

## Chapter 12

### Dutch Posts on the “Wild Coast” and the Limits of Alliance (1678–1814)

In analogy to the previous study of the Dutch inland posts in Upper Essequibo and Lower Cuyuni, this chapter maps the various Dutch outposts on the “Wild Coast” between Essequibo and the Orinoco in the period 1678–1775/1796. Moreover, the relation between Indigenous Peoples and the Dutch in terms of military and political alliances with regard to both the violent removal practices of the Catalanian Capuchins and the Berbice Rebellion (1763) and Seacost Revolt (1772) is explored. Finally, the chapter researches the lawfulness of the Dutch transfer of Essequibo, Demerara, and Berbice to the English by the Convention of London of 1814.

#### Dutch Posts from Pomeroon to Barima (1678–1796)

Predated by the colony of Nova Zeelandia, which was established by the surviving Zeeland colonists of the Brazilian Caron colony, who arrived in Pomeroon (via Tobago; 1642) in 1650,<sup>1</sup> based on the WIC grant of 24 December 1657 to the Walcheren cities as hereditary fief with jurisdiction<sup>2</sup> and destroyed in the English attack of 1665/66,<sup>3</sup> the river Pomeroon (“Bauwmerona”) re-emerged in the WIC Charter of 20 September 1674 as exclusive trading area of the WIC along with Essequibo (Isekepe),<sup>4</sup> after the Pomeroon colony was retaken by the Dutch

---

1 Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169; Boomert, *Indigenous Peoples of Trinidad and Tobago*, p. 118.

2 HaNA, WIC, “Register of WIC resolutions: Grant to Abraham van Pere”, 14 September 1678; WIC (Zeeland) and commander Aert Groenewegen, “Minutes”, 2 January 1659, in: BRC, serial No. 67, p. 248.

3 Governor Byam, “Journal”, c. 1669, p. 167. Priorly, Arawak settlements are recorded for the area between Corentyne and Waini in the 1660s, predated by joint Arawak and Iao (Yao) settlements between Waini (Wayemi) and Arowary and the Essequibo mouth in 1599 (De Bry, “Sketchmap of Guiana”, 1599, p. 59). In 1665/66, Arawak were also recorded for the “Bawrooma”, who had withdrawn all trade, after the English had stormed “two warehouses”, killed 30 Arawak and took 70 as captives during the English attack (Governor Byam, “Journal”, c. 1669, p. 167).

4 Dutch States General, “Charter of the New West India Company”, 20 September 1674, pp. 174–175.

in 1667, along with those in Essequibo and Tobago.<sup>5</sup> Hence, the commander in Essequibo in August 1678 had sent a soldier to Pomeroon “to barter for annatto dye”,<sup>6</sup> but recalled the same again in October 1679<sup>7</sup> due to “the approach of a strong fleet of Caribs from the Corentyn” with the intention to be sent back “within four or five weeks” and “to build a hut for two or three men, so that they may dwell permanently among [sic!] the Indians” and occupy that river, as “the place is too far off for them to bring it here to the fort”.<sup>8</sup> Thereupon, the Essequibo commander sent Daniel Galle as postholder to Pomeroon, who was replaced by Abraham Candardt in August 1684 to “encourage the Caribs to trade in annatto and letter-wood, which the French even from the islands in the river frequently come with their vessels to fetch”.<sup>9</sup> At the same time, a Company’s servant was ordered in December 1683 “to reside in Barima” and “take up his abode, since there is much annatto and letter-wood there and it is close by Pomeroon”.<sup>10</sup> Moreover, he was instructed to “check” Suriname interloper Gabriel Bishop,<sup>11</sup> who was, however, in August 1684 surprised and overtaken by the Caribs from Coppename.<sup>12</sup> Expelled by Suriname governor Cornelis van Sommelsdijck,<sup>13</sup> those Caribs, thereupon, took refuge in May 1685 in Waini,<sup>14</sup> Amacura, and Barima, “often alarm [ed] this coast, sometimes slaying some unlucky Arawaks (*Arrowacken*) or Christians”,<sup>15</sup> and took in union with the French possession of Spanish Santo Tome

---

5 Scott, “Description of Guayana”, after 30 April 1668, p. 169; Governor Byam, “Journal”, c.1669, p. 167.

6 Commander A. Beekman, “Letter to WIC”, 20 October 1679, in: BC, No. 45, pp. 144–145, at 145.

7 WIC (Zeeland), “Letter to commander Beekman”, 30 December 1678, in: BC, No. 44, p. 144.

8 Commander Beekman, “Letter to WIC”, 20 October 1679, p. 145; WIC (Zeeland), “Letter to commander Beekman”, 30 December 1678, p. 144.

