

Chapter 9

Dutch Appropriation Practices on the Wild Coast and Tobago (1581–1673)

Based on the presented findings about the European colonial law of the time and the legal provisions on colonial appropriation of Hugo Grotius, this chapter complements the examination of the Dutch WIC treaty making practices by inquiring about the implementation of Dutch colonial legal means of appropriation (occupation and conquest) on the Wild Coast for the yet inconclusive period between 1581 and 1673. The chapter therefore first traces Dutch settlement attempts on the Wild Coast prior to the establishment of the West India Company (WIC) in 1621, before examining the establishment of the first two permanent Dutch settlements in Berbice (1627) and Essequibo (1616/1624) on the coastal mainland, and Dutch settlement attempts on Tobago from 1626/27 until the French attack of 1677, including the Courlandian attempts from the 1630s until 1690.

Dutch Settlements on the Wild Coast (c. 1613–1637)

Predated by the first Dutch voyage to the “Indies” in June 1581,¹ subsequent voyages to “Guiana” and “the Land of Guiana, situate[d] in the kingdom of Peru”² since 1597,³

1 Holland Estates, “Proceedings”, 1581, p 3.

2 Dutch States General, “Proceedings”, 1597, p 11. See also Holland Estates, “Proceedings”, 1597, p. 11.

3 Those voyages were granted to merchants from Amsterdam, Rotterdam, and Enkhuizen between 1597–1599 (Dutch States General, “Proceedings”, 1597, pp. 9–10; Holland Estates, “Proceedings”, 1597, p. 11; States General, “Proceedings”, 1598, pp. 12–13; States General, “Proceedings”, 1599, pp. 22–23). At the same time, an exploration voyage was initiated by Burgomaster of Middelburg, Adriaen ten Haef, who in 1598 “at heavy cost to himself” had “caused to be investigated on the continent of America many different rivers and islands, and how that in this voyage were discovered various coasts and lands where one could do notable damage to the King of Spain” (Zee-land Estates, “Proceedings”, 20 November 1599, in: BC, No. 7, pp. 23–25, at 24), which was followed by voyages from Amsterdam in 1602 and 1604 (Dutch States General, “Proceedings about the Action relative to a certain Freedom of Convoy, provisionally granted by the States General, 1602, and awarded by the Admiralty of Amsterdam, 1604”, 10 July 1602/12 January 1604, p. 25; “Proceedings”, 1 March 1604, p. 36). The first preserved report about those voyages is dated August 1599 (Cabeliau, “Report”, 3 February 1599, pp. 13–22). In contrast, the first voyages to the North American counterpart were granted only in 1614 (States General, “General Charter

the denied population project in Guiana in 1603,⁴ and the Twelve Years' Truce concluded between the Dutch and Spanish in 1609, the Dutch since August 1613 were present on the "Wild Coast" on three places, namely on the Corentyne (Corentine; Corantijn), Suriname/Cayenne, and Wiapoco, before the WIC was established in 1621.⁵ Accordingly, the first recorded Dutch and Carib⁶ tobacco plantation was in August 1613 established on the Corentyne, when it was attacked by Spanish Captain Melchor Cortes and twelve soldiers,⁷ who "entirely" devastated the settlement and "burnt the fort with all who were in it"⁸ by order of interim governor Sancho de Alguiza, who had replaced Fernando de Berrio during his trial.

for Those Who Discover Any New Passages, Havens, Countries, or Places", The Hague, 27 March 1614, Avalon Collection: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/17th_century/charter_010.asp.

4 States General, "Proceedings", 25 February 1603, p. 36.

5 The Council of the Indies confirmed "three or four" Dutch tobacco plantations in July 1615, which the Dutch had established "with the help of the Carib Indians with whom they have made friends" in an area extending from "the River Marañon [Amazon] to the Orinoco" (Council of the Indies, "Report to King of Spain", 29 July 1615, in: BRC, serial No. 17, pp. 43–44). However, a Dutch settlement on the Amazon is nowhere else confirmed for that period: Therefore, the Council might have erroneously referred to the French fort of April 1615, which was situated "two degrees from the [Equator] line" and "constructed by order of the French king", along with the fort of a certain Tomas Rey, situated "in the mouth of the River Amazon, where he makes great profit" (King Philipp III, "Letter to the Council of the Indies", 24 May 1615, in: BRC, serial No. 15, p. 39–40, at 40), whereas a Dutch settlement on the Amazon was only implicitly referred to in the years 1627/28 (WIC [Zeeland], "Proceedings", 10 April 1628–17 April 1628, in: BC, No. 19, pp. 55–56, at 55; WIC [Zeeland], "Contract for the grant of a Colony in the River Berbice for Abraham van Pere", 22 April 1627, in: BRC, serial No. 26, p. 63; Scott, "Description of Guayana", after 30 April 1668, p. 169).

6 Prior to this, the Corentyne (Citrine, Curytine) was occupied by the Arawak (Arwaccas), where the indigenous town (Vaporon) was established, who were attacked in 1596 by the "Waccawaes that dwell above the falles" more than "five days' journey further up" (Colson, *Land: The Historical Evidence*, p. 21). In contrast, about 1668 the Corentyne (Currianteen) was settled by Sapoyes (Upper Corentyne) and Caribs (same as Suranam, Commowina, Suramaco, Copenhagen, Wiapoco, Mocorea, Abrewaco, Marrawina), along with Paricoates in Upper Marrawina "towards the head of Sinnamar", Turroomaes in Suramaco and Upper Suranam (Scott, "Description of Guayana", after 30 April 1668, p. 1669) and in 1642 resp. 1645 by unspecified Indigenous Peoples, whereas the Cayan (Cayenne, Chyan) was occupied by Careebs (1573) and Paracoates (1573, 1613), unspecified Indigenous Peoples (1615) and Careebs and Saepoys (1649), the Wiapoco by unspecified Indigenous Peoples in 1607 resp. 1618, the Suranam and Suramaco by unspecified Indigenous Peoples in 1626, 1642, 1645, 1650, 1654 (Pedro de Viedma, "Letter to King of Spain", Guayana, 20 March 1662, in: BRC, serial No. 71, pp. 152–156, at 154–155).

7 Don Jhoan Tostado, "Report on the Dislodegment of the Dutch on the Rivers Corentin and Marataca", 1614, in: BRC, serial No. 13, pp. 31–34, at 32.

8 Sancho de Alguiza, "Letter to King of Spain", 14 June 1612, in: BRC, serial No. 12, pp. 29–31, at 31.

The second Dutch settlement attempt was undertaken by Teodor Claessen from Amsterdam, who had petitioned for “artillery, powder, and all warlike stores” in December 1614, which was initially rejected by the burgomaster of Amsterdam “until it was seen whether or no[t] the truce [with Spain] was to come to an end”, since “the States could take no decision in the matter until it was seen whether or no[t] the truce were to continue”.⁹ Claessen had before April 1615 then established two settlements on the Suriname and Cayenne,¹⁰ which were “situated two degrees one from another”.¹¹ The details about those settlement attempts are disputed, for a Spanish account of December 1615 stated that Claessen had “started with 100 men divided among the two settlements”, whose “greater part” (80 people) would have been “with Indian women”¹² and resided in Cayenne since “eight months”, where they joined the Anabaptists.¹³ In contrast, an English account indicates that “anno 1615” two Dutch ships with “two hundred and eighty Zeelanders” arrived in Cayenne, but returned “the same yeare” after having been “ga[ul]led” by Indigenous Peoples.¹⁴ Finally, a third Dutch settlement was established on the Wiapoco until April 1615¹⁵ by Jan Pietersz. from Vlissingen¹⁶ and Jan de Moor,¹⁷ who had there established a plantation and “two houses” at a

9 Council of the Indies, “Account of Map of Coast from the Ports of the Amazon to the Island of Margarita”, Valladolid, 27 June 1615, in: BRC, serial No. 16, pp. 40–43, at 42.

10 Alternative spellings are Caena, Cayan or Caiana. In addition, John Hemming mentions earlier trade relations between the Dutch and the Iaio by citing “[a]n aged Iaio” in 1609, who had reported to an Englishman about being “on his way to the coast of Surinam to trade for metal tools with Dutch settlers” (Hemming, “How Brazil Acquired Roraima”, p. 298).

11 Council of the Indies, “Account”, Valladolid, 27 June 1615, p. 42.

12 King Philipp III, “Letter to the Council of the Indies”, 24 May 1615, p. 39.

13 Council of the Indies, “Account”, Valladolid, 27 June 1615, pp. 40–41.

14 Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169. The disappearance of the settlement for unknown reasons is confirmed by Cornelis Goslinga (Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, pp. 420–421). Instead, another attempt on the Cayenne was undertaken by a certain Jan Claessen Langendyck in November 1658, which was based on a grant from the WIC Nineteen on “the conditions settled [. . .] by a Committee of the respective Chambers” of 13 August 1654 (Dutch States General, “Permit to C. Langendyck to raise a Colony on the Wild Coast”, 1 November 1658, in: BRC, serial No. 65, p. 147).

15 Alternative spellings are Viapoko, Oyapok, Oyapock or Oiapoque.

16 Other sources give the name of the naval Captain from Vlissingen as “Pedro Luis” (King Philipp III, “Letter to the Council of the Indies”, 24 May 1615, p. 39; Cornelis van Lodensteijn, “Petition to WIC for a Grant of Land on the Coast of Guiana”, in: BRC, serial No. 57, pp. 140–141).

