1640

Immigration is currently a hotly debated issue in the United States. This surprises many of us because we believe, since our nation is composed almost entirely of immigrants, that we should be sympathetic to immigration. Notwithstanding our similar narratives, most Americans, for most of the nation's history, have had little exposure to foreign-born American citizens – new immigrants. Indeed, immigration into the United States has been full of starts and stops.

On average, with the exception of the five years 1905-1910, the number of persons obtaining legal permanent resident status in our nation each year has been quite small. The number did not even reach 100,000 per year until 1845. As a significant phenomenon, foreigners becoming permanent residents is quite recent. Only in the last 25 years has the number of new permanent residents reached one million per year.[1]

It is remarkable how many people have opinions about the impact of immigration without ever having been significantly exposed to it. Take our state of Ohio: it has never been a destination for many foreign-born immigrants with the exception perhaps of a few neighborhoods in a few cities.

Rather, migration into Ohio has generally consisted of American-born individuals from elsewhere in the United States. Since the Census began asking about country of origin in 1850, Ohio has <u>never</u> had a foreign-born population exceeding 14 percent. By comparison, Nevada has reached peaks of 44% (1870), Rhode Island of 33% (1910), Wisconsin of 31% (1890), and Washington State has reached peaks of 26% (1890).

In the last Census, (2010) foreign-born individuals comprised only 4.1% of the Ohio population. By comparison, foreign-born individuals comprised 13% of the national population.

---

1 US Department of Homeland Security, Persons Obtaining Legal Permanent Resident Status: Fiscal years 1820 to 2010.

Where are the populations with the most relevant experience with foreign-born immigrants? Just three states: New York with 22% of its population being foreign-born, New Jersey with 21%, and Texas with a much smaller 16%.[2]

This relative national inexperience is in part caused by the intermittent nature of immigration to the United States. For example, the American Revolution disrupted immigration and, in some cases, led to net out-migration, largely of residents sympathetic to England. Because of this grand pause in immigration, "The foreign-born population in the U.S. likely reached its minimum around 1815, at approximately 100,000 or 1.4% of the population. By 1815, most of the immigrants who arrived before the American Revolution had died, and there had been almost no new immigration. Nearly all population growth up to 1830 was by internal increase [so that] about 98.5% of the population was native-born [in 1830]."[3]

This changed with a surge of immigration in the 1840s. The Irish, with the Potato Famine (1845–1849) driving them, emigrated directly from their homeland to escape poverty and death. The failed revolutions of 1848 exiled many intellectuals and activists to the U.S. Bad times and poor conditions in Europe also drove people to leave for America.[4]

Over the next 100 years the largest numbers of immigrants came from Germany, Ireland, and Italy with sizable numbers in the early 20th century from Canada, Poland, Russia, and the United Kingdom. Only since 1980 has immigration been disproportionately from Mexico.[5]

Now that I have you all excited about immigration, you must be wondering, what would cause immigration to start and stop?

---

2 Historical Census Statistics on the Foreign-Born Population of the United States: 1850-2000 (http://www.census.gov/population/www/documentation/twps0081/twps0081.html)
3 Ibid.
4 Wikipedia, History of Immigration to the United States (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_immigration_to_the_United_States)
5 Op.cit.

To answer that we should talk about what to me is the biggest of the immigration "stops:"

> for almost 200 years, immigration was <u>not</u> an important feature of New England life. "Immigration to the New England colonies after 1640 … decreased to less than 1% (about equal to the death rate) in nearly all years prior to 1845. The rapid growth of the New England colonies…was almost entirely due to the high birth rate…and low death rate…per year."[6]

The story of the abrupt end of immigration to New England is the tale I bring to you this evening.

My interest was prompted when I ran across a mention of Stephen Winthrop, son of the Governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, as a soldier in the armies of Oliver Cromwell. I asked myself, what in the world was New England Puritan aristocracy doing back in England? If you learned history as I did, we studied the movement from England to New England, not the other way around.

As Paul Harvey used to say, "tonight I will tell you – the rest of the story."

* * * * *

To understand why immigration to New England stopped, we need first to review why it started in the first place. To do that I need to introduce you to King James I of England and William Laud, eventually to become Archbishop of Canterbury.

James I, who succeeded Elizabeth I, had a rough time with Parliament. He pushed for the supreme authority and divine right of kings, he called Parliament into session only twice during his reign, and he was quite fond of imprisoning members of Parliament for criticizing him or his policies. He was equally tough on Catholics and Puritans, who were having a difficult time granting him his divine right.

