

Strangers come to devour the land.

Changing views of foreign migrants in early eighteenth-century

England

*Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.
(A discourse of the growth of England in populousness and trade, 1689, p.120, after Hebrews 13:2)*

*These strangers have come to devour the land... to eat the bread out of Englishmen's mouths.
(Reception of the Palatines Vindicated in a Fifth Letter to a Tory Member, 1711, after Isaiah 1:7)*

Abstract

This article investigates the debates surrounding immigration to England some three hundred years ago and considers why it was that between the 1680s and the 1710s a discernable change occurred in how migrants were treated. Work on a 'British' Protestant identity and its relationship with continental Europe, on changing ideas of Englishness and on the campaign for a relaxation in rights of access to the English and colonial labour market are considered. The shift in popular and political responses to the arrival of refugees in England in 1709 provides a contrast to the charitable welcome extended to migrants a generation before and offers an opportunity to see that views of foreign migrants changed for a combination of reasons. True vocalization of "England's first nationalist revolution" of 1688-'89 came one generation later in 1709. Then, the first full pronouncement of a rhetoric of 'suitability' for English society and of economic utility meant that a refugee community was denied Protestant charity, denied employment, and was directed away from England's shores

Introduction

At the turn of the eighteenth century, Great Britain was characterised by great change and upheaval. At home, the Act of Union (1707) saw the absorption of Scotland into a new united kingdom, the Naturalisation Act (1708) granted some European Protestants free movement into the country, and a period of vast economic transformation was afoot. Abroad, British involvement in the War of Spanish Succession (1701-14) provided an international backdrop to domestic debates and called England's role in continental European affairs into question. Tensions were sparked by the need to define, in language and in law, British attitudes to continental migrants. The matter was precipitated when in the spring and summer of 1709, thirteen-thousand emigrants from the Rhine region of northwest Germany amassed in Dutch ports, awaiting their opportunity to cross over to England. Unlike the Huguenots before them, who were warmly welcomed in the 1680s, this 'swarm' of migrants as they were called, became the focus of a countrywide debate: what rights did foreigners have to come and settle in England? How useful would they be to the nation and what support should they have when in England? And who, if anyone, had the right to claim to be English?

This article investigates and contextualises the debates surrounding immigration to England some three hundred years ago and considers why it was that a discernable change occurred in how migrants were treated between the 1680s and the 1710s. Study of the evolution of popular attitudes to migration, and resulting attitudes towards English and British identity, is hardly new.¹ Over two decades of writing on national identity, and on Britain's engagement with continental Europe has also been expertly set out.² Some writers have stressed the Protestant, as well as Catholic,

linkages between England and the Continent.³ Others have outlined how an island mentality, scepticism towards the continent, Europhobia, and the roles of Anglicanism and monarchy have served as the conscious commonalities around which an English identity was formed.⁴ While much has been done, more work remains on the consideration of new themes and sites of cultural reference in this narrative, on the sense of mission often seen in a 'British' Protestant identity and its relationship with continental Europe, and on the part played in changing ideas of Englishness by the campaign for a relaxation in rights of access to the English and colonial labour market. This article focuses on this latter area of research.

The dramatic shift in popular and political responses to the arrival of refugees in England in 1709 stands in stark contrast to the charitable welcome extended to a similar number of migrants just a generation before. Just as today, discussions on emigration, on Englishness and on Europe played a large part in popular debate in the early-eighteenth century, and can be revealed through a review of parliamentary, print and public debates of the time. The advent of daily broadsheets in 1702, the expansion in the number of titles and the popularity of pamphlets and sermons in-print meant that in the early years of the eighteenth century, "people in geographically separate locations" in England were "linked" in a way previously unseen.⁵ A burgeoning pamphlet and newspaper literature of philanthropy and moral reform fuelled this debate.⁶ The immediacy of current events, growing concern for the changing present and the anxiety for a rapidly-approaching 'future' all met in the pages of late Stuart newspapers.⁷ Attention to the different attitudes, audiences and politics of communication reveals a more dynamic slant on national identity formation, and attitudes towards migrants provide an exacting lens through which to view the trial

runs of new English and British identities at the birth of Britain. As will be seen, after 1708, some continental migrants were ostensibly welcomed into Britain as ‘Foreign brethren Protestants’. The Act of Union 1707 (6 Anne c 11) tentatively placing Protestantism as one of the few unifying bonds between Anglo and Scots, and the Foreign Protestants Naturalisation Act 1708 (7 Anne c 5) was held by many to advertise and sell the “rights of a free-born Englishmen” to Europeans for the price of an oath and a shilling. The Spanish War (1701-1714), which drained both English funds and patience, likewise forced many to reflect on the merits of continued English interest in the continent. Some began to suggest, it might be best for England to disengage from European affairs entirely; at just this crucial turn, a crisis presented which came to crystallise these debates. The reception and re-settlement of some 13,000 refugees who arrived in 1709 – the ‘Poor Protestant Palatines’ – tested the ways in which English people understood and experienced their own Englishness, how they reacted to refugees from war, and even more how they viewed Europe and continental Europeans.⁸

After 1707, it seemed to many that British boundaries had been settled once and for all: “marked out by the sea, clear, incontrovertible, apparently pre-ordained. ‘Fenced in with a wall which knows no master but God only’.”⁹ This article explores the tensions that vibrated within a changing English and British identity in the wake of recent constitutional change and purposes that the refugee crisis of 1709, unlike similar crises of the 1680s and ‘90s, became the focus of a debate about the “utility of poverty” and the need for foreign labour as an economic resource.¹⁰ After this crisis, refugee groups would no longer be welcomed in Britain; rather, they would be directed immediately to the colonies, bypassing England almost entirely. This was

largely as a result of the successful lobbying of private interest groups dominated by merchants and colonial investors. The second section of the article contextualises and explains the impact of migration upon an expanding English society in the period 1700-10. Faced with insurmountable difficulties, many of the refugees and migrants seeking entry to England returned (or were returned) to continental Europe; some were sent to the British American colonies, and others to Ireland.¹¹ Section three purposes that it was as a result of growing scepticism about the legitimacy of the refugees' claims, the coincidence of economic downturn and climatic change, and the successful efforts of colonial entrepreneurs in creating a loophole by which cheap labour could be funnelled to North America, that England rejected European immigration in the eighteenth century. Migration into England three hundred years ago, as well as the political debates it inspired and the legislation it provoked, informed the processes and attitudes that helped to create 'British' and 'English' identities in the eighteenth century and thereafter, as well as attitudes towards continental Europe and beyond. The article concludes by proposing that, as a result of the migrant 'swarm' of 1709-10, foreign migrants ceased to place a part in the popular English imagination, leaving the English with out-dated images of foreigners and a growing scepticism about colonial Americans, who appeared increasingly un-English because of their daily interactions with other Europeans in the American colonies.¹²

From the very late seventeenth century, the arrival of a Dutch king and his large retinue, the growing popularity of English travel on the continent and the simultaneous development of empire prompted calls for a new strategy to deal with strangers within the realm. The first significant articulation of this problem had come much earlier in the sixteenth century with the toleration of religious refugees and the establishment of Strangers' Churches in London from 1547. Then followed Calvin's

Case 1608 (7 Coke Report 1a, 77 ER 377) – the point at which it was declared that the King’s authority, but not the writ of common law, could be extended beyond England into the Crown’s global territories.¹³ Later in the eighteenth century William Blackstone set out clearly the existing legal categories defining the resident population of England: “The people are either Aliens, that is, born out of the Dominions, or Allegiance of the crown of Great Britain; or Natives, that is, born within it.”¹⁴ An alien’s allegiance and rights, then, were “local and temporary only”, whereas a native’s rights and duty of allegiance were deemed “natural and perpetual”.¹⁵ It followed that there were two means by which an alien might change his legal status: an act of naturalization by parliament, which would bestow rights of citizenship on the person in question; or an act of denization by the monarch, which conferred all rights of citizenship. A general act of naturalization, were such to be passed by parliament, would certainly ease the process by which aliens –or ‘strangers’ as they were commonly called– might become citizens. First, a general act rather than a private grant took initiative away from the will of the reigning monarch, and made a blanket provision for the naturalization process. And second, a private bill made the process more costly.¹⁶ Attaining citizenship through a general naturalization act would confer citizenship rights beyond the border of the kingdom, into the kingdom’s jurisdiction abroad, and grant certain privileges and rights which were seen as important to economic and political integration.¹⁷ It was felt that foreign residents of England, precisely because they did not owe allegiance to the English monarch, were ‘qualified’ in their loyalty to the new nation – as such they were excluded from jury service, for example, and from a range of other areas in life.¹⁸

For many in England, it was “the religion of the nation [which was] the law of the nation”; it was “the central issue in the debates’ defining English nationalism in the later Stuart period.”¹⁹ The association of foreignness with religious dissent made any possible mass incorporation of foreigners into England by way of a naturalization act unpalatable to opponents. Sir John Knight, Roger North and others who opposed naturalization held that religious dissent provided a legal obstacle to the extension of citizenship to non-Anglicans.²⁰ In the 1699 *Humble Address to the Honourable House of Commons on behalf of the Trades of England against Naturalizing Aliens*, reference was made to concerns that foreign kings (undoubtedly Louis XIV was here in mind) would hire naturalized foreigners as spies and sleeper agents.²¹ Similarly, a reference to ‘pretend Protestants’ plotting against the Crown and country addressed the concern that naturalization could be used as a tool of war by those seeking to attack the state on religious and political grounds. It was a religious discourse, then, that glossed attitudes to the potential of both legal and social implications of any naturalization act. Merchants and other vested interests who sought to attract cheaper labour through a liberalisation of the labour market and the recruitment of foreigner workers were prompted to consider carefully how they would present and promote such an idea to members of Parliament; to the concerned public more broadly, and to the Board of Trade, itself created by an Act of Parliament in 1696 and charged, amongst other responsibilities, with assisting foreign migrants to move to the American colonies.