17 Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, pp. 410–411. Goslinga also refers to Angelo Lennes and Señor de Lodesteyn [Cornelis van Lodensteijn], who gained the approval of the States of Holland to establish “the said colony and settlement [at the Wiapoco]” as “independent patronships”. Thereupon, Cornelis van Lodensteijn again in 1658 petitioned for the establishment of a colony (Van Lodensteijn, “Petition”, p. 140).

place where “a certain Englishman [had already] founded settlements”,¹⁸ whereupon the Noruacas (Arwacas) of that river had “fled”.¹⁹ Also predated by Spanish (1568–1573) and French attempts (1607–1609, 1613), who were both expelled by Caribs (Careebs) and Paracoates,²⁰ the exact faith of the Pietersz. colony attempt is unknown, but had with certainty vanished before July 1623.

Hence, the Dutch settlements on the Wild Coast significantly increased after the establishment of the WIC in June 1621, but only a few of them remained in existence. Thus, another settlement attempt on the Wiapoco failed in July 1623, as the Dutch colonists returned to Texel in the same year due to “many hardships”,²¹ whereas a subsequent attempt of Peter van Rhee (Ryen) in December 1626 also failed somewhere after April 1628,²² since the Dutch colonists had to escape an attack of Indigenous Peoples in “homemade sloops”, two of them reached St. Vincent and Tobago²³ and others joined the Berbice colony. In addition, Nicolaes Oudaen and Philip Purcell attempted to settle at the Curapa between July 1623 and May 1625, before they were driven out, while Claude Prevost, based on a formal agreement with burgomaster Jan de Moor and authorized by the WIC on 10 December 1626, departed for Cayenne, where his settlement existed until 1632.²⁴ In April 1637, the Dutch were also settled among Indigenous Peoples in Trinidad, the Orinoco mouth and in Surinama, Supanamo, Quiana, and Guayapoco,²⁵ where they were between 1625 and 1649 accompanied by French and English settlements at the Suranam, Meriwina, Suramaco, Chyan and Curanteen (Corentyne), who were all expelled by Indigenous Peoples, most notably Caribs and Sae-poys.²⁶ In contrast, the two settlements in Essequibo (1616/1624) and Berbice (1627) developed into permanent Dutch settlements.

18 King Philipp III, “Letter to the Council of the Indies”, 24 May 1615, pp. 39–40.

19 Council of the Indies, “Account”, p. 41. This account also reported about “a large lake” and “Manoa”, which was indicated as “the principal town of the kingdom of Guiana”, where “the brother of Atavalipa” is established and “gold is found in greater abundance than in any other part of the world” (ibid.).

20 Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169.

21 Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 411. At that time, another bunch of colonists (French and Dutch) had departed from Texel, but their settlement attempt also failed (ibid.).

22 WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 10 April 1628–17 April 1628, p. 55. At that time, the Dutch ship Armuyen sailed to the Wiapoco with provisions and colonists (ibid.).

23 Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 412.

24 WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 8 October 1626–17 December 1626, in: BRC, serial No. 24, pp. 62–63; Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 413.

25 Corporation of Santo Tomé de la Guayana, “Letter”, Santo Thomé, 11 April 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 44, Annex 2, pp. 109–110, at 109.

26 Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169.

Van Pere's Berbice Colony and the WIC in Essequibo (1616–1732)

The colony in Berbice commenced with the approval of WIC Zeeland to the request of Abraham van Pere of March 1627²⁷ to plant “a colony of 60 persons” on “the Wild Coast and adjacent islands”.²⁸ The subsequent grant of 22 April 1627²⁹ entailed the allowance for patron Van Pere to “carry men to the number of 40, and 20 youths – in all 60 individuals – as settlers, over to the coast of the mainland (called the Wild Coast) of West India, in the river Berbice”,³⁰ and also granted the “liberty to build a fort in the aforesaid river, at such convenient place as they shall think fit, to carry on their trade with the natives of the land, to fell forests, sow, plant, seek minerals, and, in general to do all other things which they shall judge good and profitable for their colony”. Although van Pere was likewise permitted “to explore other neighbouring rivers and transfer themselves thither if they should think to find better profit there”, Essequibo as well as “any other river where the Company [. . .] has its colonists or folk” remained strictly prohibited. Hence, the first Berbice colonists, 40 men and 20 boys, departed Zeeland in July 1627 to arrive on the Wild Coast “in late fall”.³¹ Sponsored by van Pere, they

27 WIC (Zeeland), “Conditions and Articles of WIC Zeeland grant to Abraham van Pere”, 22 April 1627, in: BC, No. 16, p. 46. See Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 413; Schiltkamp, “On Common Ground”, p. 74, footnote 7. By contrast, the English John Scott gives the foundational year of the “small [Dutch] factory at Berbishees” imprecisely as “1624” (Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169).

28 WIC, “Conditions for Colonists adopted by the West India Company (the Nineteen)”, 22 November 1628, in: BC, No. 20, pp. 56–64, at 57. See West India Company, “Conditions for Colonists and Patrons on the Wild Coast [orig. ‘Wilde Cust’] of Brazil”, 22 November 1628, in: BRC, serial No. 30, pp. 65–69, at 65.

29 Schiltkamp, “On Common Ground”, p. 74, footnote 7. The approval was based on the report of Messrs. Boudaen, Coorte, and De Moor (WIC [Zeeland], “Proceedings”, 22 April 1627, in: BRC, serial No. 25, p. 63). In contrast, the WIC had recognized that “private persons who for themselves, or [as regards] others who in the service of their masters here at home, in lesser numbers than the patrons, shall go to live there as free people” are allowed “to choose and occupy, upon approval of the Directeur and Council there, as much lands as they shall be able conveniently to work, and to retain it in full possession for themselves or their masters, on condition of paying seignorial dues of 10 stivers per acre” for colonies on the “Wild Coast of Brazil” (WIC, “Conditions for the Wild Coast of Brazil”, 22 November 1628, p. 68, Article 1).

30 *Ibid.*, p. 65; WIC (Zeeland), “Conditions and Articles for Van Pere”, 22 April 1627, p. 46. Instead, Anna Benjamin determines the number for 1627 as “60 or 80 male colonists and six African slaves” (Benjamin, “A Preliminary Look”, p. 1).

31 WIC (Zeeland), “Conditions and Articles for Van Pere”, 22 April 1627, p. 46, Articles 11–12; Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 413.

were strengthened with 30 more on board of the Westcappel in April 1628,³² while the material for the fort was already sent in July 1627³³ to establish a Dutch stronghold on the Berbice. In line with the condition of the patron's grant³⁴ and WIC Charter of 1621,³⁵ van Pere thus acquired land as property by occupation. In contrast, "the Conditions for Colonists on the Wild Coast of Brazil" of November 1628 had additionally granted "the right of intermediate and inferior jurisdiction, taxes, tithes, fisheries, and mills, to the exclusion of all other persons",³⁶ and "an everlasting hereditary fief",³⁷ along with "usufruct and possession of such lands

32 WIC (Zeeland), "Proceedings", 10 April 1628–17 April 1628, in: BRC, serial No. 29, pp. 64–65, at 65. The yacht Westcastel [Westcappel] also carried provisions and "cargo to Essequibo" (ibid., p. 55) and was accompanied by the ship Armuyen, carrying "over all the necessities for the colonists" and "as many colonists as are to go along" for the "Amazon, Wiapoco, Cayenne, and so onward to Essequibo" (ibid.). The transport of 60 colonists in the first year resonated with the "Conditions for Colonists on the Wild Coast" of November 1628, which ordered that "one-third of the sixty persons" had to be sent "within one year" and all of them "within the next three years [. . .] on penalty of losing the acquired privileges in case of evident neglect" (West India Company, "Conditions for the Wild Coast of Brazil", 22 November 1628, p. 66, Article 4).

33 The Dutch original reads "in de riviere van Berbice op de Wilde Cust" (ibid.).

34 WIC (Zeeland), "Conditions and Articles for van Pere", 22 April 1627, p. 46; WIC (Zeeland), "Contract with Patroon Abraham van Pere", 22 April 1627, in: BRC, serial No. 28, p. 64.

35 States General, "Charter of the Dutch West India Company", The Hague, 3 June 1621, in: BRC, serial No. 18, pp. 44–46, at 46.

36 WIC, "Conditions for the Wild Coast of Brazil", 22 November 1628, p. 65, Article 6. In addition, the WIC granted the right "to catch all game and fish in the district of their dwelling-place, subject to the orders of the Directeur and Council" (WIC, "WIC [the Nineteen] Conditions for Colonists", 22 November 1628, p. 62), while both colonists and private persons had been treated equal with regard to the extraction of salt (WIC, "Conditions for the Wild Coast of Brazil", 22 November 1628, p. 68). The WIC shareholders "who send out these Colonies shall provide them with appropriate instructions that they may be governed and ruled according to the form of [g]overnment, both administrative and judicial, framed, or to be framed, by the Directors in session of the Board of Nineteen; which instructions they shall first submit to the Directors of the respective Chambers" (ibid., p. 66, Article 9). In contrast, rights to jurisdiction were not granted by the "Conditions for Colonists" of June 1627 (WIC, "Conditions for Colonists on the Wild Coast and adjacent islands", 12 June 1627, in: BC, No. 17, pp. 47–53, at 51), while the WIC conditions on jurisdiction for Abraham van Pere are not preserved (WIC [Zeeland], "Conditions and Articles for van Pere", 22 April 1627, p. 46).