---

6 Ibid. and Daniel Scott Smith, "The Demographic History of Colonial New England", Journal of Economic History, 32 (March 1972), 165-183.

Upon his death in 1625, his son Charles I continued the notion that monarchs were more important than Parliament, an attitude called "personal rule." And he advanced James I's royal chaplain William Laud to Privy Counsellor and Bishop of London, and in 1633 to Archbishop of Canterbury. Most of you know that Charles I ultimately had a bad end, but, as Purkiss writes, "personal rule was … sunk…by the fact that the king made another, larger group of enemies…made for him by his Archbishop of Canterbury William Laud."[7]

At this point I tread gently since our fellow Kat, Dick Burnett, knows more of what I speak than I do. I beg his indulgence until the end.

What did Laud do that so inflamed the opposition? He brought formality back into the Church of England: formality that in the minds of many felt like a return to Catholicism – or "popery" as the "godly" opposition charged. Things like priests wearing surplices, installation of rails to separate the people from the altar, bowing at the mention of Christ, prohibition of deviations from the rituals of the Book of Common Prayer such as lengthy sermons, and disavowal of the Presbyterian doctrine of predestination. This was big stuff in those days!

And there was his fondness for the Star Chamber as his ultimate weapon against his detractors.[8] The nasty years before the relative peace brought by Elizabeth I were returning. Or as Purkiss states so pithily, "from a godly point of view, the Church of England was being run by an emissary of hell and the king was doing nothing to stop him."[9]

As early as 1629 Parliament had had its fill with Laud's "reforms." Charles I's response? He dissolved Parliament, not to be reconvened until 1640.

So how does this relate to immigration to New England?

Many of us were taught a history of high-minded Pilgrims and Puritans who sought to foster a purer society. While that was true for some, it is also true

---

7 Purkiss, page 25.
8 Purkiss, ibid.
9 Purkiss, page 26.

that emigration to New England was often not voluntary, but rather an effort to seek refuge or exile to avoid legal penalties at home, thanks to the efforts of Bishop Laud.

Consider Thomas Allen, rector at St. Edmund's Norwich. He liked extra preaching on Sunday afternoon and celebrating communion with members standing around the communion table. This was banned by the bishops led by Laud, so Thomas Allen was excommunicated, in effect depriving him of a living. With no relief despite many appeals, within three years he emigrated to New England.[10] A weaver, Michael Metcalfe, stood up for Allen in the church courts. He soon fled to New England with his family to avoid a summons from church officials.[11]

The profile of emigrants to New England better describes exiles and political refugees than emigrants motivated by economic improvement. Compared with emigrants to the southern colonies, emigrants to New England tended to have higher social standing and were substantially older. In contrast, emigrants to the southern colonies were usually under 25 years of age and indentured servants.

Writes historian Susan Moore, "New England had a more skilled population than anywhere else in the New World. The level of literacy was much higher than in England….Most came from communities in which they had a long family history."[12]

This social profile, and the reasons why many had to leave England, set the stage for a more "temporary" view of one's stay in New England.

Here are a few more examples why many English were motivated to consider emigrating to New England:

---

10 Moore, page 16-17.
11 Moore, page 18.
12 Moore, pate 21.

- When Henry Burton and John Bastwick ridiculed the bishops, they were punished by "branding and other mutilations."[13]
- Alexander Leighton was brought before Bishop Laud's Star Chamber in 1630 for publishing a pamphlet. His sentence: he was pilloried and whipped, his ears cropped, one side of his nose slit, and his face branded with "SS" (for sower of sedition). Oh yes, he was imprisoned too.
- In 1634 William Prynne was sentenced by the Star Chamber to a 5,000 pound fine, life imprisonment, pillorying, and the loss of part of his ears for a publication critical of the King and his Catholic queen, Henrietta Maria.
- In 1638 John Lilburne was flogged for distributing Puritan publications.[14]

The following examples will draw mostly from preachers' reasons for emigration because most documents that have survived are from ecclesiastical archives. There is no reason to believe the preachers' reasons for emigration were substantially different for other "godly" emigrants to New England.