Blair Worden has suggested that the late seventeenth century in England saw the social and cultural value of religion trump its soteriological import; society was seized by “a growing sense that religion should be what civilizes us”, rather than

simply what saves.²² Others, including J.C.D. Clark, vehemently disagree with the thesis.²³ Undoubtedly, religion matters, but in this period it was also undergoing change: “the sense that something about the religious basis [of society] changed in the later seventeenth century will not go away.”²⁴ Attitudes to the labour market in England were also changing, with employers calling for a cheaper workforce; any liberalization either through an act of naturalization or the granting of particular privileges to certain foreign workers, would clearly grant advantage to foreign Protestants over native non-Anglicans. High church and Tory campaigns to end occasional conformity –whereby dissenters who made token appearances at Anglican communion were qualified for public office– was a way of branding these groups as ‘lesser Englishmen’: at the very same time that non-conformists and Roman Catholics were being further excluded, the British government would welcome foreign, ‘conforming’ groups to populate both kingdom and colony.²⁵ The English colonies in particular were especially prepared to be far more pragmatic in populating their lands with dissenters. Troubling features of a general naturalization act – not least the bringing in of dissenting religious interests – could be minimised, proponents claimed, if such influences were confined to the colonies rather than England. Migrants to British North America and elsewhere did not need to be ‘conforming Protestants’; the negotiated authority enjoyed by many of the colonies ensured they had more freedom to effect change in America than was possible in England.²⁶

In terms of attracting people to settle in England, the Foreign Protestants Naturalization Act (1708) had relatively little to offer and surprisingly few aliens decided to become naturalized citizens.²⁷ Many felt that economic freedom was more important than naturalization: the Council of Trade, for example, rejected a petition

from London merchants to tighten regulation in 1660, for fear that they would ‘plant their manufactures elsewhere’.²⁸ In 1699, the Committee of Trade requested a statement from the French and Dutch churches of London with regard to the privileges that foreign artisans sought: the reply made no mention of naturalization schemes, but called for greater freedom to practice trades, for an end on attacks carried out by English tradesmen and merchants and for liberty of conscience.²⁹ Similarly, advocates of immigration within Britain’s borders, such as Roger Coke and Josiah Child, were more concerned with loosening existing restrictions, like those on guilds, rather than specifically calling for naturalization schemes. Child, in particular, was committed to the notion that the edifice of the new English state should be erected on land and property, both of which were natural and finite; hence the possession of land was the basis of all political power. “The principal advantage and foundation of trade in England is raised from the wealth which is gained out of the produce of the earth.”³⁰ This revolution in political economy, campaigned for by economic thinkers, writers and actors, proposed a new political economy more concerned with the creation and circulation of wealth, seen as vital to the maintenance of England’s national integrity and identity. Undoubtedly, the sourcing of cheap labour was more important than any offer of religious toleration or naturalization *per se*.³¹ And the importance of any future naturalisation act was that it would form a blanket provision for the movement of people to, and within, Britain and her colonies that was independent of the will of the monarch.³² Under the Stuarts, there was a constant threat of a Naturalization Bill being lost at the sudden prorogation of Parliament or not being discussed at all during a period in which Parliament had not risen. The passing of a general act would give provisions longevity and place the transfer of people into the hands of mercantile and colonial agents, rather than

courtiers and the Crown.³³ Was this a good or a bad thing? That debate grew, and in ferocity, in the first years of the eighteenth century.

Underpinned by links to authority, a rhetoric of English Protestantism was trotted out during debates on the Act of Union (1707), on an Act of Naturalisation (1708) and on the wisdom of sheltering Protestant refugees from the continent.³⁴ Protestantism is often depicted as one of the foundations of English and British national identity, firmly opposed to continental Catholicism.³⁵ Critics of this interpretation suggest that Protestantism was too fissiparous to act as a vehicle for national unity and stress the divisions between English Anglicanism and Scottish Presbyterianism or between established protestant churches and protestant dissenters in each of the three kingdoms.³⁶ Selective use of the language of Protestantism took little account of its heterogeneous interpretations in daily life, nor did it reflect contemporary changes regarding notions of an international Protestantism.³⁷ In England, as elsewhere in Europe, cultures of Protestantism overlapped with political and institutional systems of rule and were just one element in the admixture of British nationality: one constituent element in, rather than constituting, national identity.³⁸ Regional and social manifestations had emerged to define denominational difference in a particular local circumstance and symbols and systems of order were closely linked through the Church of England's alliances with both the constitution and monarchy. Acts of Parliament including the Bill of Rights 1689 (1 William & Mary Sess 2 c 2) and the Act of Settlement 1701 (12 and 13 Will 3 c 2) underscored the legally-enshrined connections between Protestantism and power: a neat reversal of the European principle of *cuius region eius religio*.³⁹ Already by the 1660s, when the Clarendon Code excluded non-Anglicans from public affairs, foreign churches

continued to enjoy the privileges enjoyed by Church of England, having a special arrangement with successive archbishops of Canterbury who exercised a qualified influence on continental Protestantism through these London-based missions.⁴⁰ The Toleration Act 1689 (1 Will & Mary c 18) did little to subdue prejudice against nonconformists and Catholics, especially in light of military engagements in Ireland and a steady climate of anti-French sentiment.⁴¹ And more importantly, perhaps, it made clear that by the end of the seventeenth century, the foreign churches no longer enjoyed the unqualified support and protection of Canterbury: “It contradicted her Majesty’s Character of being the Head of the Protestant Interest in Europe: and how contradictory [did] it look [that] that was condemned at home, for which Her Majesty is pleased to interpose Her Royal Authority, this very time, in relation to Protestant Germany.”⁴² Anglican divines hoped to extend the moral discipline of the established Church over a sluggish nation; this was a “moral revolution” which verged on moral nationalism.⁴³

The 1707 Anglo-Scottish Act of Union, in particular, had sought to build upon an English and Scottish shared belief in Protestantism, avoiding religious confrontation and social disquiet. But religious disquietude crossed the unionist and loyalist divide, and most particularly amongst Presbyterian anti-unionists who were unwilling to accept both an English head of state and church, and to cede synod autonomy.⁴⁴ Daniel Defoe, in pro-Union polemicist mode, argued against such Presbyterian stubbornness; failure to support the Union, he claimed, was an obstacle to national security and akin to hampering the growth and strength of the entire Protestant Church.⁴⁵ In this context, Protestant commonalities proved convenient in

masking deeper-rooted political and social differences between England and Scotland.⁴⁶

Beyond the high political arena, the state of the nation was also a matter of discussion. Economic, social and political frameworks underwent intense scrutiny as British society struggled to come to terms with the demographic impact of decades of rapid commercialization and urbanization.⁴⁷ Political economists including William Petty, John Bellers, and Richard Cantillon, focused on ideas of velocity of trade circulation, population growth and trade deficits when attempting to regulate and predict how best to manage future growth.⁴⁸ Bellers, a Quaker merchant with an eye on the American colonies, articulated the views of many when he argued that impoverished labourers, both domestic and foreign, were needed: "...regularly labouring People are the Kingdom's greatest Treasure and Strength, for without Labourers there can be no Lords."⁴⁹ Territory and mercantilist production were no longer considered the determining factors which regulated national prosperity, but rather the size of a states' population, and the value and productivity of labour: *ubi populus, ibi obulus*. In *England's Interest and Improvement*, the title of a 1663 pamphlet by Samuel Fortrey, it was pointed out that, "the greatest thing therefore that any Prince can aim at, is to make his dominions rich and populous."⁵⁰ The ambition and language of political economy had infiltrated popular debate and was pulled along by a troika of labour, migration and nationality.⁵¹

Tensions brought about by these debates on political economy forged the Naturalisation Act (1708). Passed by a Whig administration, the Act granted any foreign person willing to swear an oath of allegiance to the Crown, to take sacrament in the Church of England, and to pay the sum of one shilling, "deemed, adjudged, and

taken to be one of Her Majesty's natural-born subjects, as if they... were born within this kingdom".⁵² Englishness, at least in this context, was now defined as loyalty to the Crown, adherence to the Church and financial probity. The Act drew upon already-coagulating discourses of the rights and privileges of Englishmen common to the late-seventeenth century.⁵³ Between 1650 and 1680, some 8-10,000 French Protestant refugees arrived in England and another 40-50,000 followed the 1685 Revocation of the Edict of Nantes.⁵⁴ The Naturalisation Act was, at least in how it was publically promoted, primarily intended to acknowledge the contributions of these refugees to the manufacturing and financial development of the kingdom, and to encourage guilds and employers to end their hostility to foreign workers. Referencing Hebrews 13:2, the foreigners presented an "opportunity to entertain angels", according to Sir Peter Pett.⁵⁵ Everything possible should be done to facilitate their entry into English society. But Tory critics like Joseph Addison protested loudly against this politics of accommodation, claiming it reduced the "birthright of an Englishmen to the value of twelve pence;" others argued that 'Englishness' went far beyond laws and privileges, encompassing as it did the manners, assumptions, and history of the national make-up.⁵⁶ "Men could not transplant themselves," and concomitantly their political loyalties, "merely by words".⁵⁷ Growing vocal debates concerning the rights of refugees now went to the heart of the party political division, as well as to concerns about a changing, more international, London.

The Williamite revolution, and later Hanoverian succession, helped to play a significant role in shifting attitudes towards foreignness. The accession of William of Orange to the English throne could have been presented as the action of an 'alien' saving the country from the throes of James II's popery; such a view was epitomised

in contemporary Whig literature, seeking as it did to endear a British public to the idea of a foreign monarch at the time of the Succession crisis.⁵⁸ Pamphlets directly addressed the religious concerns of Tories who questioned the idea of a foreign prince taking Anglican communion: one, *The Harmony of the Lutheran Doctrine with that of the Church of England*, compared, in adjacent columns, the doctrine of the Anglican Church with the articles of the Augsburg Confession, in an effort to refute the accusations of High Church propaganda.⁵⁹ The providential rhetoric employed in Williamite propaganda bypassed questions of constitutionality and emphasised instead the sweeping moral purpose of William's kingship.⁶⁰ If a foreign prince could adopt the English crown, then the idea of a foreign subject and a stranger becoming a citizen became thinkable.

Consideration of the monarch's nationality paralleled debates on new ideas of kingship. In theory the king, as an extension of the divine, should surpass ideas of nationality and borders: the divine right to rule did not possess limits. William III's decision to move with him to England much of the Dutch officer class is a testament to this idea that birth and heritage might exceed nationality in terms of power and acceptance within a state. Noble blood and class transcended and trumped the political, and elites and migrants working in sectors designated culturally, socially or modishly acceptable were seen to integrate with relative ease. The craze for learning French and attending French music recitals, common in London at the end of the seventeenth century, seemed to mitigate the arrival of Calvinist refugees; by 1700, French refugees numbered nearly 25,000 and made up 5 per cent of the total population of London.⁶¹ Indeed, many complained of the "French education" which had "changed our natures, and enslaved our nation".⁶² Language teachers, cloth

workers, musicians and artists all found a place, but many ordinary workers did not. French migrants were one matter, but refugees of a lower socio-economic status were seen as lazy and unbecoming to English society. Yet British society was not homogeneously or resolutely hostile to foreigners. Prominent advocates of naturalization like Daniel Defoe rebuked attacks on William III for giving English titles to Dutch interests in *The True Born Englishman* (1701). He argued that society should take little concern over a person's name or identity and focus, rather, on their character and moral standing.⁶³ In arguing that the 'true born Englishman' had been a foreigner not long before, Defoe attempted to soften his readership's views towards the idea of refugees growing into Englishmen.⁶⁴ There was, after all he argued, no "heterogeneous thing, an Englishman".⁶⁵