37 WIC, "Conditions for the Wild Coast of Brazil", 22 November 1628, p. 66. In case of the death of the patron, the fiefs are "transfere[d] to other hands", who has to pay seigniorial dues of 20 florins to the WIC, in particular "to the Chamber at the place where he originally set sail" (Article 6) and the patron has the right to "be granted *venia testandi*, or authorization to dispose by testament of the aforesaid fiefs" (ibid., Article 7).

as these shall have selected”,³⁸ including “all the land lying within the aforesaid limits”, that is “7 or 8 [Dutch] miles”. Reflecting the different reality in Brazil, the “Conditions” for the “Wild Coast and adjacent islands” of 1627 had instead just inserted that the lands “take[n] into possession” by the colonists had to be brought “under cultivation to their utmost ability” within “the first three years” and would, otherwise, “be taken away from them by the commander and Council after previous admonition and shall be assigned to others”,³⁹ which reflects the conformity with the lawful acquisition of land as property by occupation. Consequently, both the grant of a fief or jurisdiction are not inserted, since neither sovereignty nor jurisdiction was acquired by the Dutch. Instead, the “Conditions” of 1627 referred to the profits of the goods cultivated by colonists or traded with Indigenous Peoples,⁴⁰ which are to be shared with the Company (one third), while the other two thirds remaining theirs in return for their expenses and risk, “all subject to the rules of the Company”.⁴¹

The focus on trade is also reflected in the subsequent practices of Abraham van Pere, since the Berbice patron at least since 1632 exclusively traded in annatto dye,⁴² after the WIC Nineteen in April 1632 had surprisingly voted for “the abandonment of the Company’s Guiana colonies”,⁴³ despite previous considerations to relocate the war between the United Provinces and Spain to those parts of the world.⁴⁴ However, WIC Zeeland strongly opposed the decision⁴⁵ and on 8 April 1632 resolved

38 Ibid., p. 65, Article 4; Article 5. This Article also enshrined that “unless the condition of the land thereabout were such that the commander and council for good reasons ordain otherwise, who shall also decide and remove such questions as may arise concerning the limits” (ibid., p. 66, Article 5). The spatial extent was also indicated in the “Conditions” of 1627 (WIC, “Conditions for Colonists on the Wild Coast”, 12 June 1627, p. 49), which had bound the colonists to the directives of the commander and council in Cayenne (ibid., p. 50, Article 10), where Claude Prevost was present since December 1626.

39 Ibid., pp. 51–52, Article 14. The colonists of the respective colony “shall have the right to carry on the inland trade for their own benefit [Article 16]”, while the discovery of “any minerals, precious stones, crystals, marble, or anything of that sort [. . .] shall remain the property of the patroon or patroons of that colony, on condition that he grant to the finder such a reward as does the Company to its colonists, and that he give to the Company as a tax and fee twenty per cent of the aforesaid minerals, when it is seen that the thing is a success” (ibid., Article 18).

40 WIC, “Conditions for Colonists the Wild Coast of Brazil”, 22 November 1628, p. 68.

41 Ibid., p. 67, Article 13.

42 Alternative names are *annatto* or *urucu*, which refers to the “red dye derived from the seeds of the *Bixa orellana* tree” (Colson, *Land*, p. 26).

43 WIC, “Proceedings”, 1630–1632, p. 65, Annotation.

44 J. Israel, *The Dutch Republic. Its Rise, Greatness, and Fall, 1477–1806*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995, pp. 518–519.

45 WIC, “Proceedings”, 1630–1632, p. 65, Annotation.

“not to abandon the colony at Essequibo”.⁴⁶ In result, the Guiana colonies were kept, the Zeeland Chamber assumed “responsibility of maintaining that colony”,⁴⁷ and in July 1632 entered into negotiations with Abraham van Pere “regarding the trade on the Wild Coast and the continuation of his Colony in the River Berbice and that of Essequibo for the Company”. The resulting joint annatto trade agreement of 16 July 1632 thus provided a shared profit “half and half” and “*pro rata*” sharing of expenses,⁴⁸ whereas the annatto was exchanged with Indigenous Peoples for axes, all sorts of knives (black-handled, *carniceros* and sailor’s knives), mirrors, scissors, tin boxes, fish-hooks, razors, nails, bottles, and beads.⁴⁹ The WIC agreement signed on 28 July 1632,⁵⁰ Abraham van Pere was accompanied by Zeelander Pieter van Rhee,⁵¹ while the number of Dutch colonists had decreased for unknown reasons until 1637 to “forty Dutch and twenty-five negroes”.⁵² Nonetheless, Abraham van Pere signed yet another agreement with the WIC in Zeeland on 18 January 1646 for the exclusive trade in annatto dye, regulating the transport of annatto “which the Company has in the River of Essequibo, at the Fort Kijkoveral” and had to be taken “on board” by Abraham van Pere in exchange for payment.⁵³ At the same time, trade on the Wild Coast remained exclusively reserved for Abraham van Pere and WIC Zeeland, as in response to the complain of Abraham van Pere on 19

46 WIC, “WIC (the Nineteen) Conditions for Colonists”, 22 November 1628, p. 62.

47 WIC, “Proceedings”, 1630–1632, p. 65. Evidently, a conversation with Jan van der Goes of Essequibo had taken place on the same day (WIC, “WIC [the Nineteen] Conditions for Colonists”, 22 November 1628, p. 62).

48 WIC (Zeeland Chamber), “Agreement with Abraham van Pere as to Trade on the Wild Coast”, in: BC, No. 22, pp. 67–69, at 67; WIC (Zeeland), “Contract with Abraham van Pere”, Middelburg, 16/28 July 1632, in: BRC, serial No. 32, pp. 72–73, at 72.

49 WIC (Zeeland), “Accounting with the Heirs of Abraham van Pere as to Commodities due Essequibo: List of Merchandize and Wares of Cornelis van Pere in Berbice”, 1647, in: BC, No. 29, pp. 109–110. The list also contains the unidentifiable ware of *cassoeren* (coloured) (*ibid.*).

50 WIC (Zeeland), “Contract with Abraham van Pere”, Middelburg, 16/28 July 1632, p. 73.

51 Schiltkamp, “On Common Ground”, p. 74. footnote 7. See also Burr, “The Dutch in the Essequibo,” p. 189, who most likely refers to an English source, describing Berbice as “a small factory at Berbishees about ye yeare 1634, [which] is now a strong garrison, and belongeth to two merchants of Flushing, Myn Herr Van Ree and myn Heer Van Pear; a place that abounds with excellent horses and chattle, and is a good factory for annotta dye and drugs” (Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169).

52 Don Juan Desologuren “Memorandum on the Powers of the Dutch in the West Indies”, Santa Fé, 19 November, 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 39, pp. 77–82, at 78; Corporation of Santo Tomé de la Guayana, “Letter”, Santo Thomé, 11 April 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 44, Annex 2, pp. 109–110, at 109; NATT, Escobar, “Report to Audiencia”, St. Thome, 11 April 1637. Those historical accounts contradict Goslinga’s indication that the Berbice colony had “evidently prospered for some time” (Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 413).

53 WIC (Zeeland), “Cargo Contract with van Pere”, 18 January 1646, pp. 131–132.

April 1632 about Dutch ships, who were permitted sailing to the West Indies for salt and wood, but would have had also “carry on their navigation in the places where certain colonies trade”, WIC Zeeland released fines “in accordance with the resolution of the Board of Nineteen”.⁵⁴ Despite the exceptions of the WIC monopoly of navigation of May 1632 and July 1633,⁵⁵ the “Wild Coast” remained consistently reserved for van Pere and WIC Zeeland, which was confirmed in June 1634,⁵⁶ May and June 1635, June 1636⁵⁷ and August 1648 although Councilor de Moor was in May 1635 also permitted to navigate to Tobago.⁵⁸

Spared by the English attacks of 1665/66, Berbice developed into “a strong garrison” after 30 April 1668 and continued as “a good factory for annotta [annatto] dye”,⁵⁹ whereas the river remained occupied by Acowaio (Acquewyen/Akawai), who were documented for Upper Berbice between 1671 and 1674.⁶⁰ Arguably, those Acowaio had been the contracting party in the agreement concluded to prohibit enslavement in 1672,⁶¹ which was predated by the general enslavement prohibition

⁵⁴ WIC, “Proceedings”, 1630–1632, p. 65.

⁵⁵ Dutch States General, “Orders and Regulations”, 14 May 1632 and 15 July 1633, in: BRC, serial No. 33, pp. 73–74, at 73; WIC (Zeeland Chamber), “Proceedings”, 29 June 1634, in: BRC, serial No. 34, p. 74; WIC, “Proceedings”, 1634–1636, in: BC, No. 23, pp. 69–72, at 69.

⁵⁶ WIC (Zeeland Chamber), “Proceedings”, 29 June 1634, p. 74; WIC, “Proceedings”, 1634–1636, p. 69. According to Cornelis Goslinga, the exclusive rights for WIC Zeeland were challenged by WIC Amsterdam, who had threatened to repeat the effort of Theodore Claessen and to send its own colonists to Cayenne in 1634, whereupon “The Heren XIX” would have had “immediately petitioned to recognize Zeeland’s ‘rights’”, which “was denied” and WIC Zeeland issued “a statement, which prohibited all navigation to Guiana except for the chamber itself and for patron Abraham van Pere” (Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 417).