9 Commander Essequibo, “Letter to WIC”, 27 February 1683, in: BB3, serial No. 11, p. 59. On 18 August 1684, Abraham Baudaart was postholder in Pomeroon and is most likely the same as Abraham Candhardt.

10 Commander Beekman, “Letter to WIC”, 25 December 1683, in: BC, No. 58, pp. 158–159, at 158.

11 Commander Beekman, “Letter to WIC”, 27 February 1683, p. 59. Furthermore, it was indicated that Bishop (Biscop) had “two or three times” navigated the Barima and traded “with great success, and was well treated” (commander Essequibo, “Letter to WIC”, 25 December 1683, in: BB3, serial No. 10, p. 59).

12 Commander Essequibo A. Beekman, “Report to WIC”, 1 May 1685, in: BC, No. 64, pp. 173–174, at 173.

13 In August 1684, the Coppename Caribs had also “threat[en] to some other Indians friendly to us that they, conjointly with the French, will probably come to destroy all the plantations outside the fort at Essequibo” (commander Essequibo, “Letter to WIC”, 18 August 1684, in: BB3, serial No. 12, pp. 59–60).

14 Alternative spellings are Weini and Weyne.

15 Commander Essequibo, “Letter to WIC”, 1 May 1685, in: BB3, serial No. 14, p. 60; commander Beekman, “Report to WIC”, 1 May 1685, p. 173.

and San Joseph between July 1682 and May 1686, before proceeding against the Dutch in Pomeroon, where WIC Zeeland had until 1688 replaced the previous hut by a post.<sup>16</sup> Previously, the Nova Zeelandia colony in Pomeroon was formally transferred from Middelburg, Flushing (Vlissingen), and Vere to WIC Zeeland<sup>17</sup> in April 1686 and Jacob de Jonge was appointed provisional governor in December 1685.<sup>18</sup>

Hence, on 30 April 1689, about 300 Caribs of Coppename in union with 33 French<sup>19</sup> attacked and destroyed the newly established Dutch outpost of WIC Zeeland in Pomeroon in a sudden attack, before the French in October 1689 had built “a strong-house” in the Barima river,<sup>20</sup> which was occupied by the Caribs of Barima at least since 1593. In response to the French-Carib attack, the Dutch in Pomeroon from 1689 until 1691 continued with a reduced cast, since the WIC Board of the Ten in November 1689 had resolved to bring from Pomeroon “both the employees and the slaves and other commodities” and to leave at the Pomeroon post “three men with a flag for the maintenance of the Company’s possession at the aforesaid place”.<sup>21</sup> Thereupon, Adriaen van Gastel was sent to Pomeroon in September 1691 as “master; with one soldier” at the “outlier’s house”<sup>22</sup> before the post was abandoned in 1710/16 when it disappeared completely from the Company’s muster rolls kept between 1691 and 1785.<sup>23</sup>

---

**16** In April 1688, the post was “completely finished” (commander, Pomeroon, “Letter to WIC”, Rio Bourona, 6 April 1688, in: BRC, serial No. 115, pp. 207–208).

**17** WIC (Zeeland) and Walcheren Cities, “Provisional Contract”, 16/24 December 1657, p. 125; Committee governing the Colony of Nova Zeelandia, “Proceedings”, 1657–1659, p. 126; WIC (Amsterdam), “Resolution about the Population and Cultivation of Pomeroon”, 5 April 1586, in: BRC, serial No. 106, p. 193.

**18** WIC (Amsterdam), “Report”, 5 August 1686, in: BB3, serial No. 15, p. 60.

**19** Commander Pomeroon J. de Jonge, “Letter to WIC”, 6 July 1689, in: BB3, serial No. 22, p. 66.

**20** Commander A. Beekman, “Letter to WIC”, 12 October 1689, in: BC, No. 71, p. 190.

**21** WIC (The Ten), “Proceedings”, 15 November 1689, in: BC, No. 72, pp. 190–191, at 191.

**22** WIC, “Muster Rolls”, p. 150; WIC (Zeeland), “Letter to commander Beekman”, 18 May 1690, in: BC, No. 73, pp. 191–192, at 192.