The quandary Defoe confronted was how to make the continental refugees now crossing the Channel and arriving in England appear a support, and not a threat to the wider public and to show how foreign labourers would help to develop both English, and colonial, economies. Defoe advocated greater "methods of civil polity, which we see this age arrived to;" social management and the admission of foreign workers was a project which could be lucrative to the state.⁶⁶ Politicians and political commentators, meanwhile, recognised in the charitable and confessional support offered to migrants an opportunity to present the arrival of European Protestants into the kingdom as further evidence of the 'election' of the English people to lead a Protestant International, a cosmopolitan diaspora of Protestants championed by good Queen Anne.⁶⁷ The English people had been tested, like the Israelites of the Old Testament, and now they could save other Christians from popish persecution.⁶⁸ If Britishness in this period was about the development of a broad English Protestant

culture contrasted with the “outlandishness” of a Catholic one, then a link should be forged between Britons and ‘Protestant refugees’, however reluctant some interests were to embrace continental Europeans.⁶⁹

Whether it was for personal cultivation or economic advancement, in the second half of the seventeenth century a growing section of English society grew to appreciate that something could be gained from permitting, indeed encouraging, foreigners to settle in England.⁷⁰ This general goodwill was broken down by the turn into the eighteenth century. Questions were raised as to why migrants should be granted entry at all, why the Crown gave foreigners aid when Englishmen went hungry, and why citizenship rights in the form of naturalization should be granted when England had not first taken care of her own poor. The manufacturing classes, more specifically, had concerns about the possible effects of any liberalisation of the labour market in favour of foreign workers, or indeed the granting of freedom of movement into the country. In London’s Spitalfields, weavers’ meetings adopted frenzied and violent tones when rumours circulated of the arrival in East London of French cloth workers during the 1670 and ’80s.⁷¹ Perceived threats to the economy and the added perception that refugees brought with them threatening practices, ideas and innovations led to popular resentment. Such concerns were not exclusively reserved for non-native English-speakers from the continent: many Londoners feared the ‘foreigners,’ as persons from outside the capital were also called, just as much as they did strangers from the continent.⁷²

Much of the debate concerning the suitability of foreigners for English society was couched in a confessionalised language. Englishmen were Anglicans, and

adherence to another faith cast doubt on the means of being a full-blooded loyalist. To some extent, as Tony Claydon has argued, invocations of Christian solidarity were merely designed to highlight the importance of acting in conformity with Christian principals in the conduct of international relations.⁷³ Nevertheless, many Tories did fret over migrants damaging the religious integrity of the established Anglican Church, dislodging the very bedrock of English identity which could not be conceived of without reference to that religion.⁷⁴ Such views had earlier stymied attempts to liberalise foreign access to the labour market. In 1667, the parliamentarian John Milward had argued against the introduction of a general Naturalization Bill on the grounds that it would be a threat to the established Church.⁷⁵ At a time when dissent and the very faith of the king was a cause for concern, ‘confessional migrations’ could further challenge the already-weakened Church of England.⁷⁶ On 28 July 1681, Charles II issued a proclamation which allowed “distressed Protestants abroad” to settle in England, but it did not guarantee any special concessions; the king’s promise of letters of denization for the immigrants, and indeed of proposing a naturalization bill to Parliament, all came to nothing.⁷⁷ Under James II, only French Calvinists and other foreigners who conformed to Anglicanism could obtain charitable support from the Church.⁷⁸ There had already been an overwhelming growth in outward dissent since the Act of Toleration (1689; 1 William & Mary c 18, which received the royal assent on 24 May 1689), an Act which brought in freedom of worship for non-conformists who pledged to the oaths of allegiance and supremacy and rejected transubstantiation. While Dissenters (Catholics, non-Trinitarians and atheists) continued to be excluded from public office and universities, between 1689 and 1710, 3,901 dissenters’ places of worship were licensed.⁷⁹ In 1708, the issues of religious adherence, labour, migration and nationality fused in popular and political debate and

came to have a direct bearing on the subsequent passing of England's first Naturalisation Act.

THE
STATE
OF THE
PALATINES
FOR
Fifty YEARS past
TO THIS
PRESENT TIME.
CONTAINING,

- I. An Account of the Principality of the *Palatinate*; and of the Barbarities and Ravages committed by Order of the *French King* upon the Inhabitants; Burning to the Ground a great Number of their most Famous Cities, and throwing the Bones of Emperors, Princes and Prelates, out of their Tombs, &c.
- II. The Case of the *Palatines*, Publish'd by themselves, and Humbly Offered to the Tradesmen of *England*. With a List of them; and the Trades which the Men are brought up to.
- III. The Humble Petition of the Justices of *Middlesex* to Her Majesty on their Behalf, with Her Majesty's Order thereupon, and an Abstract of the Brief graciously Granted for their Subsistence.
- IV. A Letter about Settling and Employing them in other Countries.
- V. A Proclamation of the *States-General* for Naturalizing all Strangers, and receiving them into their Country.
- VI. Lastly, Their present Encamping at *Camberwell* and *Black-head*, in many Hundred Tents, by Her Majesty's Grace and Favour, till they can be otherwise dispos'd of, and how they Employ themselves; with their Marriages, Burials, &c. Also the great Kindness their Ancestors shew'd to the *English Protestants* in the Bloody Reign of *Queen Mary*.



LONDON: Printed for J. Baker, at the Black-Boy in *Park*.
1710.

The State of the Palatines for Fifty Years to this Present Time, London, 1710.

The origins of the ‘refugee crisis’ of 1709 seem relatively benign. In the German Rhineland in the summer of 1708, the German Lutheran minister Joshua Kocherthal gathered round him nineteen families and offered them a particularly appealing new escape route from their war-torn homeland.⁸⁰ Poor harvests had meant that “tears and lamentations [were] seen and heard in every place... leaving poor people reduc’d to the utmost want and extremity”.⁸¹ Kocherthal assured his attentive followers that the prohibitive costs of such a long voyage need not deter them from leaving for a new life in British America. The cost of the crossing, Kocherthal said, would be paid by the generous bounty of Queen Anne, who as Protestant Protectress was “the Mother of Europe, and the Best of Queens”.⁸² John Churchill, the duke of Marlborough and hero of Blenheim, had promised Rhineland Protestants that the Queen would not abandon them, Kocherthal said. Seeking the Crown’s benevolence and wishing to pass through England to the Queen’s American colonies, these Rhineland refugees were escorted by Kocherthal towards the Channel, the first stage in their journey to a new life overseas.

In Holland, British officials were unsure how much the recently-arrived Palatine migrants knew of life in England and the American Colonies.⁸³ Not ten years earlier in 1699, the Board of Trade had acquired land in Virginia and provided it to Huguenot refugees to settle, and in 1706 it had purchased yet more land in Pennsylvania and paid for the transportation of European refugees to that Commonwealth, to aid in populating the colony with European labourers.⁸⁴ News of these ventures was certainly available to Kocherthal and it was clear that the migrants had been well briefed to appeal to the three aspects of precedential treatment of Huguenots and Germans in the preceding years; to English Christian charity; and to

Crown benevolence in the hopes of having their claims for asylum in England accepted. On arrival in England the migrants sought the support of other strangers in the city; Kocherthal and a number of British supporters helped to file petitions and advance the cause of the refugees.⁸⁵ Herbert Schumen, for example, requested “any form of money as Her Majesty shall be pleas’d to order for our subsistence”.⁸⁶ Melchoir Giles, a self-confessed “poor Lutheran”, asked for extra funds and “humble permission to stay here... until my wife is cured of the cancer in her breast”.⁸⁷ Falling on the charitable support of London hospitals, refugees quickly faced accusations of being a drain on tax payers. The Queen herself was not free of involvement in the matter and heeded especially her late consort’s chaplain, John Tribbeko, who encouraged her to set an example and support the refugees. From her private funds Anne granted Melchoir Giles two months respite, “until he can go to New York with his fellow countrymen to the land of bountys”.⁸⁸

This first small group of refugees in 1708 set in train a far larger migration in 1709. When Kocherthal returned to the Rhineland in late 1708 he reaffirmed stories of English generosity, and he set out details of England’s open ports and bountiful wealth. The *Goldene Büchlein* [Golden Book] set out the success of the 1708 migration and stirred up even greater interest in England.⁸⁹ The recent bad harvest and a devastating winter prompted many Rhinelanders to gamble on a better life abroad and to flee to the Rhine ports, amassing at Rotterdam where they encountered an unexpectedly well-organised and large-scale transportation network of traffickers willing to aid them on their journey.⁹⁰

The British Resident in Holland, James Dayrolle, launched an investigation into the migrants' welfare and as to how they were being treated in Rotterdam and he noted that "some of the Palatines... have been in a manner forced to come hither [to Britain]".⁹¹ British officials struggled to keep up with the "great number of German Protestants now coming over", and the Earl of Sunderland intervened to state that they should be accommodated as quickly as possible as they would be of "greater benefit to this kingdom".⁹² If they were quickly settled and set to work, these rootless "husbandmen and labouring people... would be rendered easy to dispose of to the advantage of the public", strengthening England's population and providing a "great example for others to follow".⁹³

News of desperate and traumatic cross-channel crossings, and of changes in policy and confused decision-making regarding the relief and settlement of migrants, slowly shifted attitudes towards the migrants. The journey to the Channel and on to England had weakened many; "great misery," plagued the Channel crossing, "causing severall children to die in their passage from Holland for want of room".⁹⁴ In London the chaplain royal John Tribbeko, together with George Andrew Rupperti, minister of St Mary's Lutheran church in the Savoy, both Germans by birth, established an insurance fund for the Palatines and attended to their immediate needs.⁹⁵ Many stricken migrants found themselves "in great straits... many going almost naked" and as ship after ship arrived at St Catherine's Dock, the situation worsened. Most were "sick and destitute" and their capacity to work was curbed by the disproportionate number of very old and very young women and children under the age of fourteen years among them. Ribberti and Tribbeko compiled detailed information regarding the refugees, now languishing in hastily prepared 'tent cities' at Blackheath and

Camberwell.⁹⁶ And almost half of the first cohort were “sick or unable to work”; leaving only 191 fit-to-work adult males.⁹⁷ Port officials reported the discovery of Baptists and “papists mix’d among” the group, a finding that at first sparked protest, until it was decided that even Dissenters could be set to work at London’s naval dockyards.⁹⁸

It is correct that John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, had left a hanging promise of English support for German Protestants during his campaigning in the Rhineland in the early years of the eighteenth century. Indeed his sympathetic words for the residents of the Rhineland and Palatinate was likely the impetus for the ‘Golden Book’. The House of Commons Committee, established to inquire into causes of the 1709 migration, hinted strongly towards the possibility:

And upon the examination of several of them [Palatines] what were the motives which induced them to leave their native country, it appears to the committee that there were several books and papers dispersed in the *Palatinate* with the Queen’s picture before the book and the title pages in Letters of Gold (which from thence was called the Golden Book), to encourage them to come to *England* in order to be sent to *Carolina* or other of her Majesty’s Plantations to be settled there. The book is chiefly a recommendation of that country.⁹⁹

What exactly was this Golden Book? It was most likely the *Ausführlich und Unständlicher Bericht von der berühmten Landschafft Carolina, in dem Engelländischen America gelegen* (*A Compete and Detailed Report of the renowned District of Carolina*) written by Joshua Kocherthal, the former Lutheran pastor of Landau (Bavaria) whose proper name was Joshua Harrsch.¹⁰⁰ Before the journey of 1708, Kocherthal had travelled to London in 1704 to petition for permission to escort some German Lutherans to the British American colonies. When in London,