⁵⁷ WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 22 April 1627, p. 63; WIC, “Proceedings”, 1634–1636, p. 70; WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 14 May 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 36, p. 75: “[The Deputies] shall also come prepared to consider and, if need be, to amend the Regulations for the management of New Netherland, Curaçao, Cape Verde, Senegal, Gambia, Sierra Leone, the Wild Coast, Fernando Noronho, and the Colonies planted here and there; and to this end each from his own Chamber will bring with him all books and papers for information thereon” (WIC [Zeeland Chamber], “Proceedings”, 14 May 1637, p. 75).

⁵⁸ WIC, “Proceedings”, 1634–1636, p. 70; WIC (Zeeland Chamber), “Proceedings”, 14 May 1637, p. 74.

⁵⁹ Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 170.

⁶⁰ Colson, *Land: The Historical Evidence*, pp. 21–25.

⁶¹ Menezes, “The Dutch and British Policy of Indian Subsidy”, p. 66; Menezes, *British Policy Towards the Amerindians in British Guiana*, p. 68, references the (inaccessible) Tribunal of Arbitration between Great Britain and the U.S. of Venezuela of 1899 (Proceedings, i. p. 200) and Jan Jacob Hartsinck (*Beschryving van de Volksplanting van Berbice, met de aanhoorige Landen*, vol. I, p. 281) cites only a boundary treaty between the two Dutch colonies of Essequibo and Berbice in the year 1672, which was according to Ellen Kambel and Fergus MacKay followed by a boundary agreement

in Brazil in 1636⁶² and followed by the travel of some Arawak to the United Provinces in the early 1700s, after the first WIC was dissolved in 1674 and the new WIC Charter of 20 September 1674 had included “the places of Isekepe [Essequibo] and Bauwmerona [Pomeroon], situated on the continent of America”,⁶³ but not the colony of Berbice, which was, instead, granted to Abraham van Pere on 14 September 1678 as “immortal hereditary fief” until 1701, including the right to the subsurface resources, minerals, rivers, springs⁶⁴ and, same as the Walcheren cities for the Dutch settlement Nova Zeelandia in Pomeroon on 24 December 1657, which was granted in “high, middle and low jurisdiction, tithes, fisheries and mills”.⁶⁵ In contrast, the “Conditions” for the “Wild Coast of Brazil” had already on 22 November 1628 granted “the right of intermediate and inferior jurisdiction”,⁶⁶ which were not inserted in the van Pere grant of April 1627 and the “Conditions” of 1627.⁶⁷

In 1713, the Dutch settlement in Berbice was interrupted by a French attack. The dispute lasted until 1732, as “[t]he owners refused to pay the requested ransom” and instead “transferred the colony to the French”, who were “not interested in the possession” and returned it “to a combination of Amsterdam and Zealand merchants who formed a corporation for the exploitation of the colony in 1720”. At the same time, the Dutch merchants opposed WIC’s view that Berbice would “be a feudal possession” of the Company; the States General settled the matter in 1732 by granting the Charter for “the *Directie van Berbice*”, which established the *aasdomsrecht*⁶⁸ and ensured Berbice’s independence from any

between Suriname and Berbice in 1686 (Kambel and MacKay, *The Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Maroons*, p. 39).

62 WIC, “Brazil Instructions of 1636”, Article 87, cited in: Schiltkamp, “On Common Ground”, p. 78.

63 Dutch States General, “Charter of the New West India Company”, 20 September 1674, in: BRC, serial No. 85, pp. 173–175, at 174–175.

64 HaNA, WIC, “Register of WIC resolutions: Grant to Abraham van Pere”, 14 September 1678. The Dutch original reads “oonsterflijk erfleen” (ibid.).

65 Ibid. WIC, “Provisional Contract between WIC Zeeland and the Walcheren Cities”, 24 December 1657, in: BC, No. 36, p. 125; Committee governing the three Walcheren Cities in the Colony of Nova Zeelandia, “Proceedings”, 1658, in: BRC, serial No. 62, p. 146.

66 WIC, “Conditions for the Wild Coast of Brazil”, 22 November 1628, p. 66.

67 WIC (Zeeland), “Conditions and Articles for Van Pere”, 22 April 1627, p. 46; WIC, “Conditions for Colonists on the Wild Coast”, 12 June 1627, p. 50.

68 More precisely, Berbice applied the law “that everyone going to this colony was given the choice of law for his inheritance” and that, in case no choice was made, the *aasdomsrecht* of the law of the East Indies of 16 January 1661, which represents the amended *aasdomsrecht* of 16 December 1599, done by the States General, which is called the “new *aasdomsrecht*” (Schiltkamp, “On Common Ground”, p. 78).

“feudal relationship” with the WIC.⁶⁹ Moreover, Abraham van Pere had on 20 May 1681 strictly prohibited any Berbice colonist in his service from any intercourse with indigenous women under the threat of fines or expel from the colony.⁷⁰ In contrast, the Dutch applied the marriage practice in Essequibo in 1616. Known to the Dutch since 1599,⁷¹ it was private Zeeland merchant Aert Adriaensen Groenewegen, who settled as first Dutch in the Essequibo in 1616,⁷² followed by WIC servant Jan van der Goes in 1624.⁷³ Determined as “baffling circumstances [which] need to be explained”,⁷⁴ Cornelis Goslinga highlights Aert Groenewegen as “the first man that took firme foote on Guiana”, who on behalf of the private Zeeland merchant William Courten⁷⁵ had established a plantation in Essequibo, after having served the Spaniards along with Englishman Thomas Powell.⁷⁶ Prior, Groenewegen had left England on sponsorship of Courten in January 1625, while his father Henry Powell, based on a royal letter patent of May 1626, had formally taken possession of Barbados for the English Crown. Based on the remaining friendship of Aert Groenewegen and Thomas Powell, the Dutch merchant, thereupon, convinced 40 Arawaks of Essequibo to teach the English in Barbados how to plant yams and cassava, who in 1628 insisted the contract to contain the legal provision that “if they did not like the country, they should be sent back at the expiration of two years with a reward of fifty pounds worth of axes, knives and other goods”.⁷⁷

⁶⁹ Ibid., p. 74.

⁷⁰ HaNa, WIC, “Instruction for all those in the Service of Abraham van Pere regarding relations with black or Amerindian women”, 20 May 1681, pp. 1–4.

⁷¹ De Bry, “Sketch-map of Guiana”, 1599, p. 59. Mary Noel Menezes claims that the Dutch would have settled in Essequibo in this year 1599 (Menezes, “The Dutch and British Policy of Indian Subsidy”, p. 64), while Benjamin admits that “the date for the foundation of Essequibo has never been established beyond doubt” and determines that the Dutch colony in Essequibo “had its origins somewhere around 1616” and became “the property of the Dutch West India Company (WIC)” (Benjamin, “A Preliminary Look”, p. 1), whereas Neil Whitehead confirms a Dutch settlement in Essequibo in 1618 (Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 94).

⁷² Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169.

⁷³ WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 21 May 1626–4 October 1627, in: BC, No. 15, pp. 41–46, at 45; WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 23. August 1627, in: BRC, serial No. 27, pp. 63–64.

⁷⁴ Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 413.

⁷⁵ G. Edmundson, “The Dutch in Western Guiana”, *The English Historical Review* 16 (October 1901) 64, pp. 640–675 (reprint: pp. 4–40), at 20; Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 415, who assumes an involvement of Jan de Moor in the private company of Courteen in London (p. 415). See Hemming, “How Brazil acquired Roraima”, p. 209.

⁷⁶ Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169.

⁷⁷ Edmundson, “The Dutch in Western Guiana”, pp. 17–19.

However, something went certainly wrong with the agreement between Groenewegen, Powell, and the Essequibo Arawak, since in 1631 “one of these [Arawak was] getting on board a Dutch ship [and] got passage for Dissekeeb [Essequibo]”, which “proved of all consequence to Captain Gromwegle [Groenewegen]”, who had “lost his fort and Colony and for this cause only was forced to marry a woman of the Carib nation to balance the power of the Arawaks, and afterwards was at the charge of great presents to make up the business between the Dutch and the Arawak nation”.⁷⁸ The marriage between the private Zeeland trader Groenewegen and a Carib woman is supported by the fact that a certain Amos Groenewegen, who was postholder of Demerara in September 1699,⁷⁹ was indicated as the son of Aert Groenewegen and “an Indian mother”.⁸⁰ The same forced marriage practice was applied in Suriname in the mid-1680s, when the new governor of the Chartered Society Cornelis van Aerssen van Sommesdyck in the context of the concluded agreement about the prohibition of enslavement of 1684/85 had entered into a forced marriage with “the daughter of one of the indigenous chiefs” on the condition that “without this tie [. . .] we cannot trust the whites at all”.⁸¹ Both the “Order of Government” of 1629 and the

78 Ibid. The occupation of Lower Essequibo by Arawak is widely confirmed since 1596, including the settlement Maburesa, accompanied with the legend “Iaos en arw[akas]” for 1596 (De Bry, “Sketch-map of Guiana”, 1599, p. 59), 1597 and 1625, along with Caribs and Acowaio (Wacceways) for 1625 in Upper Essequibo (Colson, *Land: The Historical Evidence*, p. 21), where Raleigh in 1595 indicates “Esparagoto” and “Cassipagotos” (Raleigh, “Chart of Guayana”, c. 1595, p. 55). Again, Arawaks are confirmed in the 1660s for the whole coastal area between the Corentyne and Waini (including Essequibo) (Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169), described as “the best-humoured Indians of America, being both very just and generous-minded people”, and again in 1665 as well as in the mouth of the Pomeroon [Bawrooma] (Governor Byam, “Journal”, c. 1669, in: BRC, serial No. 76, p. 167). Furthermore, Arawak are confirmed to occupy the Essequibo east bank at the Mazaruni and Cuyuni junction and on the sea coast between Berbice and Corentyne in June 1750, along with Acowaio in Upper Essequibo (Dutch Original “Accar-eye”) and “Parhavianes, Attorneys, and Magnauts” above the Rupununi junction (L. Storm van’s Gravesande, “Sketch-map Rios Essequibe et Demerary”, 22 June 1750, in: BC, No. 61, p. 139). In 1723, Magnauts were also reported to be located “in the plantations [sic!] of the Caraibans [in Upper Essequibo]” (Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 31 January 1725, in: BB3, serial No. 53, p. 78), whereas Upper Cuyuni and Mazaruni were still “unknown” to the Dutch in 1750 and occupied by “unknown Nations”. The Dutch original reads “onbekende N[atien]” (Storm van’s Gravesande, “Rios Essequibe et Demerary”, 22 June 1750, p. 139).