Moore concludes that a large number of emigrant preachers were "reluctantly detached" as she terms their emigration from England "only after coming into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities….Twenty-two had been suspended or removed from their posts. Sixteen more resigned or left when they were cited to appear in the Court of High commission….Many of the rest left when …the sense of threat became too much…."[15]

And the general pattern of emigration was that many of the families in the parishes that were served by the persecuted ministers also chose to emigrate with their preachers. "A close connection exists between emigration and the dioceses where [Bishop Laud's] agenda was most vigorously pursued. The diocese of London saw the greatest concentration – over a fifth of all clerical emigrants."[16] When Bishop Laud moved from London to Canterbury, emigration of preachers from London virtually ceased. This persecution

---

13 Hall, page 17.
14 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1630s_in_England.
15 Moore, page 23.
16 Ibid.

theme is reinforced by other patterns of emigration. "Eleven ministers emigrated from the diocese of Chester and York after pressure for conformity from…the Archbishop of York."[17] Forty ministers were disciplined in the diocese of Norwich.

Fines could be so prohibitive that exile was the only response: Samuel Eaton had accumulated fines for failing to appear before the Court of High Commission amounting to the equivalent of 20 to 30 years of earnings for a minister.[18]

Even the Cotton family of New England historical fame may not have left for New England as voluntarily as some of us have been led to believe. John Cotton left his parish for New England in 1633 "only when his activities came under direct investigation by [Bishop Laud's] officials." [19]

* * * * *

While punishments and tensions had been pushing people out of England, a push back was building by 1637 as life in New England was becoming less pleasant and exile in New England would soon become less necessary.

"Emigration [to New England] peaked in 1638, against a backdrop of rising suspicion among the godly in England about the direction New England was taking. As the 1630s came to an end, the reasons that had been woven together to justify the Great Migration were disintegrating. Former allies pilloried New England's 'purity' as separatism [from the Church of England]. News of religious disputes in Massachusetts…threatened to make it 'a kingdom divided against itself', which could not survive….The question mark over settlement was confirmed by financial losses and hardship [among New England settlers]."[20]

17 Moore, page 23.
18 Moore, page 24.
19 Moore, page 25.
20 Moore, page 50.

The concern with developments in New England reached such a point by 1637 that King Charles I issued a proclamation seeking to discourage emigration to New England.[21]

What was causing this crisis of confidence that the "city on a hill" was dimming as a beacon of purity, justice, and godly behavior?

It started with a debate over whether faith in Christ or obedience to the (earthly) church leadership provided the keys to salvation. The debate, called the Antinomian Controversy, led to imprisonment or banishment from New England for many.

You recall Roger Williams, who was forced to flee to Narragansett Bay in the dead of winter to avoid arrest. Then there was Anne Hutchinson, who held meetings of women in her home, in defiance of orders from the General Court and was forced to emigrate as well.

And there was the Pequot War, which pitted Dutch settlements against English settlements and ended in perhaps the New World's first genocide, a war Sarah Vowell describes as "set off by murder and vengeance and fueled by misunderstanding, jealousy, hatred, stupidity, racism, lust for power, lust for land, and, most of all, greed, all of it headed toward a climax of slaughter."[22]

With the emerging criticism of what was going on in New England, any impetus for investment and emigration ceased by 1640.

The rising tensions created by Bishop Laud in England were also creating financial crises that made it difficult for some settlers to remain in New England. Samuel Eaton wanted to sort out legal actions taken against him in the 1630s. He went back to England in 1640 "to rescue his estate from the clutches of the Court of High Commission, which was trying to seize his assets."[23]

---

21 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1630s_in_England.
22 Vowell, pages 166 ff.
23 Moore, page 57.

That same year in England Parliament reconvened after an 11 year hiatus. The hopes of New World refugees and exiles for change for the better in England increased as the so-called Long Parliament got to work:

- In 1640 Archbishop Laud was impeached for treason.
- In 1641 Parliament abolished the Court of High Commission and the Star Chamber.
- In 1642 the Bishops Exclusion Act removed all bishops from the House of Lords.
- Later that year, civil war began as Parliament and Charles I took arms against each other.

By 1643 Parliament had abolished the bishop-centered structure of the Church of England so hated by the exiles, and, thanks to Oliver Cromwell's strong views, "a de facto tolerance of religious diversity (but not of Catholics) arose."[24]

The English Civil War was not ignored by the colonists. In fact, a significant number of New Englanders returned to England to take up arms for Parliament's cause.

"[New England] settlers' involvement in military campaigns…began with the naval expedition mounted in 1642… to suppress Irish Catholic rebels…. Towards the end of 1643, after summer victories in the English Civil War for the royalists, Israel Stoughton – sergeant-major-general of the [Massachusetts] Bay Colony – led a party back [to England]." Stoughton became a lieutenant colonel in the Earl of Manchester's Eastern Association army.