Kocherthal had established contact with Captain William Killigrew, son of the courtier and playwright of the same name; Killigrew was a land adventurer who had in 1706 suggested to parliament that it use him secretly, as an agent to buy out the Carolina land proprietors at a low price.¹⁰¹ Killigrew's plans grew so far as to suggest to parliament that, "I am in treaty with some thousands of Protestant People from foreign parts, who are desirous of to go thither when this affair [the War of Spanish Succession] is settled which naturally will increase the rent of the county and the customs by considerable for England."¹⁰² At the time of his first visit to London in 1704, Kocherthal likely sought to reach agreement with either the proprietors of Carolina (perhaps through Killigrew) or with members of parliament about such a venture. The result of Kocherthal's visit to London was his 1706 pamphlet, *A Complete and Detailed...report of...Carolina*, known locally as the 'Golden Book'. Kocherthal's text does not make explicit any offers made by Queen Anne or others, but does note that he had plans to aid Germans in relocating to the Colonies.¹⁰³ The text was hugely popular: a fourth edition appeared in Frankfurt in 1709, the year of the mass migration to England. Kocherthal's advertising pamphlet helped to create what was called the *rabies Carolinae* in German-speaking Europe, with 'Carolina' becoming a moniker for all American colonies, and most especially Pennsylvania. The 'Golden Book' did have some detractors: Anton Wilhelm Böhme was moved to pen his *Das verlangte, nicht erlangte Canaan* ('The desired, not acquired Canaan') to try to counter-balance Kocherthal's gleaming depiction of life abroad.¹⁰⁴ Kocherthal's desire to move German refugees to the Americas was undoubtedly financially and commercially-driven; the proprietors of Carolina were already planning to recruit German workers and an altogether more-complex game was at play, pitting the interest of proprietary investment in Carolina against parliament in London. This push

to liberalise access to the colonial labour market for foreign workers involved bishops, knights, kings and queens – all that was missing was a pawn to make the first move.

Kocherthal's efforts resulted in a surge of c.6,500 refugees reaching London by June 1709. Of the 1,770 families enumerated, there were 693 Calvinist families; 550 Lutheran; 512, Catholic; twelve Baptist; and three Mennonite families.¹⁰⁵ One-third of the migrants were Roman Catholic, who together with many "pseudo-Protestants" made up the band of would-be persecuted Lutherans. It now seemed from reports sent by Dayrolle from Rotterdam that the "poor Palatines" were "flying not so much for religion" as for other reasons. The consul noted that the Palatine Catholics and Protestants "seem to agree all very well, being several of them mixed together husbands and wives of different religion or united by parentage".¹⁰⁶

Back in London, a one-hundred man Palatine Commission, headed by Sir John Chamerlayne, Sir Thomas Bray and others, set about collecting funds and coordinating the movement and settlement of the Palatines outside the city; meetings took place at the Temple Exchange Coffee House in the city's Petty France district.¹⁰⁷ Many gentlemen feared that the surge in the number of poor migrants in the city would shake the social hierarchy.¹⁰⁸ "The city and the suburbs", they complained, had recently become "a continued scene of riot and confusion". This malaise trickled down to the smallest social arenas. In the years immediately preceding, changing signs of politeness and a perceived sense of overcrowding as a result of spatial remapping following the Great Fire imbued many with a sense they were surrounded by 'semi-strangers', and new groups had emerged in response to this changing social-

political framework. Church bodies, like the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (1699), and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (1702) and political and literary clubs, such as the Kit-Kat (1689) appeared too.¹⁰⁹ This eclectic collection of reform and debate organisations reflected a reforming generation which shared similar objectives, seeking to broaden social participation rather than completely overhaul society and it was within this context, ostensibly appealing to the public's Protestant goodwill, that the Palatine's Commission trotted out phrases and tropes laced with the language of reform. Charity was the "most lasting, valuable, and exquisite luxury," and the Commission pleaded to the "best-disposed of England's subjects" to "readily and cheerfully contribute to the relief and support of the Poor Palatines".¹¹⁰ Widespread poverty was already serving as a focus for reforming energies throughout the country at a local, as much as a polite and clubbable, level; the establishment of pauper farms, of workhouses and the review of Settlement Laws and parish systems marked a turning point in attitudes towards dependency in these early years of the eighteenth century. By instilling more uniform categories to poverty, a new national system of relief was pieced together, and an increasingly well-entrenched division between 'able' and 'non-able bodied' paupers was established. Defining and nationalising aspects of local discourse and social hierarchy, reforming and political legislation engendered a widespread, albeit socially and legally undefined, understanding of people who lay outside social and safety networks. New legal modes were required to legitimise pre-existing principles of inclusion and exclusion in the country.

Troubled voices declared the migrants' arrival a "crisis" and demanded royal and governmental intervention to ease the situation.¹¹¹ Queen Anne issued a

proclamation calling upon her subjects “to take effectual measures, in conjunction with your allies to redress that Calamity” and to aid the recently-arrived Protestant brethren.¹¹² The government feared an urban public health crisis and frantic meetings took place during the summer of 1709; if the Palatines “are not quickly dispos’d of”, officials worried, “[they] will breed a sickness in the city”.¹¹³ Dispersal beyond London was encouraged and officials granted a bounty of £5 to every parish willing to accept a migrant into their community.¹¹⁴ The Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison, worked hard to mobilise his clergy in support of the refugee cause. “I do earnestly recommend to you”, he implored his colleagues, “the promoting of this good, necessary work”. The migrants’ cause was promoted as a prime and much-needed opportunity to “provide a public testimony of our zeal for the Reformed Religion”.¹¹⁵ But the migrants’ religious requirements rapidly slipped from focus, as their true faith became a matter of inquiry and their illness a matter of concern. Reverends Riberti and Tribekko lamented the lack of general support for their cause, confessing that “we are finding it difficult to take care of their spiritual concerns”.¹¹⁶ Fellow Germans, at the Hamburg Lutheran Church on Trinity Lane, St Mary-Le-Savoy Lutheran Church and the other four German churches in the city, offered no substantial donation towards the upkeep of the new arrivals and other migrant communities such as the Huguenots appeared untouched by the refugees’ plight.¹¹⁷ Visitors to the city who might well have shown an interest would appear to have been shielded from the sight of the poor Germans. The German orientalist and traveller Zacharias von Uffenbach spent weeks in London in 1710 and never once heard of, or mentioned, the thousands of fellow-German impoverished migrants in the city.¹¹⁸ And foreigners already established in London were reluctant to reveal their all-too-recent immigrant origins, refusing to openly support the new arrivals. The Anglican Church

searched vainly to find incentives for its own clergy to support the migrants. It proved more convenient for parliament and the Established Church to declare a public crisis than to confront the social and legislative challenges created by the arrival of the unsolicited foreigners in the country.

The economic debates provoked by the new migrants went to the heart of contemporary Whig-Tory divides and to broader social concerns. Whigs saw in Louis XIV's persecution of the Protestant Palatines justification for the war with Catholic France, while Tories complained that supporting German Lutherans simply prolonged a costly war. Of even greater concern was whether English men and women, who had as was noted in 1710 a "natural aversion to foreigners", wanted Europeans to live amongst them and if so, irrespective of their religious views, how their presence might change England.¹¹⁹ The refugees' was also linked to discussions concerning rights of access to welfare, as well as the thesis that "people are the wealth and strength of a nation".¹²⁰ Supporters of immigration claimed that the Palatines were analogous to "industrious bees in a hive", a "treasure" and an untapped source of human wealth.¹²¹ John Bellers advocated that they be directed into schemes that would provide profit for employers and "help to make food sufficient for the whole of society".¹²² Critics, meanwhile, suggested that the migrants had neither the intention nor the capacity to work, and cast Sir Peter Pett's earlier use of Hebrews 13:2 to describe the migrants as angels, against Isaiah 1:7, claiming that "these strangers have come to devour the land... [and] to eat the bread out of Englishmen's mouths".¹²³ Bread became a pervasive metaphor in these debates, provoking memories of all-too-common food shortages in the late seventeenth-century. And there were probing questions about the type of men and women these migrants were. By fashioning the

migrants as “innocent, laborious, peaceable, healthy and ingenious people”, supporters sought to quell escalating popular animosity and re-focus debate on the nature, rather than produce, of an ideal British society.¹²⁴ But this line of argument had limited success and popular opinion was increasingly hostile towards the strangers.

Contemporary reactions to the migrants of 1709 underscore how much of the widespread anti-emigrant rhetoric and xenophobia stemmed from social, rather than local, politics. Archbishop of Canterbury, Thomas Tenison, worried about the “concerning disturbances which occur’d [in southern towns] whilst some of the Palatine refugees were being settled”.¹²⁵ The authors of the *Palatine Catechism* (1709) were prompted to devote sections of their German-to-English vocabulary to the language of English social hierarchy, to etiquette in taverns, and polite customs; inference can be drawn as to where the Palatines were encountering the greatest challenges when encountering English men and women. Phrases such as “they have stolen from us” and “everybody talks of us” were given, in German and English; as were recommendations that the migrants learn how to say in English, “We behave ourselves submissively to all people” and “We are strangers and here upon charity”.¹²⁶ German migrants were encouraged to learn these lines quickly and to defend themselves against popular accusations of laziness and avarice, and of seeking to fall upon welfare, state support and charity. Palatine friends and foes alike both concurred that the migrants needed to understand what role they might play in their new English home. English neighbours drew attention to the migrants’ “age and infirmities” and their behaviour was judged foreign and unbecoming. Parishioners of St Olave’s in York, for example, were outraged at the sight of “Palatine wives

begging for their husbands in the streets”.¹²⁷ Even the Board of Trade argued that pushing them into rural areas would make the foreigners “more fit for the almshouse than the workhouse”.¹²⁸ Using the language of Whig, Tory and political economic debate, the St Olave’s parishioners contended that the Palatines were an “extravagant and unreasonable charge to the kingdom... with whosoever advising the bringing over of the poor Palatines”, “an enemy to the Queen and this kingdom”.¹²⁹ The manner in which the migrants were variously reported on, criticised and sympathetically supported sheds light on the ways and forms in which discourses of society and state were merging in early eighteenth-century Britain. Not just the language, but the ideological divisions of Whig-Tory politics too, were appearing with surprising regularity.

The Board of Trade continued throughout 1709 to argue that the German migrants could be put to best possible use in the Colonies, just as the Germans who had been moved to Pennsylvania some years earlier were. The Board’s founding articles charged it with populating the colonies and it certainly attended to this charge in 1709-10: at every meeting of the Board of Trade in 1709, the issue of what to do with the refugees was raised.¹³⁰ The Board of Ordinance, the Attorney General, Sir James Montagu; and the Lord Treasurer, Sidney Godolphin, were all drawn into the debate and in May 1709 Charles Spencer, Lord Sunderland encouraged members of the Board of Trade “to consider of a method for settling the said Germans in some part of the kingdom”, and most especially to attempt to move them to the American colonies.¹³¹ Charles, Lord Townsend, who as ambassador extraordinary to the States-General knew at first-hand of the plight of the German refugees amassed in Rotterdam, added his weight behind plans to transport the migrants to North America.