79 Commander Essequibo, “Journal”, Fort Kijkoveral, 1699–1701, in: BRC, serial No. 127, p. 215.

80 Edmundson, “The Dutch in Western Guiana”, p. 22.

81 Kambel and MacKay, *The Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Maroons*, p. 52. The authors are quoting an “Indigenous Chief of Suriname” between 1683–1685. In turn, a “promise of marriage” in the colonial Dutch law “had serious consequences”, since “[a] party who refused to marry could be forced to marry anyhow and be punished if he or she persisted in the refusal”,

“Order of San Salvador” of 1624 are confirming that the promise of marriage was a serious matter for the WIC and “a party who refused to marry could be forced”, whereas the marriage between a Dutch man and indigenous woman in Curaçao in 1638 “was only possible if the woman had been educated in the Dutch Reformed religion and had become a member of that church”.⁸² The relevance of the marriage practice across the Americas is, furthermore, confirmed by the cases of the Algonquian daughter Pocahontas and an English colonist of Jamestown in 1613, and a shipwrecked Portuguese at the coast of São Vicente in 1510, who “managed to marry a daughter of the powerful chief Tibiriçá of the Goianá Tupinikin” of the Piratininga plateau, before a Portuguese colony was founded at São Vicente in 1532.⁸³

Meanwhile, WIC servant Jan van der Goes had arrived in Essequibo (Issekepe) in August 1624, who was “bound to the Company”⁸⁴ and followed by Dutch colonists between November 1626 and June 1628.⁸⁵ The Essequibo river in August 1624 occupied by Caribs and Arawak,⁸⁶ the WIC servant in April 1628 had established a Dutch fort in Essequibo, whose material had been requested in April 1627, along with “thirty men” in order to “cause a fort to be made”.⁸⁷ Nonetheless, the WIC settlement in Essequibo was on the rocks as early as 1632, since the WIC Nineteen in April 1632 had voted for “the abandonment of the Company’s Guiana colonies, including that in Essequibo”,⁸⁸ which was just impeded by the engagement of WIC Zeeland, who assumed “responsibility of maintaining that colony” and prolonged the employment of Jan van der Goes in August 1632, after the WIC in Zeeland had in July 1632 “settle[d] up with Jan van der Goes and [. . .] keep him at

which had happened in 1657 in New Amsterdam, where a colonist was imprisoned and “finally gave in” (Schiltkamp, “On Common Ground”, p. 77).

⁸² Ibid. See Kambel and MacKay, *The Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Maroons*, p. 52.

⁸³ Hemming, “Indian Frontier”, pp. 147–148. Furthermore, this practice contradicts Anna Benjamin’s assumption about Indigenous Peoples’ “tolerance of European plantation settlements on their lands” due to “their dependency on European manufactures” (Benjamin, “A Preliminary Look”, p. 3) and the claim of Kambel and MacKay that some Indigenous Peoples were “acquiesced to certain Dutch incursions” (Kambel and MacKay, *The Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Maroons*, p. 54).

⁸⁴ WIC (Zeeland Chamber), “Proceedings”, 21 May 1626–4 October 1627, p. 45; WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 23. August 1627, pp. 63–64.

⁸⁵ WIC (Zeeland Chamber), “Proceedings”, 21 May 1626–4 October 1627, p. 45; WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 10 April 1628–17 April 1628, p. 65; WIC, “Conditions for Colonists on the Wild Coast”, 12 June 1627, p. 53.

⁸⁶ Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, p. 87.

⁸⁷ WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 10 April 1628–17 April 1628, p. 64; WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 10 April 1628–17 April 1628, p. 55; *ibid.*, 23. August 1627, pp. 63–64.

⁸⁸ WIC, “Proceedings”, 1630–1632, p. 65, Annotation.

hand until Bevelander comes home, in order after that to negotiate with him about sending him again to that river” and having “sharply” admonished him “to do his duty”.⁸⁹ However, the WIC colony in Essequibo remained on shaky grounds, since the WIC colony stayed behind the trade expectations of the WIC, although Jan van der Goes was experimenting with “two kegs of syrup, or sap of sugarcane [for] reducing it to sugar”.⁹⁰ In addition, the Essequibo colonists had in August 1637 thrown in the towel and were “minded to come home by the first ship” to return to Zeeland as “poor people”.⁹¹ The reasons are unknown, as the Dutch presence on the Wild Coast was generally increasing at this time due to “sixteen Dutchman”, who settled at the Orinoco mouth in 1636 among “a great population of Carib Indians”,⁹² and Dutch settlers on the Amacuro⁹³ and Aniavero (Amavero) “among the Caribs and Aruac nations” (1637) at the mouth of the Guayapiche and in Oquetay (1638),⁹⁴ whereas the three Dutch settlements in Trinidad and Tobago were destroyed by the Spanish governor Escobar in September and December 1636, which was responded by attacks on Santo Tome and San Joseph in July and October 1637 by Caribs, Nepoio, Tivitives, Warao, Arawak, and Dutch, whose forces were most likely led by Aert Groenewegen. In 1639, Jan van der Goes was then replaced in Essequibo by Cornelis Pietersz. Hose [Hoste] by the ship “de Jager”, who was followed by twenty-five new colonists, selected by Abraham van Pere and Confrater Lonissen,⁹⁵ who arrived in Essequibo before August 1640.⁹⁶

89 Ibid., pp. 65–67.

90 WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 14 May 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 37, p. 75.

91 WIC, “Proceedings”, 1634–1636, p. 72.

92 Cooperation and Governor of Santo Thomé, “Letter to the Royal Audiencia”, 1638, pp. 115–116.

93 In 1637, the Dutch had established “a fort in the mouth of the River of Amacuro, to windward of the Orinoco 20 [Spanish] leagues” (Maldonado, “Account”, 1638–1639, p. 124), after “ten Dutch [were] waiting for reinforcements to fortify themselves” in the river in 1636 (Don Juan Desolguen, “Memorandum”, 19 November 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 39, pp. 77–82, at 78).

94 Corporation of Santo Tomé de la Guayana, “Letter”, Santo Thomé, 11 April 1637, p. 109; Cooperation and Governor of Santo Thomé, “Letter to the Royal Audiencia”, 1638, p. 115. In that context, it is claimed that “[a]ll these villages are subject to, and under the protection of Essequibo, where the fortress is” (ibid., p. 116). The settlements are confirmed for the period 1638–1639 (Maldonado, “Account”, 1638–1639, p. 120).

95 WIC, “Proceedings”, 1634–1636, p. 72. He remained there at least until 1639 (WIC [Zeeland], “Proceedings”, 26 July 1638–29 May 1645, in: BC, No. 26, pp. 96–104, at 96–97).

96 WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 26 July 1638–29 May 1645, pp. 98–99. Meanwhile, Jan van der Goes was entrusted by the Zeeland Chamber with a secret mission to the Orinoco in July 1638 (ibid., p. 96), which was resumed on 7 February 1639 with regard to the “projected exploit in the river of Orinoco [. . .] concerning a mine” (ibid., p. 96), which is arguably the quicksilver mine mentioned in both the account of Jacques Ousiel of 1637 (J. Ousiel, “Report to WIC”, 1637, in: BC,

The Essequibo trade was then undertaken by Abraham van Pere of Berbice, while Essequibo continued with changing commanders, such as Adriaen Jansz. in May 1644⁹⁷ and Art Adriaensen van Scherpenisse in March 1645,⁹⁸ who were situated at “Fort Kykoveral in Essequibo”. At the same time, the Essequibo colony reported about two Dutchmen from Vlissingen, who three years ago had seized 81 Indigenous Peoples from St. Eustache. Confirming the enslavement prohibition in Brazil of 1636 and the agreement of 1672, the commander requested the WIC Nineteen to act “thereon as shall be suited to prevent the carrying off of people”.⁹⁹

Hence, Aert Groenewegen re-emerged on the scene in November 1650, this time as WIC commander of Essequibo, what he remained until his death in August 1664.¹⁰⁰ On 15 September 1658, he had ordered Commissary Goliat from “New Middelburg [Pomeroon]” to inquire and report about “the rivers there, and the condition of Nova Zeelandia”,¹⁰¹ established by the Walcheren cities on the basis of a WIC grant of 24 December 1657.¹⁰² Previously, surviving Zeeland colonists of Brazil led by Captain Caron had reached the Pomeroon via Tobago

No. 24, pp. 73–83, at 77) and Maldonado (Maldonado, “Account”, 1638–1639, p. 122). Thereupon, WIC Zeeland resolved that van der Goes should go “directly to the Canary Islands” with 50 soldiers and authorized him in April 1639 to obtain “provisions” for his voyage to the Orinoco (WIC [Zeeland], “Proceedings”, 26 July 1638–29 May 1645, pp. 97–98). In July 1640, Jan de Goes returned to Zeeland and “delivered [. . .] certain ore, with a little nugget of gold” (ibid., p. 98), but had failed to establish a Dutch fort in the Orinoco for unfathomable reasons “since by the testimony of the journals and of persons who have come from there, the enemy offered our people no hindrance there” (WIC [Zeeland], “Proceedings”, 26 July 1638–29 May 1645, p. 99).