Most of the officers were drawn from New England. You will recognize these familiar New England names: Captain John Leverett, Captain Stephen Winthrop.

---

24 Hall, pages 19-20.

"The experience of religious freedom in the [Cromwellian] army produced disquiet with the tight rein of orthodoxy in Massachusetts."[25]

This experience may have sped up what had by now become an emigration back to England.

Records exist primarily for the ministers so the exact number who returned to England cannot be certain. Estimates range from one in fifteen settlers to one in four returning to England.[26]

Nathanial Ward lived for 12 years in Ipswich, Massachusetts. He wrote

> *"no man ought to forsake his own country, but upon extraordinary cause, and when that cause ceaseth, he is bound in conscience to return if he can."*

Bishop William Laud had ejected Ward from his work as a minister in 1632. After receiving news of Laud's execution and the end of the Civil War, Ward returned to England with most of his family in 1646.[27]

Of those for whom records exist Moore finds that one in three of the preachers who emigrated in the 1630s went back to England in 1640. "Almost 1 in 2 Harvard students left New England: 43 of 108 who graduated with a BA in classes up to 1659 [went back], and more … went [back] to England without staying to complete a degree."[28]

The reasons for return were generally not recorded but likely were varied. Summarizes Moore:

> "In the 1640s the relation between the two Englands was particularly complex and untidy, because of England's convulsions in civil war and New England's evolution in matters of church and state. Moreover, those who returned were quite disparate in outlook; not only because Massachusetts' drive to create a united 'orthodoxy' shook out diversity, but also … because a great variety

25 Moore, page 66.
26 Moore, page 55-56.
27 Moore, page 54.
28 Ibid.

> of people, radicalized into emigration by the particular circumstances of the 1630s , found that their commitment to the New World unraveled when circumstances in England changed. After the execution of Charles I in 1649 and the establishment of Cromwell's regime, transatlantic relations became more settled and predictable. The strongest ebb-tide of return came in the early 1650s."[29]

While some will argue that settlers came to America to start a new life, it is equally true that a substantial number came to New England as refugees, and when circumstances changed in their home country, the reason to remain in New England evaporated.

Concludes Moore:

> "Given the slow and reluctant way in which most clergy came to a decision to cross the Atlantic to America in the 1630s, the fact that plenty went home after 1649 (but scarcely any before) confirms New England's significance as a refuge in troubled times. In the 1640s changes in England – the removal of bishops, the advent of peace, the strength of the Presbyterian party, the rise of religious toleration – catalyzed decisions to return home, rather than to stay put or move on within New England."[30]

Where one had come from in England may also have played a role in the decision to return to England.

Moore says it is "hard to avoid the impression" that those from areas where tensions had been highest in the 1630s were the most prone to return when the tensions had diminished. East Anglia, Yorkshire, Cheshire, Lancashire, Hertfordshire, Kent, London: go back home. The West country: more inclined to stay in New England.

The colonial elite dominated many of the returnees for the simple reason that they could afford passage home for themselves, their families, and their goods. Even in 1629, standard fare was five pounds, up to fifty pounds to include

---

29 Moore page 56.
30 Moore page 72.

household goods – a substantial sum that equaled a year's wage for a yeoman or minister, and impossible for a laborer.[31] So it is quite reasonable to conclude that the number who wanted to return was substantially greater than the number who actually did return to England.

Indeed those most likely to remain in New England were yeomen and husbandmen. They had the agricultural skills that gave them an advantage over others. Land grants often made them better off than they had been in England.

The flow of returnees to England came to a halt with the restoration of Charles II to the throne in 1660. With him in charge the Act of Uniformity brought back the bishops and imposed the rigidity of the Book of Common Prayer on the pulpit. Exactly what our returning refugees did not want.

But few of them headed back to New England and the number of first-time emigrants was minimal. Part of the reason few returned was that those who had first emigrated to New England in 1630 were now too old to undertake the physical demands of voyage and farming.[32] Immigration to New England was caput.

Now, as a special treat for you this evening, I bring you the link between our New England exiles and our Kit Kat Club.

****

So far I have told you a tale of New Englanders that went back home to England when the reasons for their exile had ended. They returned when Archbishop Laud's persecutions ended, when fears lessened of a return to religious practices reminiscent of Catholic mass, and when Parliament asserted its right to determine the future of England.