‘The expenses may be great’, the Rotterdam British envoy Dayrolle wrote in June 1709, “but are necessary if you are in want of these people for the Plantations, as my Lord Townshend [sic] seems to be of opinion you are.”¹³² By late summer 1709, the Board of Trade recommended to Godolphin that the refugees be transported to Jamaica and New York, the latter location because many of the Germans then in London “were of the same country as those gone to New York [in 1706 and they] ...had expressed a great desire of being transported there.”¹³³ The Board recommended that the migrants be transported as colonist-labourers “at H.M. charge”.

By October 1709, the number of German refugees in London stood at 13,500.¹³⁴ Charity towards the Palatines had dried up before the drive to support them had properly taken off. Just one-third of the amount raised in charitable donation for Huguenot refugees in the late seventeenth century was raised for the Palatines (£63,000 compared with £22,000). Finding the welcome to be more qualified than expected, some 3,000 men, women and children chose to return to Rotterdam and Germany; others returned when they were exposed as Roman Catholics.¹³⁵ The remaining migrants, perhaps now numbering 9,000, were refused admission to the City and were accommodated in tents on Blackheath, Camberwell and Greenwich commons, with the remainder housed at Deptford. The Government had grown more attentive of public disquiet about the large community of poor, ill and unemployed foreigners living in wards and parishes near to or outside the city walls and embarked on a campaign to disperse them as quickly as possible.¹³⁶ It is not clear how many of them died in the coldest winter recorded in England, 1709-10, living in tents and in warehouses, but by the spring of 1710 the surviving families were dispatched from London throughout the country. The Corporation of Liverpool accepted 130 migrants

and a small number were given leave to move to Chester; 322 men entered military service and a further 56 became domestic servants. The largest number were sent to Ireland and to colonial New York; 3,073 were moved across the Irish sea to form a 'Protestant bulwark' against the Catholic Irish and some 3,300 were sent to New York as "the first large-scale German settlement in the British colonies", to be employed there in the naval supplies trade.¹³⁷

So why were the Palatine refugees of 1709 treated in such a different way than the Huguenot refugees who had preceded them just one generation before? Without doubt, it is the fact that both parliament and public engaged in a debate about the suitability of these poor and unpopular refugees, who were more impoverished than the French refugees who had arrived in the later seventeenth century, for life in England. There were calls to censure the government for encouraging the migrants to come; an active print debate highlighted their inability to speak English, their unkempt appearance and their seemingly lazy attitude. Unlike the Palatines, the Huguenot refugees of the late seventeenth century had never been the subject of parliamentary debate (perhaps because parliament was not in session for much of James II's reign) and a print press and debate culture was not as enlivened in the last decades of the seventeenth century as it was becoming in the early eighteenth.

Even more unusual was the shift in line of argument used to condemn the Palatines, a clear change in attitude in a relatively short period of time and a shift in argument which has bearing on how English identity was being formed and reformed in the first decades of the eighteenth century. When Archbishop Tenison appealed to Christian charity to support the refugees, he did so in part because he held that

England was obliged to aid fellow Protestants in need of refuge; just as had been done for the Huguenots in the 1680s. Some in England feared that “the Protestant interest is at as low ebb now as ever it was since the Reformation” and that “Germany seems to be lost [to Protestantism].”¹³⁸ England was the patron of European Protestantism and had led the way in supporting exiled French Calvinists and now she must do the same in support of German Lutherans. But the British public at large, and many Anglicans in particular, were doubtful of the religious convictions of the German migrants, and this scepticism was strengthened when it was discovered that a large part of the body of refugees were, in fact, Catholics. Why offer Protestant charity to refugees who had not suffered for their faith as earlier religious refugees had, many argued?¹³⁹ New projects aimed at promoting social welfare rose and fell on a public reckoning of the justness of the cause, rather than the station of their authors.¹⁴⁰ This was the beginning of an ‘Age of Benevolence’, a time more especially associated with the later eighteenth century than the first decades of that century, but the Palatines failed to convince the public of their just cause and as such, were largely ignored.¹⁴¹

A second reason why the refugees of 1709 faced a response so very different to that which welcomed the Huguenots was the accident of weather and the resulting impact of economic decline. German refugees had fled because of poor harvests brought on by extremely bad weather; and while harvests in England were not as poor as in Germany, the self-same adverse climatic conditions had caused food prices in England to nearly double in 1709. Reverend John Shower’s sermon of 1695 entitled, *Winter meditations: or, a sermon concerning frost, and snow, and winds, &c. and the wonders of God therein*, was reprinted in London in 1709, as people struggled to understand the reasons for the change in climate.¹⁴² Climate and economy exerted a

particular, and understandable, influence on popular attitudes to the added strain on charity. And perhaps of greatest importance in understanding this shift in attitude towards foreigners is that migrants were no longer viewed as of economic advantage to the nation. Earlier refugees had found their niche in the market, working in relatively skilled jobs in craft production, in education, in finance and in cultural life. The Palatines were predominately agriculturalists who seemed unsuited for anything other than agrarian life. The refugees' defenders understood this line of argument and used it to defend the Germans' claims to "advance wealth and the strength of a nation". "The Multitude of People is the Interest of the Nation", and since the time of William Petty and Josiah Child in the seventeenth century, it was believed that a simple increase in population would benefit the state.¹⁴³ Petty and Child had reached the height of their popularity in the late seventeenth century, and a large population was no longer enough – immigrants should be skilled and of use. The illiteracy of some of the German refugees, their lack of professional skill and their unfair representation as lazy and incapable of retraining made them appear unlikely English citizens to an already-dubious English public. The refugees' Protestant faith –if such could even be proven– and their genuine need to appeal to English charity –if, too, they were refugees from an aggressive war and not simply avaricious economic migrants– were no longer enough to allow them access to England. Popular opinion had changed and it was now clear that scepticism about the refugees genuine claims to asylum, and acceptance that they were almost entirely unskilled labourers, meant that the government could not persuade the population of London or the country beyond the capital, to accommodate them. It was for this reason that they were redirected to the British American colonies and to Ireland, where their number, as much as their

agrarian knowledge, would prove useful in forming bulwarks against French and Irish Catholics.

And yet: perhaps everything turned out just as it was planned. The refugees were sent abroad, to buttress Protestant interests overseas and to buoy deficiencies in the colonial labour market. It was private interest groups, working together with the Board of Trade and interested parties in Treasury, the Board of Ordinance and elsewhere, who had relieved government of the 'refugee problem' and taken delivery of these labourers in the colonies. Colonial proprietors like William Killigrew and John Archdale in the Carolinas, William Penn Jr. in Pennsylvania and Robert Hunter in New York were exceedingly happy to have them; repeated attempts, from the 1660s onwards, to relax rights of access to the English and colonial American labour markets had failed, and the Naturalisation Act of 1708 was unpopular and largely unsuited to the colonies' real needs for European labourers. Why go to the unnecessary length of making all foreigners citizens by act of parliament, when unwanted refugees could be better employed as colonist settlers with limited rights of appeal to the law? What proprietors in the American colonies wanted, and what their supporters in government in London were willing to support, was a justification to circumvent London –in both theory and practice– and dispatch willing European migrants directly to the colonies, satisfying the terms of the Navigation Act by touching English soil en route at Cowes, far removed from the gaze of politicians and their constituents. The result of this shift in policy was a growing distance between Britain and continental Europe, at least in how Europeans and foreign migrants were viewed in Britain, as well as a growing uncertainty about just how 'English' the residents of the English American colonies really were. It would mean that by the

second half of the eighteenth century, residents of the American colonies would come to see Englishmen amongst them as strangers.

Whether refugees or economic migrants, the migration of 1709 prompted a public reaction in England to a much longer-term trade-and-industrial campaign for cheaper labour in England and in her colonies. By 1712, anti-emigration voices succeeded in revoking the 1708 Naturalization Act; not until 1844 would Parliament again vote through a similar bill for the United Kingdom.¹⁴⁴ The refugees of 1709 saw the London government buckle under populist ranting against migration; parliament backed down in the face of popular political unrest. Colonial American demands for foreign labour instead put pressure on parliament to allow agents and interested parties in England and in the English colonies to bypass London and to invite, directly, continental Europeans to settle and work in America. In this way, Germans and other Europeans in the British colonies came, indirectly, to become citizens and subjects of the Crown. Beginning in 1717, the German-speaking Elector of Hanover and English king George I offered tracts of land beyond the Alleghany Mountains, in western Pennsylvania, to German settlers.¹⁴⁵ Before long a vibrant society emerged and Philadelphia became a city of spirited debate where ideas about life and liberty were openly contested on a regular basis.

Conclusion

The Palatine refugees on 1709 were quickly forgotten. Whereas over seventy pamphlets and poems had been penned setting out the plight of the Huguenot refugees arrived in England after 1685 and almost all were supportive of their charitable reception, not a third of that number reported on the Palatines in 1709 and after, and

over half of those were condemnatory and dismissive of the legitimacy of their claims to asylum.¹⁴⁶ These poor, largely uneducated refugees had arrived at the worst possible time, when the natural and political climate was as ungenerous as it had ever been. By 1712, the Naturalisation Act had been repealed by a new Tory administration and the rights of ‘free-born Englishmen’ would not again be available to the non-English for over a century. The vague cultural compounds and ambiguous legal definitions underpinning English and British subject-hood and citizenship remained in place, just as they had before. Events of 1709 also provide a snapshot of a frenetic and important debate in early eighteenth-century England, which involved the changing nature of popular English Protestantism, reforming discourses and networks of social mobilisation, and an emerging fissure in the centre-peripheral relationship between colonies and the British metropolis. Contemporaries judged the migrant issue to be a pertinent test case of these issues.

Accounts of English nationalism in the eighteenth century can be seen to begin with an assumption of “English xenophobia”, but recalling events of 1709 offers an opportunity to see that views of foreign migrants changed for a combination of reasons.¹⁴⁷ An emerging English nationalism was not merely xenophobic, and nor was it built on a strict adherence to Anglicanism; the reception of a large French Calvinist community showed this was not the case. If 1688-9 was truly a conservative event, or even “England’s first nationalist revolution”, then the true vocalization of the revolution’s nationalism first came one generation later in 1709. Then, the first full pronouncement of a rhetoric of ‘suitability’ for English society and of economic utility meant that a refugee community was denied Protestant charity, denied employment in factories and on farms, and was directed away from England’s

shores.¹⁴⁸ Aspersions were cast on the migrants' Protestant credentials –in part, with justification– and their humble origins meant that they were seen as unfit Englishmen. The 'sensible', 'conservative' and 'nationalist' events of the later seventeenth century peaked in legislative reform in 1709 which permitted naturalization for some foreigners, but clearly not for all: general naturalization was repealed within three years.¹⁴⁹ Sensible conservative nationalism was forming and it abused a Protestant rhetoric to serve its own immediate end: to welcome some and to reject others.