⁹⁷ Ibid., p. 102; WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 5 May 1644, in: BRC, serial No. 48, p. 130. At that time, Adriaen van de Woestyne was designated “clerk” (ibid.).

⁹⁸ WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 9 March 1645, in: BRC, serial No. 50, p. 131; WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 26 July 1638–29 May 1645, p. 103. George Edmundson suggests that this person is Based on the similar first and middle name, George Edmundson suggests that this person is actually “Aert Adriaensen Groenewegen” (Edmundson, “The Dutch in Western Guiana”, p. 16, footnote 31), which however does not match with the period of Groenewegen’s WIC employment, recorded for the period 1650–1664.

⁹⁹ WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 9 March 1645, p. 131; WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 26 July 1638–29 May 1645, p. 103. See Benjamin, “A Preliminary Look”, p. 8.

¹⁰⁰ WIC, “Minutes”, 9 March 1671, cited in: Edmundson, “The Dutch in Western Guiana”, p. 16.

¹⁰¹ WIC (Zeeland), “Minutes”, 2 January 1659, in: BRC, serial No. 67, p. 248.

¹⁰² WIC, “Provisional Contract between WIC Zeeland and the Walcheren Cities”, 24 December 1657, in: BC, No. 36, p. 125; Committee governing the three Walcheren Cities in the Colony of Nova Zeelandia, “Proceedings”, 1658, in: BRC, serial No. 62, p. 146.

(1642) and Trinidad (1650) to trade with the Arawak.¹⁰³ Nevertheless, the first WIC was dissolved after the English attacks on all three Dutch settlements in Essequibo, Pomeroon, and Tobago in 1665. Only in 1670, WIC Zeeland petitioned again to establish a new colony in Essequibo, whereas Pomeroon was transferred from the Walcheren cities to the WIC in 1686¹⁰⁴ and the Lampsins colony in Tobago was re-built in 1668.

The Dutch and Courlanders in Tobago (1627–1803)

Following Abraham van Pere (Berbice), and Jan van der Goes (Essequibo), Vlissingen burgomaster Jan de Moor was on 8 October 1626 ordered “to commit to paper what fresh trading-places might be found within the limits of the Charter”¹⁰⁵ and in June 1627 nominated as patron for a colony in Tobago,¹⁰⁶ after Jacob Maerten had anchored in Tobago until June 1621¹⁰⁷ and Jan de Moor’s petition for the Amazon was rejected by the WIC in November 1626 as “an infringement of their charter”.¹⁰⁸ Hence, Maerten was designated the “general of the folk”, whose ship “Out

103 Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 170; Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 118.

104 WIC (Zeeland) and Walcheren Cities, “Provisional Contract”, 16/24 December 1657, p. 125; WIC (Amsterdam), “Resolution about the Population and Cultivation of Pomeroon and Appointment of Jacob de Jonge”, 5 April 1586, in: BRC, serial No. 106, p. 193.

105 WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 8 October 1626–17 December 1626, in: BRC, serial No. 24, pp. 62–63, at 62.

106 In 1498, Columbus named the island “Belaforma” (Thacher, *Columbus*, p. 390), whereas a Spanish slave raider had named the island Tabaco (alternative spellings Cabaco, Tavaco, or Tabacho), since the contour of the island “reminded him of a long fat cigar”, which the Tainio “Amerindians of the Greater Antilles were accustomed to smoke” and called “tabacos” (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 85). By contrast, the Spaniard Antonio Vázquez de Espinosa in 1628 indicated that “[t]his island is called Urupaina in the [Carib] Indian language, meaning big snail” (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 2).

107 Jacob Maerszt., “Petition to Send a Colony to the Island of Tobago to WIC and WIC response”, 21 June 1627, in: BC, No. 18, pp. 54–55. More precisely, the location of his anchorage was indicated as “near such an island as Tobago”. Hereby, Maerten had successfully petitioned for undertaking “expeditions, be it to the island of Trinidad, or to Orinoco, Comenagotta [Cumanagoto], Margarita, Caracas, or Cumaná”, where “at the proper time of the year good profits and prizes are to be made, to which end the aforesaid colonists will at any time be very glad to give their service [. . .], on condition that they receive their shares and fares” (ibid.).

108 Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 410. Beforehand, Jan de Moor was in December 1626 ordered to “to draw up instructions concerning the manner in which the people for the Amazon or the rivers thereabouts are to be located” (WIC (Zeeland), “Proceedings”, 8 October 1626–17 December 1626,

Vlissingen” arrived in Tobago in 1628,¹⁰⁹ where the Zeelanders “founded a tobacco plantation, defended by a major fortification and a smaller one, on the leeward coast of Tobago”. However, the first European settlement in Tobago was abandoned before 1630 “due to raids by Island Caribs from St. Vincent and Grenada”,¹¹⁰ after the Spaniards had undertaken excessive slave raids between 1602 and 1632, which were declared as “punishing expedition[s]” against the “Caribs” of Tobago, but never established any Spanish settlement, since Juan Rodriguez’ attempt failed in 1614 after “four months” and earlier letter patents, such as the nomination of Francisco de Vides in 1591, were never implemented.

Despite, until 1633 the Dutch had sent new colonists to the Jan de Moor colony on the west side of Tobago, who established friendly contacts with the Nepoio of Trinidad and developed a flourishing settlement, whose number of settlers, arguably due to joining survivors of the Peter van Rhee colony at the Wiapoco, increased from “a hundred”¹¹¹ to 150 in 1636, among them Dutch, Flemings, English, French, and Irish, who were accompanied by “a large number of Negros taken there by order of the Prince of Orange to provide the country with labour”.¹¹² Furthermore, several buildings and two forts,¹¹³ the smaller fort as a “stockade house” and “the great fort” intended “as a defence against the Caribs”,¹¹⁴ were built, before the colony was attacked and destroyed by the Spanish governor Diego Escobar on 1 December 1636, after his attack on two Dutch settlements in Trinidad in September 1636.¹¹⁵ In Tobago, Escobar made short work and destroyed “all the buildings between the two forts” and imprisoned all the colonists,¹¹⁶ whereupon the Dutch governor “surrendered”.¹¹⁷ The prisoners, whose

p. 62). Priorly, he had sent “seventy colonists to the Wild Coast” without the approval of the WIC, who were immediately ordered back. (Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 411).

109 Jacob Maerszt., “Tobago Petition”, 21 June 1627, p. 54.

110 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 110. Accordingly, Antonio Vásquez de Espinosa stated in 1628 that the island Tobago “is inhabited by Carib Indians” (ibid., p. 2).

111 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, pp. 110; 116–117.

112 NATT, Governor Diego Escobar, “Letter to King of Spain”, January 1637, publication No. 84.

113 Both forts were fitted out “with twenty-eight pieces of cannon”, arms and ammunition (Desolguren, “Memorandum”, 19 November 1637, pp. 77–78). The main fort (Nieuw Vlissingen) was situated “just north of the mouth of the Courland River” and “a major stronghold” was built at Black Rock (Boomert, *The Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 117).

114 J. Ousiel, “Report”, 1637, in: BRC, serial No. 40, pp. 82–88, at 83.

115 Diego Escobar had succeeded Don Luis de Monsalves and Cristóval de Aranda as interim Governor on 23 June 1636 (NATT, Escobar, “Account”, San Joseph, November 1636). See also NATT, Escobar, “Report to Audiencia”, St. Thome, 11 April 1637.

116 Ousiel, “Report”, 1637, p. 83.

117 NATT, Governor Diego Escobar, “Account”, San Joseph, November 1636, publication No. 82.

number varies between 45¹¹⁸ and 70,¹¹⁹ were subsequently brought to Margarita, where the majority of them were hanged, in violation of the agreement of surrender, except some boys including the son of the patron Cornelis de Moor,¹²⁰ who was forced to “plant provisions and tobacco for the Spaniards” on the seven Spanish plantations in Trinidad, situated “(a)bout one mile east and one mile west of the aforesaid town [San Joseph]” in places named Tacaribe and Aracao;¹²¹ which were established as two of the four *encomiendas* until 1612.¹²² In consequence, Diego Escobar was charged for having undertaken the Tobago attack “solely for his own profit” and “without the agreement of the old established *vecinos* of Trinidad” in July 1640¹²³ and was commanded “to leave his government physically at the arrival of his successor”.¹²⁴ In result, the Jan de Moor colony remained abandoned, since the initially approved petition of the Dutch de Moor heir for re-establishing the Jan de Moor colony was stopped in 1650, after Jan de Moore had died in 1644.

Prior, the Dutch had revenged the Spanish attacks in Trinidad and Tobago with counter-attacks on Santo Tome and San Joseph in 1637, before they returned to Tobago in September 1654.¹²⁵ Preceded by short-lived English settlements of the captains Masham (1639–1640) and Marshall (1642–1646),¹²⁶ which were

118 Ousiel, “Report to WIC”, 1637, p. 76; Ousiel, “Report”, 1637, p. 83. Another account of Jacques Ousiel gives this number with 44 (Ousiel, “Account of the Spanish coasts to the West India Company”, 1637, p. 89) and Cornelis Goslinga with 40 (Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 414).