**23** WIC, “Muster Rolls”, pp. 149–187; Storm van’s Gravesande, “Rios Essequibe et Demerary”, 22 June 1750, p. 139; Storm van’s Gravesande, “Plantations of Essequibo”, 1748/1749, p. 137. In June 1757, Pomeroon was also reported “uninhabited” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 27 June 1757, Rio Essequibo, in: BRC, serial No. 323, pp. 135–136) and the Dutch just in 1794 (again) considered to establish a “military post” there (Council of the Colonies of the State in the West Indies, “Proceedings”, 1–10 December 1794, in: BC, No. 344, pp. 637–639, at 638).



**Figure 16:** The Location of the Moruca Post in 1748/49.

Instead, the Dutch post in Wacupo emerged in 1700,<sup>24</sup> situated “25 miles”<sup>25</sup> or “9 days’ sail by sea” from Fort Kijkoveral.<sup>26</sup> Maintained by postholder Pieter de Blaake, Wacupo became the sole Dutch post on the sea-coast, after the post in Pomeroon was abandoned in 1710/1716 and before it was accompanied by a post in Moruca in 1732 (see Figure 16),<sup>27</sup> for which Wacupo was abandoned in October 1754.<sup>28</sup> Meanwhile, Wacupo was two times attacked during the war “between England, Spain, and France” and the United Provinces,<sup>29</sup> namely on 24 August 1709, when the postholder in Warwereijkowrij was “busy with the enemy, killed various of them, and by guess wounded some forty”<sup>30</sup> and again on 30 December 1712, when Pieter de Blaake and a Dutch force “three times delightfully repelled” about “25 French and Spaniards”, half-breeds and “red

**24** WIC, “Muster Roll”, 17 July 1701, in: BC, No. 83, p. 199. The first postholder of Wacupo was Frans Cantenaar (builegger, outlyer) (*ibid.*) and was replaced by Jan Debbaut in July 1701, whereupon he assumed the position of “master planter on the Plantation New Middelburg” for late Jan Govertse (*ibid.*, p. 152). Alternative spellings are Wacapo, Waccupo, Wackepo, Wae-cupo, Wakapau, Wakapou.

**25** WIC, “Muster Rolls”, p. 152.

**26** Commander Essequibo, “Extract from Muster-Roll”, 19 June 1703, in: BB3, No. 29, p. 70.

**27** WIC, “Muster Rolls”, p. 157. In 1745, Pieter de Laet had replaced Jan Baptist as postholder of both Wacupo and Moruca (*ibid.*, p. 160).

**28** WIC, “Muster Rolls”, p. 162.

**29** Commander Essequibo, “General Report”, 28 September 1702, in: BB3, No. 27, p. 68. The commander received the news about the declaration of war of 4 May 1701 only in September 1702, whereupon he fitted out an expedition to Waini “to inquire what the enemy’s designs might be” (Court of Policy, “Proceedings”, Essequibo, 19 November 1701, in: BRC, serial No. 130, pp. 224–225, at 224), and brought Kijkoveral “into state of defense” (commander Essequibo, “General Report”, 28 September 1702, p. 68).

**30** Commander Essequibo, “Letter to WIC”, 6 September 1709, in: BB3, No. 37, p. 73. Thereupon, “a Prince’s flag [Royal ensign] is seen flying on Simiej” in September 1709 (*ibid.*).

nation”,<sup>31</sup> who “all have taken to flight and otherwise done no damage except carried off three corials[,] set fire to a house and the galley of our fort”,<sup>32</sup> and in the Pomeroon mouth also “burn[t] some Indian houses and destroying or taking with them some canoes”.<sup>33</sup>