These are much the same reasons that led to the formation of our alma mater, the Kit Kat Club of 18th century London England. But first let me quickly fill in

31 Moore, page 32.
32 Moore, page 143

some developments between 1660, the year of the Restoration, and the formation of the Kit-Kat Club in 1700.

In the ensuing years of his reign, Charles II tried to relax the laws against Catholics but was reversed by Parliament. Parliament in 1679 tried to prohibit his Catholic-leaning brother James, Duke of York, from succession, but failed, and in 1685 James II became King of England.

Within a year James II had appointed four Catholics to the Privy Council. The Catholic-Protestant tension came to a head in 1687 when James II issued the Declaration of Indulgence, suspending penal laws enforcing conformity to the Church of England and allowing persons to worship as Catholics if they chose, and it ended the requirement of affirming oaths supporting Protestantism before gaining employment in government office.

In 1688 the King imprisoned the Archbishop of Canterbury for refusing to read the Declaration of Indulgence from the pulpit. Worries about the re-establishment of Catholicism further increased in June when James II baptized his son a Catholic.[33]

At this point Parliament -- here we go again -- joined with troops led by Dutch William III to defeat the troops of James II. Why? Because James II now had an heir who was likely to be raised Catholic. With this "Glorious Revolution" the crown passed to William and William's wife Mary, a Protestant and next in line to the throne, seemingly bringing an end to worries about the restoration of Catholicism in England.

But by 1702, Queen Anne ruled, favoring the Tories and their sympathies with James II and his Catholic relations. Fellow Kat George Paulson's *Centennial History* of our Columbus Kats explains why favoring Tories posed a problem.[34] Whigs were for the most part disciples of Oliver Cromwell, were anti-Catholic, and strove to curtail the power of the King over Parliament. The Tories at the time supported the hereditary right of James II to the throne and identified

33 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1680s
34 Paulson, page 18.

with the established "squirearchy," (a wonderful word I suspect George invented).[35]

Seems like our returning New England exiles had a lot in common with those Whigs! And supporting the Whigs to protect the centrality of parliament and the pre-eminence of Protestantism was why the original Kit Kat Club was formed in 1700.

As Ophelia Field writes in her exhaustive homage to the London Kats, "…the Kit-Cat [sic] Club was the prime example of a political grouping formed and sustained around shared ideological and cultural values….Its members would pursue an ultra-Whig political agenda for over twenty years, such that an opponent could plausibly describe the Kit-Cat [sic] in 1704 as a 'Club that gave Direction to the State.'"[36]

At Queen Anne's death in 1714, George I, Elector of Hanover, became King of England and replaced all the Tory ministry officials with Whigs.

Combined with the Act of Settlement of 1701 which prohibited Catholics or those married to Catholics from succeeding to the throne, the Kats could rest their W(h)igs in peace….and they did. The club petered out by 1720.

And this takes us back to America's first immigrants and why immigration to New England came to a halt and stagnated for almost 200 years.

The reasons why so many New England settlers found exile no longer necessary and went back home, beginning the first of many future interruptions in immigration to the United States, are the same reasons our beloved Kit Kat Club found itself no longer necessary after 20 years.

And it all goes back….

….to 1640.

Thank you.

---

35 Paulson, op.cit.
36 Field, page 7.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Professor David Lincove who guided me through the most remarkable bibliographical resources that opened the door to the remarkable story of the returning New Englanders.

And thanks to fellow Kat David Staley for introducing me to Professor Lincove.

Selected Bibliography

Field, Ophelia, *The Kit-Cat Club* (London: Harper Press) 2008.

Hall, David D., *A Reforming People – Puritanism and the Transformation of Public Life in New England* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf) 2011

Handlin, Oscar, *The Uprooted* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap) 1951

Miller, Perry (ed), *The American Puritans: Their Prose and Poetry* (New York: Doubleday Anchor Books) 1956

Moore, Susan Hardman, *Pilgrims – New World Settlers and the Call of Home* (New Haven: Yale University Press) 2007

Paulson, George W., *The Columbus Kit Kat Club 1911-2011* (Columbus) 2011

Purkiss, Diane, *The English Civil War* (New York: Basic Books) 2006

Seton, Anya, *The Winthrop Woman* (Chicago: Chicago Review Press) 1958

Vowell, Sarah, *The Wordy Shipmates* (New York: Riverhead Books) 2008

Wikipedia, *History of Immigration to the United States*
(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_immigration_to_the_United_States)