119 NATT, Governor Diego Escobar, “Letter to King of Spain”, January 1637, publication No. 84, NATT.

120 According to the Dutch eyewitness Ousiel, the Governor of Margarita had “received letters from the one of Trinidad, requesting him to give the Dutchmen free passage to Saint Christopher, in accordance with the *capitulaciones* made with them in the name of His Majesty. But this Governor at once gave orders to hang every one of them, great and small, as was done immediately, exception being made only of a shipbuilder and of the boys under 16 years, these being saved through the repeated intercession of the Franciscans”. The boys, among them Cornelis de Moor, the son of the Tobago governor, were then distributed among the Spanish in Margarita to work as slaves on the plantations and thus shared “the same fate, as the Dutch prisoners taken during the Trinidad attacks” (Ousiel, “Account of the Spanish coasts to the West India Company”, 1637, p. 87, emphasis added).

121 Ibid.

122 Alternative spellings are Cuara or Cura, which was arguably “situated south of Tacarigua” (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 104).

123 King Philip IV, “Royal Cedula”, 31 July 1640; NATT, Escobar, “Letter to King of Spain”, January 1637/ 8 March 1641 (emphasis added).

124 NATT, King Philip IV, “Royal Cedula”, 31 July 1640.

125 Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 440.

126 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 118. This settlement attempt had comprised about some hundred people “under the patronage of the Earl of Warwick”, who settled “in an unknown part of the island”, before they were attacked “by Island Caribs from St.

deserted after attacks by “Island Caribs from St. Vincent” (1640)¹²⁷ and “trouble given by ye Indians” (1646),¹²⁸ the Dutch Pieter Bequard and several Zeelanders from Vlissingen had petitioned for a “separate colony on Tobago”, which was approved by the Dutch States General, established at Roodklyp Bay on the eastern side of the island in July 1654 and called “New Walcheren”.¹²⁹ According to Cornelis Goslinga, the colony had as anticipated a heavy flux of Dutch colonists from St. Eustatius and the Guianas.¹³⁰ In 1656, the Zeelanders in Tobago were joined by the Courland colony of Wilhelm Molleyns,¹³¹ which was based on a grant of the Earl of Warwick of May 1654¹³² and had followed a short-lived Courlandian settlement attempt at the end of the 1630s.¹³³ While Molleyns had after his arrival on “the north west coast of Tobago at Jacobus Bay (Great Courland Bay)” and establishing of fort Jacobus and several plantations with 80 families and 120 soldiers¹³⁴ claimed to have “found the Island deserted, in thick forest and obviously not occupied for 30 years past” and “took possession of it in the name of Monseigneur” and “settled without complaint or resistance from anyone”, the

Vincent” and crossed over to the Toco area of Trinidad (ibid.), whereas Cornelis Goslinga asserts that the Caribs of Tobago had “[g]ive[n] him [the Duke] a cleare possession”, before the settlement was destroyed (Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 441).

127 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 118.

128 NATT, N.N. “Description of the Careeby (Caribee) Islands including Trinidad and Tobago”, 1666. The English settlement attempts were predated by Sir Thomas Warner’s claim of having taken “actual possession of all the Charibbee Islands (of which Tobago is one) for the use of the Crown of England and in the name of Charles I”, assertively based on a formal “Letters Patent dated 2 June 1627” (NATT, Paramount Indian Chief of Tobago Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709, publication No. 782), while the French king issued a grant for Tobago on 24 December 1645 (NATT, Company of the Islands of America, “Articles and Conditions for the settlement of Tobago”, 24 December 1645, publication No. 439).

129 In addition, Adriaen Lampsins was designated as “the former burgomaster of Flushing and deputy of Zeeland at the States General” (Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 440); NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681, publication No. 766. According to Boomert, this was situated “at present Rockly Bay” (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 119).

130 Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 440.

131 NATT, N.N. “Description of the Careeby (Caribee) Islands including Trinidad and Tobago”, 1666. Instead, the governor of Barbados gives the date retrospectively with 1655 (NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681).

132 NATT, N.N. “Description of the Careeby (Caribee) Islands including Trinidad and Tobago”, 1666.

133 According to Cornelis Goslinga, the Courland expedition took place in 1637 (Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 440), while Arie Boomert indicates the start of the settlement attempt as “1639” (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 115).

134 NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681; NATT, Duke of Courland, “Pamphlet claiming right to the Island of Tobago”, 1668, publication No. 731).

Courlander “later” found three Dutchmen of Becquard’s New Walcheren colony¹³⁵ “on the other side of the Island five leagues from Fort Jacobus”, who “had been left as a hostage for the son of a Cacique of the Indians” and “in fear of the Indians [. . .] had no other course but to pray for the protection of Monseigneur, and for this purpose applied to Captain Molleyns”.¹³⁶ The request “was granted and they were allotted a portion of land subject to the same conditions as the other settlers and to the payment of the required dues to the Duke” and on the condition that the Dutch would “acknowledge [. . .] the Duke as their superior in this Island and agreed to pay all necessary dues”.¹³⁷ However, the Courland colony in 1658 was several times attacked by both “Arawaks from the mainland and Island Caribs [Kali’nago] from St. Vincent”, which was survived by “only some fifty Courlanders”,¹³⁸ whereupon Molleyns went to Courland to report in person,¹³⁹ but “the Duke of Courland was [already] imprisoned by the Swedes”.¹⁴⁰

Hence, Cornelis Lampsins took over the Courland colony by an agreement of association with the Duke of Courland,¹⁴¹ which was already concluded in 1654, when the “States General of the United Provinces had a Treaty of Neutrality with the Duke of Courland”.¹⁴² In this context, Cornelis Goslinga indicates that the Zeelanders had prior to the abandonment of the Dutch colony also concluded an agreement with the Tobago “Caribs” in 1654, but with certainty only occupied “a part of the island”, as the “Caribs” in the 1650s had “held the middle and northern part” and “with help from St. Vincent” often raided in particular the Courlanders.¹⁴³

Instead, the colony at Lampsins Bay had until 1660 established “six sugar mills” and was “protected by three forts, the main fort Lampsinsberg, and two

135 NATT, Duke of Courland, “Pamphlet claiming right to the Island of Tobago”, 1668.

136 Cornelis Goslinga determines the Chief as “Carib” (Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 441) and Arie Boomert suggested the hostage practice as an indicator for the conclusion of “a treaty of friendship” (Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 119).

137 NATT, Duke of Courland, “Pamphlet claiming right to the Island of Tobago”, 1668, publication No. 731.

138 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 121.

139 NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681.

140 NATT, Paramount Indian Chief Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709; NATT, N.N. “Account on Courland and English settlers in Tobago, including Letter Patent of Duke of Courland (1684) and Earl of Carlisle Lord James Hay by Charles I (1627)”, April 1749, publication No. 316.

141 NATT, Paramount Indian Chief Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709; NATT, N.N. “Account on Courland and English settlers in Tobago”, April 1749.

142 NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681.

143 Goslinga, *Wild Coast*, p. 441; Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 116.

smaller ones Van Veveren and Bellavista”.¹⁴⁴ Somewhat confusing is the account of the wife of Tobago planter Christian Gaymer, who determines Cornelis Lampsins in 1663 instead as being “in the government” and “one of the owners” of the colony of “New Walcheren” [sic!],¹⁴⁵ who died one month after his request for the “renewal of his Charter in August 1664” and had left the colony to his brother Adriaen and his two sons.¹⁴⁶

Despite, the Dutch Lampsins colony in Tobago (same as Essequibo and Pomeroon) was attacked by Englishman John Scott in October 1666, but retaken by the Dutch Abraham Crynsen [Cruijnsen] in April 1667, after his capture of the English Suriname colony in February 1666 and before his relieve of Essequibo in 1667.¹⁴⁷ Although the Lampsin family had sent new colonists and soldiers “to rebuilt *Lamsinstad*” in 1668,¹⁴⁸ they were just a couple of months afterwards again attacked, this time by “twenty pirogues with 150 Nepoio” of Trinidad, who were repulsed with the support of “the local Kali’na (Galibis)”, with whom they had “a friendly relationship”.¹⁴⁹ However, the Lamspin colony was again attacked by the English in 1672, this time by “Sir Tobias Bridge and Sir William Pool” with a force from Barbados,¹⁵⁰ who had “expelled” the Dutch, “destroyed

144 Goslinga, *Guianas*, pp. 418; 440; 444. However, the German Clement Gunter in March 1665 had reported to the Spanish that “Curlanders and Dutch have divided it [“Tavaco”] into two parts” (German Captain Clemente Gunter, “Declaration”, 18 March 1665, p. 163).

145 NATT, Wife of Christian Gayner, “Petition to the King concerning her Husband’s Case against Planters in Tobago” (1636/1662), 7 May 1673, publication No. 363.

146 Goslinga, *Guianas*, p. 444.

147 Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, pp. 169–171. Therefore, the English Governor of Nevis upon his sail to Tobago in 1667 concluded that Tobago would be “now deserted by both Courlanders and Dutch” (NATT, Governor of Nevis William Stapleton, “Report about an Expedition against Indians assumed to prepare an attack on Tobago”, 1683, publication No. 392); Governor Byam, “Journal”, c. 1669, p. 167.

148 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 122.