Thereupon, Wacupo became a flourishing trading place for annatto dye, corials, canoes, salt fish, but also for red slaves,<sup>34</sup> which reached its peak in annatto dye in 1729, when “7,127 lbs. orange dye” were exchanged by Indigenous Peoples for goods, but significantly declined between 1735<sup>35</sup> and 1746 (285 lbs.), since the slave trade with the Dutch from Suriname became more profitable.<sup>36</sup> Previously, the Indigenous Peoples of Pomeroon had refused to trade annatto dye with the Dutch in the early 1680s, a situation that only changed with the arrival of the new Pomeroon commander Jacob de Jonge in 1686, who asked the WIC in Zeeland in April 1686 to send “five or six red coats and breeches, with some sham gold and silver lace, to keep on friendly terms with the upper Chiefs of the Indians”.<sup>37</sup> This practice was repeated until the decline of the annatto trade in Pomeroon in 1735, such as in March 1700, when an Indigenous Chief (Owl) was “for past, and as an encouragement for further services [. . .] in the name of the Honourable Company presented by the commander with a new dress of honour”,<sup>38</sup> in February 1721, when Fort Kijkoveral received “materials for a coat to be presented to the Indian Owl who delivers most dye to the Company” and again in January 1735, when “(g)oods were assigned as a present to 2 Indian Captains, 1 being of the Carib nation and 1 of the Warouw nation, to maintain the good

---

31 Postholder Wacupo P. de Blaake, “Letter to commander Essequibo”, Wacquepo, 2 January 1713, in: BC, No. 101, pp. 236–238. By contrast, this Dutch force “consisted in four men without more, to wit Pieter de Blacker, Jan van Stralen, Jan Vervis, and Aerens of Surinam” in comparison to 25 attackers (*ibid.*).

32 *Ibid.*, p. 237. See also commander, “Letter to WIC”, 19 April 1713, in: BB3, No. 40, p. 74.

33 Commander Essequibo, “Letter to WIC”, 19 April 1713, in: BB3, serial No. 40, p. 74. In consequence, the postholder received a reward “of 30 florins as an encouragement” for having successfully defended the post (WIC [Zeeland], “Letter to commander Essequibo P. van der Heyden Resen”, 11 May 1714, in: BC, No. 104, pp. 240–241, at 241), while the continuation of the post after the two attacks was confirmed by the Company’s muster roll (WIC, “Muster Rolls”, p. 155).

34 WIC, “Muster Rolls”, p. 178.

35 During this time a total of 1,677 lbs. were exchanged in 1733 and 5,279 lbs. in 1734, compared to 4,409 lbs. In May 1724 and a total of 10,341 lbs. orange dye in the period 1720–1722, while only 270 lbs. were traded in April 1745 (*ibid.*).

36 Whitehead, *Lords of the Tiger Spirit*, pp. 167–168.

37 Commander, Pomeroon, “Letter to WIC”, Bourona, 6 April 1688, p. 207. See also Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 12 May 1728, in: BB3, No. 59, p. 81.

38 Commander Essequibo, “Journal”, Kijkoveral, 1699–1701, in: BRC, serial No. 127, pp. 214–221, at 220.

harmony with both nations; 2 hats, 4 ells gold lace, 6 coarse Osnaburg”, before in October 1735 a “tailor [was] paid for making coats for Indians”.<sup>39</sup> In contrast, still in January 1683 the Indigenous Peoples in Pomeroon had “listen[ed] to no argument” or “inducements of every kind”. At the same time, wares had “no effect upon them”, as “they meet you with the tart answer that they can get plenty of these by trade in Barima and other places, which partly squares with the truth, on account of the trade which the French from the islands carry on there”,<sup>40</sup> although the WIC in Zeeland had in August 1681 ordered “not [to] approach the [. . .] Indians too eagerly, but somewhat indifferently”.<sup>41</sup>

Hence, the post in Wacupo (abandoned in 1754) was in 1732 accompanied by a post in Moruca,<sup>42</sup> after the transfer of the post from Wacupo to Moruca was planned since October 1725, as Wacupo was identified as lying “far out of the ordinary course of boats which come hither through the inland waters”, whereas the Moruca site, “where the horse-dealers from Orinocque generally moor their boats”, is passed by “all vessels which come through the inland waters” and provided the opportunity “to build a house there so close to the river side that a hand grenade can be thrown into the boats”, as “the river being at its narrowest there”.<sup>43</sup>

In January 1756, the outpost in Moruca (established in 1732) was transferred<sup>44</sup> to prevent the “desertion and flights from the slaves towards Orinoco”,<sup>45</sup> before the director general in August 1764 had determined its new purpose of “(k)eeping possession of that district” and “(s)topping and catching the slaves who try to run away from this Colony to Orinocque”, as they “mostly pass this way” and the importance of the trade in both annatto dye and boats “manufactured by the

---

<sup>39</sup> WIC, “Muster Rolls”, pp. 179–180. See also Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 3 September 1724, in: BRC, serial No. 172, pp. 2–3; Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 3 September 1724, in: BB3, serial No. 52, p. 78. Throughout the period, Indigenous Peoples were also paid for the capture of African and so-called red slaves, which requires further investigations.

