed.gov/research-collections/archaeology/bioarchaeology/research/schuyler-flatts-burial-ground. Retrieved April 8th, 2019.

[25] Kingsbury, Susan Myra. *Records of the Virginia Company of London*. Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1933, p 243. At https://www.encyclopediavirginia.org. Retrieved April 3rd, 2019.

[26] Historic Jamestowne National Park. "From African Americans at Jamestown." At https://www.nps.gov/jame/learn/historyculture/african-americans-at-jamestown.htm. Retrieved March 3rd 2019.

[27] Austin, Beth. "1619: Virginia's First Africans," p. 5. Last revised *11 December* 2018. At www.HamptonHistoryMuseum.org/1619 . Retrieved April 4th, 2019.

[28] "An earlier case (1625) also appears to imply an African named Brase was enslaved for life and considered the property of Sir Francis Wyatt." *Ibid*., p. 9.

[29] The term "servant" found in written documents has proved difficult to define and attempts to do so have been the source of numerous academic writings. Some historians argue that slavery may have existed from the very first arrival of the Negro in 1619. Others are of the opinion that the institution did not develop until the 1660s and that the status of the Africans until then was that of an indentured servant. Still others believe that the evidence is too sketchy to permit any definite conclusion either way. To gain some insight into the long-standing discussions on the subject of Africans being servants or slaves, first see Foner, Philip S. "History of Black Americans: From Africa to the Emergence of the Cotton Kingdom." In *Contributions in American History*, number 40. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press, 1975. In 2019, Governor Ralph Northam came under sharp criticism in this regard. See: Warren, Katie. "Embattled Virginia Gov. Ralph Northam corrected by journalist Gayle King after he calls slaves 'indentured servants'." In *Business Insider*. 10 February, 2019. At https://www.businessinsider.com/ralph-northam-calling-slaves-indentured-servants. Retrieved on April 6th, 2019.

[30] Austin, *Op. cit*., p. 7.

[31] In "An act concerning Servants and Slaves," transcript of the decision of the General Assembly of Virginia October 1705. At https://www.encyclopediavirginia.org. Retrieved April 6th, 2019.

[32] It should be said that designating a date of institutional slavery on American shores erases the bigger framework of slavery within which American history unfolds. See: Guasco, Michael. "The Misguided Focus on 1619 as the Beginning of Slavery in the U.S. Damages Our Understanding of American History". *The Smithsonian*, September 13, 2017. At https://www.smithsonianmag.com. Retrieved April 4th, 2019.

[33] Emmer, Pieter Cornelis. *The Dutch Slave Trade: 1500-1850*. New York: Berghanh Books, 2006.

---

[34] Van Laer, A. J. F. *(translator)* (1908). "Charter of the Dutch West India Company." *Van Rensselaer Bowier Manuscripts*. Albany: University of the State of New York. pp. 87–115 (odd pages only; the original Dutch text is on the even pages) At https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Charter_of_the_Dutch_West_India_Company. Retrieved April 30th, 2019.

[35] Alan Singer provides some of the major dates in the history of the Dutch establishing slavery in New Netherland. See his sub-chapter entitled "A Brief History of Dutch New Amsterdam." In Singer, Alan J. *New York and Slavery: Time to Teach the Truth.* Albany, New York: State University of New York Press, 2008, p. 42-43.

[36] Callaghan, E.B., ed. *Documents relative to the Colonial History of the State of New York; procured in Holland, England and France, Vol. V*. Albany, New York: Weeds, Parson 1853, p. 68. Archived from the original on 2016-06-14. At https://archive.org/details/documentsrelativ01brod. Retrieved April 9th, 2019.

[37] Moore reveals that the account of the arrival of the African women is not clearly documented. See: Moore, *Op. cit.*

[38] Singer, *Op. cit.*, p. 43.

[39] Callaghan, *Op. cit.*, p. 65. It has been considered that the spelling of words in the documents quoted in this article does not hinder understanding and it has therefore been left as originally written, without the use of [*sic*] to mark such an occurrence.

[40] *Ibid.*, p. 245.

[41] *Ibid.*, p. 246.

[42] Shorto, *Op. cit.*, p. 307.

[43] *Ibid.*

[44] Nicholl, Richard Esqr Deputy Gov. of His Royal Highness the Duke of York. "Articles, Whereupon the City and Fort Amsterdam and the Province of the New Netherlands Were Surrendered" or otherwise called 3Articles of Capitulation". 1664. At https://www.gilderlehrman.org/content/surrender-new-netherland-1664. Retrieved April 12th, 2019.

[45] Berlin and Harris, *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

[46] *Ibid.*

[47] See New York State population statistics at https://exhibitions.nysm.nysed.gov/albany/populationny.html. Retrieved April 12th, 2019.

[48] Berlin and Harris, *Op. Cit.*, p. 8.

[49] Hunter, Governor Robert (1712). "The New York Slave Revolt of 1712". In Callaghan, *Op. cit.*

[50] *Ibid.*

[51] *Vol. III. Minutes of the Common Council of the City of New York, 1675-1776*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, 1905, pp. 30-31.

[52] *Ibid.*, p. 31.

[53] Franklin, J. *Original Narratives of Early American Life 1609-1664*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909, pp. 329-330. At https://archive.org/stream/narrativesofnewnetherland, 1609 – 1664. Retrieved April 29th, 2019.

[54] Shorto, *Op. cit.*, p. 273.

[55] New York Historical Society. "Buried Stories: Lessons from the African Burial Ground." At http://www.slaveryinnewyork.org/PDFs/Buried_Stories.pdf. Retrieved April 29th, 2019.