Today, migration remains a touchstone for debate, especially in popular and public discussions about the impact on national identity. At a time of unprecedented refugee movement, and facing calls for further constitutional devolution and dissolution from Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales, Britons are once again immured in discussions on the merits of immigration and on the future of the union, both on the island and with the continent.¹⁵⁰ Then as now, the great desire of migrants is to integrate and to succeed, and to enrich the lands they settle. And then as now societies will be the richer for their actions.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

¹ *Your country is desolate, your cities are burned with fire: your land, strangers devour it in your presence, and it is desolate, as overthrown by strangers.* (Isaiah 1:7). Debate was sparked by Linda Colley, 'Britishness and Otherness: An Argument', *Journal of British Studies*, 31, Oct.1992, pp.309-29; eadem, *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707-1837*, London, 1992. See, too, the very helpful Review Article by Tony Claydon, 'Problems with the British Problem', *Parliamentary History*, vol. 16, pt. 2 (1997), pp. 221-227.

² Colley, *Britons*; Gerald Newman, *The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History 1740-1830*, London, 1987; Stephen Conway, 'Christians, Catholics, Protestants: The Religious Links of Britain and Ireland with Continental Europe, c.1689-1800', *English Historical Review*, vol. CXXIV, no. 509 (2009), pp. 833-862; Andrew C. Thompson, *Britain, Hannover and the Protestant Interest, 1668-1756*, Woodbridge, 2006; Hannah Smith, *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714-1837*, Cambridge, 2006; Brendan Simms and Torsten Rott (eds.), *The Hanoverian Dimension in British History, 1714-1837*, Cambridge, 2007.

³ Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England 1660-1760*, Cambridge, 2007.

⁴ Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, 'The trials of the chosen peoples: recent interpretations of protestantism and national identity in Britain and Ireland' in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and national identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650-c.1850*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 3-32, here: p. 7; Colin Kidd, *British Identities Before Nationalism*, Cambridge, 1999; Stuart Ward (ed), *British Culture and the End of Empire*. Manchester, 2001.

⁵ Tony Claydon, 'Daily News and the Construction of Time in Late Stuart England, 1695-1714', *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 52 (January 2013), pp. 55-78, here: p. 56.

⁶ Peter Lake and Steve Pincus, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere in early modern England', *Journal of British Studies*, 45 (April 2006), pp. 282-285.

⁷ *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 66, 73-78.

⁸ The migration of 1709 has once again served as a site of comparison with current events; see 'Stranger's in strange lands', *The Economist*, Sep 12th 2015 for consideration of the "Poor Palatines" in light of the Syrian refugee crisis.

⁹ Colley, *Britons*, p.17.

¹⁰ The phrase is Baugh's; see Daniel Baugh, 'Poverty, Protestantism, and Political Economy: English Attitudes Towards the Poor, 1660-1800', in Stephen Baxter (ed.), *England's Rise to Greatness, 1660-1763*, Berkley, 1983, p. 76; Alison G. Olson, 'Huguenots and Palatines', *The Historian*, vol. 63 (2), Dec. 2001, pp. 269-285, here: p. 270.

¹¹ Harry Thomas Dickinson, 'The Poor Palatines and the Parties', *English Historical Review* 82, July 1967, pp.464-85; Daniel Statt, *Foreigners and Englishmen: The Controversy over Immigration and Population, 1660-1760*, London, 1995.

¹² Michael Duffy, *The Englishman and the Foreigner*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 214-227; 247-248.

¹³ On Calvin's case and its impact beyond England, see 'The Liberties of Englishmen beyond England: Calvin's Case', in Daniel J. Hulsebosch, *Constituting Empire. New York and the Transformation of Constitutionalism in the Atlantic World, 1664-1830*, Chapel Hill, NC, 2005, pp. 20-28, and 'Evolution of British Nationality Law', in J. Mervyn Jones, *British Nationality Law*, Oxford, 1956, pp. 51-62.

¹⁴ William Blackstone, *An analysis of the laws of England*, London, 1771, p. 24.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Caroline Robbins, 'A Note on General Naturalization under the Later Stuarts and a Speech in the House of Commons on the Subject in 1664', *The Journal of Modern History*, 34:2, June 1962, pp.168-77, here p.170.

¹⁷ A. H. Carpenter, 'Naturalization in England and the American Colonies', *The American Historical Review*, 9:2, Jan. 1904, pp.288-303, here p. 291.

¹⁸ In early modern England and in cases of criminal law, foreign residents had a right to trial *de medietate lingue* or before a 'party jury' made up of equal numbers of Englishmen and foreigners to mitigate the possibility of unfair treatment. Matthew Lockwood, "'Love ye therefore the strangers': immigration and the criminal law in early modern England", *Continuity and Change*, vol. 29, no. 3, 2014, pp. 349-371, here pp. 353-54.

¹⁹ Annabel Patterson, "'Crouching at home and cruel while abroad": Restoration constructions of national and international character', in R. Malcolm Smuts (ed.), *The Stuart court and Europe: essays in politics and political culture*, Cambridge, 1996, pp. 210-227, here: p. 218; Charles Caesar, *Numerus infaustus. A short view of the unfortunate reigns of William the Second, Henry the Second, Edward the Second, Richard the Second, Charles the Second, James the Second*, London, 1689, pp. 101-102.

²⁰ Robbins, 'General Naturalization', p.171.

²¹ Steven Pincus, 'The Making of a Great Power? Universal Monarchy, Political Economy, and the Transformation of English Political Culture', *The European Legacy*, vol. 5, no. 4, 2000, pp. 531-545, here: p. 534; Joan Thirsk and J.R. Cooper (eds.), *Seventeenth Century Economic Documents*, Oxford, 1972, p.747.

²² Blair Worden, 'The Question of secularization' in Alan Houston and Steve Pincus (eds.), *A Nation Transformed: England after the Restoration*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001, pp. 20-40.

²³ J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 26-34, 43-123; idem., 'England's Ancien Régime as a Confessional State', *Albion*, vol. 21, 1989, pp. 450-474.

²⁴ Blair Worden, 'The Question of secularization', p. 24.

²⁵ Kevin Sharpe, *Rebranding Rule: The Restoration and Revolution Monarchy, 1660-1714*, New Haven, CT, 2013, pp. 637-38.

²⁶ I borrow the term from Jack P. Greene, *Negotiated Authorities: Essays in Colonial Political and Constitutional History*, Charlottesville, VA, 1994.

²⁷ The total number naturalized between 1715 and 1800 stood at only 446 males; Margrit Schulte Beerbühl, 'Naturalization and economic integration: the German merchant community in 18th century London', in Randolph Vigne and Charles Littleton (eds.), *From Strangers to Citizens. The integration of immigrant communities in Britain, Ireland and Colonial America, 1550-1750*, Sussex Academic Press, 2001, pp. , p.512.

²⁸ 'Opinion of the Council of Trade upon Shopkeepers' Petition', Thursday 14 March 1690 in Thirsk and Cooper, *Economic Documents*.

²⁹ Statt, *Foreigners*, p.83.

³⁰ Sir Josiah Child, *A Discourse of the Nature, Use and Advantage of Trade*, London, 1694, p. 7; Pincus, 'The Making of a Great Power?', p. 537. See also Nicholas Barbon, *A Discourse of Trade*, London, 1690, sig. A2: "Trade is now become as necessary to preserve governments, as it is useful to make them rich."

-
- ³¹ G. C. Gibbs, 'The Revolution in Foreign Policy', in Geoffrey Holmes, *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, London, 1969, p.297; William Petty, *Political Arithmetick*, London, 1691.
- ³² Today, right of movement into Britain is guided by the 2004 European Union directive: *Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States*. See: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2004:158:0077:0123:EN:PDF> [accessed 8 February 2016].
- ³³ Albeit the Act was revoked, in that form, four years later.
- ³⁴ Edward Vallance, *Revolutionary England and the National Covenant: State Oaths Protestantism and the Political Nation, 1553-1682*, Woodbridge, 2005.
- ³⁵ Pasi Ihalainen, *Protestant Nations Redefined: Changing Perceptions of National Identity in the Rhetoric of the English, Dutch and Swedish Public Churches, 1685-1772*, Brill, 2005; Colley, *Britons*.
- ³⁶ Stephen Conway, 'Christians, Catholics, Protestants', p. 835; J.C.D. Clark, 'Patriotism, Nationalism and National Identity, 1600-1832', *The Historical Journal*, vol. 43, no. 1, March 2000, pp.249-76.
- ³⁷ Peter Marshall, *The Beginnings of English Protestantism*, Cambridge, 2002.
- ³⁸ Steven Pincus, "'To protect English liberties": the English nationalist revolution of 1688-1689', in Tony Claydon and Ian McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and national identity: Britain and Ireland, c.1650-c.1850*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1998, pp. 75-104, here: p. 93.
- ³⁹ Michael, J. Braddick and John Walter (eds), *Negotiating Power in Early Modern Society: Order, Hierarchy and Subordination in Britain and Ireland*, Cambridge, 2001.
- ⁴⁰ See, *inter alia*, William Wake, *An Exhortation to Mutual Charity and Union Among Protestants in a Sermon Preached Before the King and Queen at Hampton Court, 21 May 1689*, London, 1689, pp. 15-18, <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/e/eebo/A66185.0001.001?rgn=main;view=fulltext>, [accessed 4 February 2016].
- ⁴¹ Julia Rudolph, *Common law and Enlightenment in England, 1689-1750*, Woodbridge, 2013, *passim*.
- ⁴² "The Case of the Dutch and French Protestant Churches in England since King Edward the Sixth", London, 1711; Edwin Sandys, *A Proposal of Union Amongst Protestants; from the Last Will of the Most Reverend Doctor Sandys*, London, 1679, pp. 2-4; Alison G. Olson, 'Huguenots and Palatines', *The Historian*, vol. 63 (2), Dec. 2001, pp. 269-285, here: p. 278.
- ⁴³ Dudley Bahlmann, *The Moral Revolution of 1688*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1957, *passim*; Daniel Brunner, *Halle Pietists in England: Anthony William Boehm and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, Göttingen, 1993, p. 22.
- ⁴⁴ Kidd, *British Identities Before Nationalism*, p.322.
- ⁴⁵ Daniel Macree, 'Daniel Defoe, the Church of Scotland, and the Union of 1707', *Eighteenth Century Studies*, 7:1, Autumn, 1973, pp.62-77.
- ⁴⁶ J.C.D. Clark, 'Patriotism, Nationalism and National Identity', *passim*..
- ⁴⁷ Peter Earle, *The World of Defoe*, New York, 1976, pp.3-44.
- ⁴⁸ Julian Hoppit, 'Political Arithmetic in eighteenth-century England', *The Economic History Review*, 49:3, August 1996, pp.516-40.