149 NATT, Duke of Courland, “Report to the Privy Council with account of Duke of Courland from 1659–1683”, December 1683, publication No. 370; NATT, N.N. “Account about the agreement between Captain Poyntz and the Duke of Courland concerning settlement of Tobago (1680) and (1699)”, 1699, publication No. 374. Furthermore, the English Governor of Nevis, William Stapleton, in 1667 reported about preparations for parallel attacks in St. Vincent, St. Lucia, Dominica and “also from the Main and the Island of Tobago” (NATT, Governor of Nevis William Stapleton, “Report about an Expedition against Indians assumed to prepare an attack on Tobago”, 1683).

150 NATT, Paramount Indian Chief Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709. The English attack of 1672 is confirmed by NATT, N.N. “Account on the validity of the title to Tobago by the Duke of Courland, 11 December 1683, publication No. 372.

the Fort and buildings without making any new settlement”¹⁵¹ and took “many planters, their African slaves and cattle [. . .] to Barbados”, while some of the slaves were “taken to the Windward Islands by a party of Island Caribs”.¹⁵² After the Peace of Westminster (1674) and the restoration of the Dutch colony,¹⁵³ the Lampsins sold the colony to the States General,¹⁵⁴ who had sent Admiral Binckes with reinforcement and new settlers to Tobago in 1676. However, after a new fortification of Lamsinstad was constructed,¹⁵⁵ the Dutch were twice attacked by the French in 1677, namely by the Comte D’Estrees “with a squadron of ships”, who had left the island “desolated”¹⁵⁶ and carried off “[a]ll the Dutch inhabitants”, except Sergeant John Hessen and two others, “who continued living there after the French had entirely abandoned the Island”.¹⁵⁷

Thus, the Courlanders embarked for another settlement attempt in Tobago in 1681,¹⁵⁸ which was based on a patent by Charles II of 17 November 1664 granted under “certain conditions”¹⁵⁹ and accorded to the released Duke of Courland as

151 NATT, Paramount Indian Chief Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709. Thereupon, the English assertively “judged sufficient that the [English] Government of Barbados should retain Tobago under its jurisdiction, thereby preserving the title of the Crown” (ibid.).

152 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 122.

153 NATT, Paramount Indian Chief Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709.

154 Therefore, the claim that a Dutch force of commander Christopher van Kayserling allegedly “captured the Fort” in Tobago in 1675 appears implausible (NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681).

155 Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 122.

156 NATT, Paramount Indian Chief Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709. The year of this attack is given as 1676 (ibid.); NATT, Duke of Courland, “Report to the Privy Council with account of Duke of Courland from 1659–1683”, December 1683, publication No. 370.

157 NATT, Paramount Indian Chief Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709. This is confirmed by the English argument against the French of March 1697 (NATT, Envoy of Duke of Courland, “True state of Case concerning Tobago”, March 1697, publication No. 377) and 1749 (NATT, N.N., “Account about Foundations for English and French claims to Tobago”, publication No. 316, April 1749).

158 NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 3 January 1682, publication No. 367. Priorly, the Duke of Courland had granted an area of 120,000 acres of land to a certain Captain Poyntz in September 1680 (NATT, N. N. “Account on Tobago Grant”, 1680, publication No. 362; NATT, N.N. “Account on Petition to King of England, Grant by Duke of Courland (1664) and Settlement of Tobago by Captain Poyntz”, December 1683, publication No. 371).

159 NATT, Paramount Indian Chief Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709. In 1686, the English Council referred to those conditions for arguing that the Duke had not “performed” those conditions and consequently “had forfeited all title and right to the said Patent” (NATT, N. N., “Account on Rights of Duke of Courland to and settlements in Tobago”, 1699, publication No. 733; NATT, Duke of Courland, “Grant to Island of Tobago”, 1666, publication No. 358; NATT, Lord Behlha-
vin, “Memorial proposing resettlement under Council of Barbados”, 1721, publication No. 734.

compensation for the English destruction of the Courland fort “at the mouth of the Gamba River” in Gambia, which was “sold to the Dutch West Indian Company”, when the English king in 1661 had “granted a charter to the Royal African Company”. Hence, English ships “demolished this fort”¹⁶⁰ and the Duke of Courland, before his death on 31 December 1683, had sent “two ships” with “Franz Monck as governor”¹⁶¹ and “about 100 men” to Tobago in 1681,¹⁶² who “again settled at Jacobus Bay and reconstituted the Colony”, but were immediately expelled by Indigenous Peoples, who had “often assaulted these late settlers, killed several of them and forced them to desert the Island”.¹⁶³ Subsequently, the Courlanders fled to Barbados to “seek passage to England” before June 1681,¹⁶⁴ while some of them appeared in the English colony in Jamaica in August 1682.¹⁶⁵ Nevertheless, the succeeding Duke of Courland Friedrich Casimir started yet another settlement attempt in Tobago in 1686 by requesting the late king James II for his support “to encourage the settlement of the said Island [Tobago] and allow some of his English subjects to join in this design”. This was refused by His English Majesty’s Attorney General, since “the said Duke” had assertively “not [. . .] fulfilled the conditions of his grant from king Charles II.”, wherefore “any rights which the Duke could pretend to by virtue thereof, were become void in law and returned to the Crown”.¹⁶⁶ Despite, Duke Casimir ordered Captain Schmoll

160 NATT, N.N. “Account on the validity of the title to Tobago by the Duke of Courland”, 11 December 1683.

161 NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681. Some earlier follow-up settlement attempts of the Duke of Courland ended with the result that the colonists “deserted ye Island” (NATT, N.N., “Description of ye Careeby Islands”, 1666, publication No. 357).

162 NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 3 January 1682. Priorly, the Duke of Courland had an area of 120,000 acres of land to a certain Captain Poyntz in September 1680 (NATT, N.N. “Account on Tobago Grant”, 1680, publication No. 362; NATT, N. N. “Account on Petition to King of England, Grant by Duke of Courland, 1664, and Settlement of Tobago by Captain Poyntz”, December 1683, publication No. 371).

163 NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681. At the same time, Indigenous Peoples had before January 1682 also attacked an English ship in Saint Lucia on its way to Barbados, as “the natives of the place fell upon them and killed four of them and forced them thence” (NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 3 January 1682).

164 NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681.

165 NATT, Governor of Jamaica Sir T. Lynch, “Letter about Tobago Settlers in Jamaica and settlers from Antigua for Trinidad”, 1682, publication No. 369; NATT, Duke of Courland, “Report about Settlers from Barbados to Tobago”, 1682.

166 NATT, Paramount Indian Chief Ayris, “Report”, 2 June 1709.

to depart for Tobago, whose reinforcement (including the new governor Dietrick von Altenbocken) shipwrecked in 1688 “on the coast of Tobago”. Hence, Schmoll and his colonists abandoned the project and left for New England. Only Lieutenant Fanton remained in Tobago “with a small remnant” until 1690, when he departed for Courland¹⁶⁷ and ended the settlement attempts of the Courlanders in Tobago, since subsequent negotiations of the Duke in 1699 with both Dutch and English remained unsuccessful.¹⁶⁸

Finally, the European possession of Tobago was (in breach with the European colonial law of acquisition) decided on the negotiation table, resulting in the bilateral Treaty of Peace of 1763 between the French and the English after decades of arguments and an abandonment of the island of more than 50 years by both French and English.¹⁶⁹ The whole island of Tobago, along with St. Vincent and Dominica, was ceded to England, although the English had only three short-term settlements on the Tobago in 1639, 1642, and 1646, while the French had expelled the Dutch from Tobago in 1677. Followed by the Treaty of Nijmegen (1678/79), Tobago was again captured by the French in 1781,¹⁷⁰ English in 1793, reverted to the French in 1802 and recaptured by the English “without loss” in June 1803,¹⁷¹ whereupon the English unified Tobago and Trinidad in 1888.

Most notably, all the transfer practices among Europeans had ignored the Treaty concluded between the “Caribs” (Kali’nago) of Saint Vincent and Dominica and the French on 31 March 1660¹⁷² and, most notably, violated the European colonial law of appropriation of Hugo Grotius, since the Dutch had just acquired land as property by occupation from the “Caribs” (who still occupied Tobago), but not sovereignty and jurisdiction, which remained with the “Caribs”,

167 NATT, Governor of Barbados, “Account”, 16 June 1681.

168 Therefore, the Duke of Courland had initially “proposed to the Dutch that they should cede to his Majesty their rights in the Island of Tobago”, which was responded by the Dutch in the Hague “that they had not forgotten the cession [to the French] made by the Treaty of Nimeguen [Nijmegen] and that there was no question of settling Dutch in Tobago” (NATT, N.N. “Account on Petition to King of England, Grant by Duke of Courland [1664] and Settlement of Tobago by Captain Poyntz”, December 1683, publication No. 371).

169 NATT, Captain Tyrell, “Account”, 19 October 1757, publication No. 325, Annex.

170 NATT, N. N., “Account on Tobago”, 1781, publication No. 826; NATT, N. N., “Account on Troops and Conditions in Tobago”, 1784, publication No. 442; NATT, Sir Ralph Abercromby, “Black Troops to be raised for Defence of Trinidad”, 1797, publication No. 701.

171 NATT, Abercromby, “Black Troops”, 1797.

172 NATT, French king Louis XV, “Instructions to Governor Martinique”, 21 October 1749, publication No. 320.

which the Dutch could, consequently, *not* lawfully cede to the French or English. Hence, the following chapters 10, 11, and 12 examine the Dutch colonial appropriation practices on the “Wild Coast” of the South American mainland from the re-establishment of the Essequibo colony in 1670/75 until the final Dutch surrender to the English in 1796/1814.