[56] *Ibid.*, p.2.

[57] New York State Museum. "Schuyler Flatts Burial Ground." At http://www.nysm.nysed.gov/research-collections/archaeology/bioarchaeology/research/schuyler-flatts-burial-ground. Retrieved April 29th, 2019.

[58] Moore, *Op. cit.*, p. 38.

---

[59] "Manumission of Manuel de Gerrit and Nine Other Negroes From Slavery", 25 February 1644. Translation from Van Laer, *Council Minutes, Volume IV, 1638–1649*, doc. 183, pgs. 212–213. At https://www.newnetherlandinstitute.org. Retrieved April 17th, 2019.

[60] *Ibid.*

[61] *Ibid.*

[62] "Manumission of Manuel the Spaniard by Philip Jansz Bingo", 17 February 1649. Translation from Van Laer, *Register of the Provincial Secretary, Volume III, 1648–1660*, doc. 30b, pg. 82. At https://www.newnetherlandinstitute.org/history-and-heritage/digital-exhibitions/slavery-exhibit. Retrieved April 17th, 2019.

63 Callaghan, *Op. Cit.,* p. 509.

[64] Moore reveals that the account of the arrival of the African women is not clearly documented. See: Moore, *Op. cit.*

[65] *Ibid.*

[66] "Petition From Emmaneul Pietersen, 21 March 1661. "Translation from O'Callaghan, *The Register of Salomon Lachaire, Notary Public of New Amsterdam, 1661–1662*, pgs. 22–23. At https://www.newnetherlandinstitute.org/history-and-heritage/digital-exhibitions/slavery-exhibit/family-and-community/petition-from-emmaneul-pietersen. Retrieved April 30th, 2019.

[67] "Biography of Manuel de Gerrit de Reus. » At https://www.newnetherlandinstitute.org/history-and-heritage/digital-exhibitions/slavery-exhibit/de-reus-bio. Retrieved April 30th, 2019.

[68] "Council Minutes, Court Proceedings, 17 January 1641." At https://www.newnetherlandinstitute.org/exhibitions/slavery-exhibit/de-reus-bio. Retrieved April 22nd, 2019.

[69] "Fiscal vs. nine negroes for killing Jan Premero, another negro, 17 January 1641." At https://www.newnetherlandinstitute.org/history-and-heritage/digital-exhibitions/slavery-exhibit/de-reus-bio/de-reus. Retrieved April 30th, 2019.

[70] *Ibid.*

[71] Shorto, p. 127.

[72] Moore, p 42.

[73] *Ibid.*, p. 39.

[74] *Ibid.*, p. 40.

[75] O'Callaghan, *Documents relative to the colonial history of the state of New York*, *Op. cit.*, p. 302. At https://archive.org/details/documentsrelativ01brod. Retrieved April 30th, 2019.

[76] Moore, p. 46.

[77] Sinha, *The Slave's Cause*, p. 347

[78] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 44.

[80] Moore, p. 38.

[81] Wilder, Craig Steven. "Black Life in Freedom: Creating a Civil Culture." In *Slavery in New York*, *Op. cit.*, p. 227.

[82] *Ibid.*, p. 223.

[83] *Ibid.*, p. 217-218.

[84] Russell, Graham and Gao Hodges. "Liberty and Constraint: The Limits of Revolution." In *Slavery in New* York, *Op. cit.*, p. 107- 109.

[85] Moore, *Op. Cit.*, p. 42.

[86] *Ibid.*, p. 45.

[87] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

[88] 20/30 April 1665. Certificate. "That sundry grants of land, near Stuyvesant's bouwery, had been made in the years 1659 and 1660 to divers negroes," Transcription. At www.newnetherlandinstitute.org/files/2814/0681/8946/Stuyvesantmanumission.pdf. Retrieved April 22nd, 2019.

---

[89] *Ibid.*
[90] Rael, Patrick. "The Long Death of Slavery." In *Slavery in New York*, *Op. cit.*, p. 140.
[91] *Ibid.*, p. 141.
[92] Moore, *Op. Cit.*, p. 47.
[93] *Ibid.*, p. 52.
[94] Lepore, Jill. "The Tightening Vise: Slavery and Freedom in British New York." In *Slavery in New York*, *Op. Cit.*, p. 75.
[95] *Ibid.*
[96] Moore, *Op. Cit.*, p. 47.
[97] *Ibid.*, p. 46.
[98] Sinha, *The Slave's Cause*, p. 420.
[99] "Colored Conventions." At http://coloredconventions.org. Retrieved April 26th 2019.
[100] Sinha, *The Slave's Cause*, p. 228.
[101] Jacobs, Jaap. *New Netherland: A Dutch Colony in Seventeenth-Century America*. Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2005, 1999.
[102] Sinha, *The Slave's Cause*, p. 158.
[103] Wilder, *Op. Cit.*, p. 227.
[104] "Onedia County Freedom Trail: The history of the Underground Railroad in Central New York." At http://www.oneidacountyfreedomtrail.com/oneida-institute.html. Retrieved May 1st, 2019. The Onedia County Freedom Trail Commission has been studying the Underground Railroad in Oneida County since 2001 within the framework of an initiative from the Federal National Park Service to identity and preserve sites of the Underground Railroad across the United States.
[105] Shorto, *Op. Cit.*, p. 273.
[106] Lepore, *Op. Cit.*, p. 61.
[107] Quigley, David. "Southern Slavery in a Free City: Economy, Politics, and Culture." In *Slavery in New York*, *Op. Cit.*, p. 286.
[108] Sinha, *Ibid.*, p. 5.

© 2020 Suzette Tanis-Plant & GRAAT On-Line