-
- ⁴⁹ John Bellers, *An essay towards the improvement of physick: in twelve proposals*, London, 1714, p.37.
- ⁵⁰ Samuel Fortrey, *Englands interest and improvement. Consisting in the increase of the store, and trade of this kingdom*, Cambridge, 1663, p.4.
- ⁵¹ Hoppitt, 'Political Arithmetic', p.528.
- ⁵² *An Act for Naturalizing Foreign Protestants*, London, 1708-9, 7&8 Anne.c.5.
- ⁵³ Thomas Wagstaffe, *The Rights and Liberties of Englishmen. With a collection of statutes and records of Parliament against foreigners*, London, 1701.
- ⁵⁴ Robin D. Gwynn, 'The arrival of Huguenot refugees in England, 168—1705', *Proceedings of the Huguenot Society*, vol. 21, (1965-1970), pp. 366-73; Selwood, *Diversity and difference*, p. 28.
- ⁵⁵ Sir Peter Pett, *A discourse of the growth of England in populousness and trade since the reformation*, London, 1689, p.120. "Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." Hebrews 13:2.
- ⁵⁶ John Addison, *Spectator*, 200, 19 October 1711.
- ⁵⁷ Petty, *Political Arithmetic*, pp.30-31.
- ⁵⁸ Geoffrey Holmes, *The Making of a Great Power 1660-1722*, London, 1993, p.246; Colley, *Britons*, p.24; Peter Lake, 'Anti-popery: the structure of a prejudice', in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes (eds.), *Conflict in early Stuart England. Studies in Religion and Politics, 1603-1642*, Longman, London, 1989, pp. 72-106.
- ⁵⁹ Kathleen Wilson, *The Sense of the People: Politics, Culture and Imperialism in England, 1715-1785*, Cambridge, 1998, p.89.
- ⁶⁰ Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution*, p. 52.
- ⁶¹ Robin D. Gwynn, 'The number of Huguenot immigrants in England in the late seventeenth century', *Journal of Historical Geography*, vol. 9, no. 4, 1983, pp. 384-395, here: p. 393; eadem., 'England's First refugees', *History Today*, vol. 35, no. 5, 1985. The population of London in 1700 is estimated at around 490,000; Roger Finlay and Beatrice Shearer, 'Population growth and suburban expansion', in A.L. Beier and Roger Findlay (eds.), *London 1500-1700: the making of a metropolis*, London, 1986, p. 48. This might be compared with the estimated 10,000 foreigners—or 12% of the total population of 120,000—living in London in 1553: Lien Luu, *Immigrants and the industries of London 1500-1700*, Aldershot, 2005, p. 107. In 2014, up to 400,000 French citizens live in London, making it the sixth largest city in France. Charles Mullins, 'France's Loss is London's Gain', 29 January 2014, http://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/charlie-mullins/top-tax-rate_b_4686902.html [accessed 8 February 2016]; Wesley Stephenson, 'Is London really France's "sixth biggest city"', 31 March 2014, <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-26823489> [accessed 8 February 2016]
- ⁶² *Present State of France*, 1687, p. 17, after: Pincus, "'To protect English liberties'", in Claydon and McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and national identity*, p. 83.
- ⁶³ Louise Bours, Member of the European Parliament (MEP) for the North West England region (elected 2014) and a member of the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) changed her name from Louise van de Bours to 'Bours' in the run-up to her campaign for election. See: 'UKIP By-Election Hopeful Changed to "Less Foreign-Sounding" Name', <http://politicalscrapbook.net/2014/01/ukip-by-election-hopeful-changed-to-less-foreign-sounding-name/> [accessed 5 February 2016]; Daniel Defoe, *The True Born Englishman*, 1701.
- ⁶⁴ William O'Reilly, 'The Naturalization Act of 1709 and the settlement of Germans in Britain, Ireland and the Colonies', in *From Strangers to Citizens*, pp.492-502.

⁶⁵ Defoe, *True-born Englishman*.

⁶⁶ Daniel Defoe, *Essay upon Projects*, London, 1702, pp. 1-2 (originally published in 1697); Valerie Pearl, 'Puritans and Poor Relief: The London Workhouse, 1649-1660' in David Pennington and Keith Thomas (eds.), *Puritans and Revolutionaries: Essays in Seventeenth-Century History presented to Christopher Hill*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978, pp. 206-232; David Owen, *English Philanthropy 1660-1960*, Cambridge, MA., Belknap Press, 1964, p. 11.

⁶⁷ Robin Gwyn 'The Huguenots in Britain, the "Protestant International" and the defeat of Louis XIV', in *Strangers to Citizens*, p.412.

⁶⁸ See Paul Christianson, *The reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions*, Toronto, 1978.

⁶⁹ The term is taken from Colin Haydon, "'I love my King and Country, but a Roman catholic I hate': anti-catholicism, xenophobia and national identity in eighteenth-century England", in Claydon and McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and national identity*, pp. 33-52; Geoffrey Holmes, 'The Sacheverell Riots: The Crowd and the Church in Early Eighteenth-Century London', *Past & Present*, 72, August 1976, pp.55-85, here p.62.

⁷⁰ J. P. Ward, "'Employment for all hands that will worke": Immigrants, Guilds and the Labour Market in Early Seventeenth Century London' in Nigel Goose and Lien Luu (eds), *Immigrants in Tudor and Early Stuart England*, Brighton, 2005.

⁷¹ Richard M. Dunn, 'The London Weavers' Riot of 1675', *Guildhall Studies in London History*, 1:1, Oct. 1973, pp.13-23, here p.14; Jacob Selwood, *Diversity and Difference in Early Modern London*, Farnham, 2010, pp.36-7; Catherine Swindlehurst, 'An Unruly and presumptuous rabble: the reaction of the Spitalfields weaving community to the settlement of the Huguenots, 1660-90' in *Strangers to Citizens*, p.366.

⁷² Such as labour-saving looms known as 'engines', Ward, "'Employment for all", pp.82, 78.

⁷³ Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England*, pp. 152-92.

⁷⁴ Tony Claydon and Ian McBride, 'The trials of the chosen peoples: recent interpretations of protestantism and national identity in Britain and Ireland' in Claydon and McBride (eds.), *Protestantism and national identity*, pp. 3-32, here: p. 3.

⁷⁵ Paul Seaward, 'Milward, John (1599–1670)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/38330>, [accessed 8 February 2016]. Statt, *Foreigners*, p.70.

⁷⁶ For example, reference to 'poor Protestant Palatines' in The National Archives, (TNA), Board of Trade and Plantations, America and West Indies, 1708-9, CO 388/76, Board of Trade Accounts and Establishments, 56: *Letter from John Tribbeko and George Andrew Ruperti*, dated: 9 May 1709. Bernard Cottret, *The Huguenots in England: Immigration and Settlement, c.1550-1700*, Cambridge, 1991, pp.8-21.

⁷⁷ Proclamation of King Charles II, 28 July 1681, promising "privileges and immunities for the liberty and free exercise of their trades and handicrafts as are consistent with the Laws." William A. Shaw (ed), *Letters of Denization and Acts of Naturalization for Aliens in England and Ireland, 1603-1700*, London, 1911, pp.124-5. Ulrich Niggemann, 'Craft Guilds and Immigration: Huguenots in German and English cities', in Bert De Munck and Anne Winter (eds), *Gated Communities? Regulating Migration in Early Modern Cities*, Farnham, 2012, pp.45-60, here pp.49-50.

- ⁷⁸ Robin D. Gwynn, 'James II in the Light of his Treatment of Huguenot Refugees in England, 1685-1686', *English Historical Review* 92:365, Oct. 1977, pp.820-33.
- ⁷⁹ Jonathan I. Israel, 'William III and Toleration', in O. P. Grell, J. I. Israel and N. Tyacke (eds.), *From Persecution to Toleration*, Oxford, 1991, p.154.
- ⁸⁰ James, T. Lemon, *The Best Poor Man's Country*, New York, 1976.
- ⁸¹ For the 1708/09 migrations and their significance in Germany and America, see Marianne S. Wokeck, 'Rethinking the Significance of the 1709 Mass Migration', in Jan Stievermann and Oliver Scheiding (eds), *A Peculiar Mixture. German-Language Cultures and Identities in Eighteenth-Century North America*, University Park, PA, 2013, pp. 23-42; *The State of the Palatines for Fifty Years to this Present Time*, London, 1710, p. 4.
- ⁸² *The State of the Palatines*, p. 6.
- ⁸³ Including Sir William Popple, Commissioner of the Board of Trade, and Sir Charles Spencer, 3rd Earl of Sunderland, Secretary of State for the Southern Department and Commissioner of the Board of Trade in the Colonies and Plantations. Rosalind J. Beiler, 'Information Brokers and Mediators: The Role of Diplomats in the Migration of German-Speaking People, 1709-1711', in Stievermann and Scheiding (eds), *A Peculiar Mixture*, pp. 43-57.
- ⁸⁴ *Journal of the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations*, 4 May 1709, His Majesty's Stationary Office, London, 1920, p. 26
- ⁸⁵ For details of the first arrival of Palatines in London, see: O'Reilly, 'The Naturalisation Act of 1709', pp. 292-302.
- ⁸⁶ TNA, CO 5/1049, *Letter of Henry Schumen*.
- ⁸⁷ TNA, CO 5/1049, *Petition of Melchoir Giles*, 16 October 1708.
- ⁸⁸ 'How NHS health tourism is costing us billions: a surgeon's story', <http://www.spectator.co.uk/features/8880071/international-health-service/> [accessed 6 February 2016]; 'The TRUE cost of health tourism: Foreigners using NHS cost Britain up to £2BILLION a year, government report reveals...up to 100 times more than thought', <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2470994/TRUE-cost-health-tourism-Foreigners-cost-NHS-2BN-year.html> [accessed 6 February 2016].
- ⁸⁹ Philip Otterness, *Becoming German. The 1709 Palatine Migration to New York*, Ithaca, NY, 2004, pp.25-7.
- ⁹⁰ The port of Calais for today's migrants. Beiler, 'Information Brokers', in *A Peculiar Mixture*, pp. 43-57.
- ⁹¹ The British Library (BL), MSS 15866, Dayrolle Correspondence, Dayrolle, *Letter*, 10 October 1709. Kevin Marsh & Rashmi Sarmah, 'An evidence assessment of the routes of human trafficking into the UK', gov.uk/government. Home Office (2012), https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/115923/occ103.pdf [accessed 6 February 2016].
- ⁹² BL, MSS 15866, Dayrolle, *Letter* of 17 May 1709.
- ⁹³ TNA, CO 5/1049, Correspondence.
- ⁹⁴ TNA, CO 388/76, 'Census of the some of the Palatines arrived at St Catherine's Docks, 25 May 1709.
- ⁹⁵ *London Gazette*, 4-6 August 1709.
- ⁹⁶ TNA, CO 388/76, 'List of Palatine widows, May –June 1709'; Lee Davison (ed), *Stilling the Grumbling Hive: Responses to Social and Economic Problems in England, 1689-1750*, New York, 1992.
- ⁹⁷ TNA, CO 388/76, 'Abstract of those Palatines arrived, May 1709'.
- ⁹⁸ BL, MSS 15866, Dayrolle, *Letter* of 23 August 1709; TNA, CO 388/76.

-
- ⁹⁹ *Journal of the House of Commons*, XVI, 14 April 1711, p.597.
- ¹⁰⁰ Heiko Diekmann, *Lockruf der Neuen Welt*, Göttingen, 2005, p.81.
- ¹⁰¹ For the father, and mention of the son, see J. P. Vander Motten, 'Killigrew, Sir William (*bap.* 1606, *d.* 1695)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, Jan 2008 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/view/article/15541>], [accessed 8 Feb 2016].
- ¹⁰² TNA, CO 5/306, 3i, p.183.
- ¹⁰³ Joshua Kocherthal, *Außführlich- und umständlicher Bericht von der berühmten Landschaft Carolina, In dem Engelländischen America gelegen*, Frankfurt (4th ed.), 1709, p.45.
- ¹⁰⁴ Wilhelm Anton Böhme, *Das verlangte, nicht erlangte Canaan bey den Lustgräbern, oder, Ausführliche Beschreibung von der unglücklichen Reise derer Jüngsthin aus Teutschland nach dem Engelländischen in America gelegenen Carolina und Pensylvanien wallenden Pilgrim*, Franckfurt and Leipzig, 1711.
- ¹⁰⁵ TNA, CO 388/76, 56ii, 64, 68-70. Lists drawn up between May and June 1709, *Journal of the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations preserved in the Public Record Office*, London, 1920, 1, 1704-1709, p.484.
- ¹⁰⁶ TNA, State Papers (SP), 84/232, 249
- ¹⁰⁷ TNA, CO 5/1049; Jones, *A trip through London*, p.4.
- ¹⁰⁸ Robert Brink Shoemaker, *The London mob: violence and disorder in eighteenth-century England*, London, 2004; Lorna Weatherill, 'The Meaning of Consumer Behaviour in Late Seventeenth Century and Early Eighteenth Century England', in John Brewer and Roy Porter (eds), *Consumption and the World of Goods*, London, 1993, pp.206-27
- ¹⁰⁹ Peter Clark, *British Clubs and Societies 1580-1800*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2000, esp. pp. 289-295; Sugiko Nichikawa, 'The SPCK in Defence of Protestant Minorities in Early Eighteenth-Century Europe', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. lvi (2005), p. 730-748; Tim Hitchcock, 'Paupers and Preachers: The SPCK and the Parochial Workhouse Movement', in Davison, *Stilling the Grumbling Hive*, pp.145-66.
- ¹¹⁰ E. Crosswell (ed), *Documents of the Senate of the State of New York*, New York, 1904, 6, p.1825; *The reception of the Palatines Vindicated in a Fifth Letter to a Tory Member*, London, 1710, p. 6.: "...but with great compassion join them in their charitable disposition towards us."
- ¹¹¹ 'Even those of us who rejoice in the multicultural character of today's United Kingdom often forget that this character – and our tradition of tolerance, of which the British can be proud – are not new phenomena. It helps to be reminded that today's waves of refugees are only the latest of many; our understanding of contemporary opportunities and challenges, in this area as in so many others, can be enormously enhanced by a better grasp of our own history.' HRH Charles, Prince of Wales, 'Foreword', in *Strangers to Citizens*, p.xix.
- ¹¹² *London Gazette*, 16-20 June 1709.
- ¹¹³ TNA, CO 5/1049; TNA, CO 389/76 – 'Note from Mr Colesby, on the news that more than one thousand on hundred Palatines have "just arrived from Rotterdam"', June 1709.
- ¹¹⁴ CO 5/1049.
- ¹¹⁵ The Guildhall Library, Gibson Papers, MSS 930, 941, 953, Tenison, 'Letter to Clergy Brethern', 6 July 1709.
- ¹¹⁶ TNA, CO 388/76.

- ¹¹⁷ Eileen Barrett, 'Huguenot Integration in late 17th- and 18th-century London: insights from records of the French Church and some relief agencies', in Vigne and Littleton (eds.), *From Strangers to Citizens*, pp. 375-382; E.G. Pearce, *The Story of the Lutheran Church in Britain*, London, 1969, pp.8-12.
- ¹¹⁸ Zacharias Conrad von Uffenbach, *Merckwürdige Reise durch niedersachsen Holland und Engelland*, Ulm; Memmingen: auf Kosten Johann Friedrich Gaum, 1753-1754; William H. Quarrell and Margaret Moore (eds.), *London in 1710, from the Travels of Zacharias Conrad von Uffenbach*, London, 1934, pp. 27-62.
- ¹¹⁹ London Board of Trade, *The State of the Palatines for Fifty Years to this Present Time*, London, 1710, p. 7.
- ¹²⁰ John Roberts, *A Brief for the Relief, Subsistence and Settlement of the Poor Distressed Palatines*, London, 1709.
- ¹²¹ *The State of the Palatines*, p.11.
- ¹²² John Bellers, *To the Lords and other Commissioners, to Take Care of the Poor Palatines*, London, 1709.
- ¹²³ Francis Hare, *Reception of the Palatines Vindicated in a Fifth Letter to a Tory Member*, London, 1711, after Isaiah 1:7.
- ¹²⁴ *The State of the Palatines*, p.11.
- ¹²⁵ Abel Boyer, *The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals*, London, 1712, 8, Appendix 3, pp.42-3; H.T. Dickinson, 'The Poor Palatines and the Parties', *The English Historical Review*, 82:324, July 1967, pp. 464-85, 471-71; Brent S. Sirota, *The Christian Monitors – The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730*, New Haven, CT, 2014, p. 197.
- ¹²⁶ *A Short and Easy Way for the Palatines to Learn English*, London, 1710.
- ¹²⁷ *Journals of the House of Commons*, 1708-1711.
- ¹²⁸ Board of Trade, *The State of the Palatines*, p. 7; TNA, CO 388/76.
- ¹²⁹ *Queen and Kingdom's Enemies*.
- ¹³⁰ *Journal of the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations*, 1709, His Majesty's Stationary Office, London, 1920, *passim*, and esp. 18 May 1709, pp. 33-34.
- ¹³¹ 'Minute Book: June 1709', in *Calendar of Treasury Books*, volume 23, 1709, ed. William A Shaw (London, 1949), pp. 19-24 <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/cal-treasury-books/vol23/pp19-24> [accessed 4 February 2016].
- ¹³² F. B. O'Callaghan (ed.), *Documents relating to the Colonial History of the State of New York*, Albany, NY, 1853-57, here: vol. 5 (1855), pp. 195-198.
- ¹³³ *Journal of the Commissioners of Trade and Plantations*, 1709, His Majesty's Stationary Office, London, 1920, *passim*, and esp. 18 May 1709, pp. 33-34, after: Alison G. Olson, 'Huguenots and Palatines', *The Historian*, vol. 63 (2), Dec. 2001, pp. 269-285, here: p. 280.
- ¹³⁴ Ludwig Hausser, *Geschichte der Rheinischen Pfalz nach ihren politischen, kirchlichen und literarischen Verhältnissen*, Heidelberg, 1924, 2, p.840; Joachim Heinz, 'Bleibe im Lande, und nähre dich redlich!': *Zur Geschichte der pfälzischen Auswanderung vom ende des 17. bis zum Ausgang des 19. Jahrhunderts*, Kaiserslautern, 1989, p.43.
- ¹³⁵ Richard Hayes, 'The German colony in County Limerick', *North Munster Antiquarian Journal* 1:2, 1937, p.43; "Two thousand of them turned out to be 'Papists'."
- ¹³⁶ Guild regulations were weaker beyond the city walls; already French migrants lived in St Thomas and St George, and Dutch immigrants in St Olave. Jacob Selwood, *Diversity and difference in early modern London*, Farnham, Surrey, 2010, pp. 32-33.

-
- ¹³⁷ Philip Otterness, 'The New York Naval Stars Project and the Transformation of the Poor Palatines, 1710-1712', *New York History*, vol. 75, no. 2, April 1994, pp. 133-157, here: p. 133; British Library, Harleian MS, 7021, fo.280.
- ¹³⁸ L.W. Sharp (ed.), *The Early Letters of Robert Wodrow 1698-1709*, Scottish History Society, 3rd series, no. xxiv, Edinburgh, 1937, pp. 93, 137.
- ¹³⁹ William Wake, preaching in favour of the Huguenots in 1699, said of the French refugees that they had "preserved so much of the *Protestant Interest* from sinking". William Wake, *Sermons Preached upon Several Occasions*, 3 vols., London, 1722, vol. III, p. 29.
- ¹⁴⁰ Brent S. Sirota, *The Christian Monitors: Church, State and the Voluntary Sector in Britain, 1690-1720*, University of Chicago PhD dissertation, 2007, p. 8.
- ¹⁴¹ See Brent S. Sirota, *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2012, esp. Chapter 2, 'The Church in an Age of Projects', pp. 69-109.
- ¹⁴² John Shower, *Winter meditations: or, a sermon concerning frost, and snow, and winds, &c. and the wonders of God therein*, J. Laurence, London, 1709.
- ¹⁴³ *Reception of the Palatines Vindicated*, p. 37.
- ¹⁴⁴ Margrit Schulte Beerbühl, *The Forgotten Majority. German Merchants, Naturalization, and Global Trade 1660-1815*, New York, 2015, p.3.
- ¹⁴⁵ J.D. de Hoop Scheffer, 'Mennonite Emigration to Pennsylvania', *Pennsylvania Magazine of History*, vol. II, 1878, p. 119; J.C. Wenger, *The Mennonite Church in America, sometimes called Old Mennonites*, Hereld Press, Scotsdale, PA, 1966.
- ¹⁴⁶ Gilbert Burnett, *History of My Own Time*, London, 1837, p. 863; H.T. Dickinson, "Poor Palatines and the Parties", *English Historical Review*, vol 82, no. 324, (July 1967), pp. 464-485, here: p. 484; Alison G. Olson, 'Huguenots and Palatines', p. 273.
- ¹⁴⁷ Tony Claydon, *William III and the godly revolution*, Cambridge, 1996, p. 17.
- ¹⁴⁸ Pincus, "'To protect English liberties'", pp. 77-78: p. 78; "1668 [sic]-9 constitute..."
- ¹⁴⁹ John Morrill, 'The Sensible Revolution', in Jonathan I. Israel, *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2003, pp. 73-104; Pincus, "'To protect English liberties'", p. 78.
- ¹⁵⁰ Tristan Clayton, "'Diasporic Otherness': Racism, sectarianism and "national exteriority" in modern Scotland', *Social and Cultural Geography*, 6:1, 2005, pp.99-116; Walter Kemp, 'Applying the Nationality Principle: Handle with Care', in *Journal on Ethnopolitics and Minority Issues in Europe* 4, 2002; Jodi Walwork and John A. Dixon, 'Foxes, Green Fields, and Britishness: on the Rhetorical Construction of Place and National Identity', in *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 2004, pp.21-39.