<sup>40</sup> Commander Beekman, “Letter to WIC”, 8 January 1683, in: BC, No. 56, pp. 155–157, at 155. This was predated by the WIC order of June 1682 to “impress them [Indigenous Peoples], though they are by nature dull and stupid” (ibid.).

<sup>41</sup> WIC (Zeeland Chamber), “Letter to commander Beekman”, 21 August 1681, in: BC, No. 61, p. 82.

<sup>42</sup> WIC, “Muster Rolls”, pp. 157–162.

<sup>43</sup> Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 2 December 1726, in: BB3, serial No. 56, p. 80. The reason was the “unfortunate state of affairs in Europe” (ibid.).

<sup>44</sup> Court of Justice, “Minutes”, Rio Essequibo, 5 January 1756, in: BRC, serial No. 313, p. 124.

<sup>45</sup> Court of Justice, “Minutes”, Fort Zeelandia, 7 January 1754, in: BRC, serial No. 290, p. 90. Already in January 1754, a Commission tried to find a suitable spot (ibid.), but came to no conclusion (Court of Justice, “Minutes of Proceedings”, 1 April 1754, Fort Zeelandia, in: BRC, serial No. 293, p. 92).

Warouws” of the Orinoco mouth islands<sup>46</sup> had ceased.<sup>47</sup> Finally, the post was to provide “the necessary boats” for “the Indians, who are required both by the Honourable Company’s plantations as well as by private colonists to go salting”,<sup>48</sup> but also for the capture of runaway slaves, whereas the post was in September 1763 reported to be “full of Indians (Caribs, Arawaks, Warows)”.<sup>49</sup> In May 1769, the post was “contrary to the law of nations” attacked by the Spaniards,<sup>50</sup> whose location was in March 1769 described as being “situated near a small river or creek out of the Weyne River, between it and the Pomaroon River”.<sup>51</sup> In consequence, the WIC in August 1769 had sold the “plantation at post Marocco with all belonging”,<sup>52</sup> while Moruca remained the sole Dutch post on the “Wild Coast” between the Essequibo and Orinoco until July 1775 with Paulus Vermeere as postholder.<sup>53</sup> In January 1776, the post was renamed “Wacquipo in Marocco” and rebuilt after the interludes of the English and French between March 1781<sup>54</sup> and September 1783.<sup>55</sup>

---

**46** Shareholders of WIC (Zeeland), “Letter to their High Mightinesses the States General”, 23 October 1764, in: BRC, serial No. 398, pp. 115–116; Storm van’s Gravesande, “Trading Places”, August 1764, p. 129.

**47** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 27 September 1763, in: BRC, serial No. 387, p. 226.

**48** Shareholders of WIC (Zeeland), “Letter to States General”, 23 October 1764, pp. 115–116.

**49** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 27 September 1763, p. 226; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 27 September 1763, in: BB3, serial No. 164, p. 126.

**50** Court of Policy, “Letter to WIC”, May 1769, in: BRC, serial No. 458, p. 12. However, the attack was not without warning, since the “Warouws of Trinidad” had informed the Essequibo colony in May 1762 “on three different occasions” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 28 August 1762, in: BRC, serial No. 372, pp. 216–217) and further warnings were expressed in November 1768 (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 November 1768, in: BRC, serial No. 449, pp. 184–185).

**51** The States General, “Remonstrance”, 2 August 1769, in: BB3, serial No. 224, pp. 169–172, at 169. Furthermore, it was claimed that the post “incontestably belonged to the territory of the Republic”, while the WIC would have had “from time immemorial the Company had had a trading depôt and a station” (*ibid.*), although it was only established in 1732.

**52** Court of Policy, “Digest of Land Grants”, 1720–1771, p. 205.

**53** *Ibid.*, pp. 187–205.

**54** On that dates, the colonies of Essequibo, Demerara (14 March 1781) and Berbice (13 March 1781) had “surrendered at the discretion to the arms of His Britannic Majesty” (G. B. Rodney and J. Vaughan, “Articles of Capitulation Essequibo and Demerara”, St. Eustatius, 14 March 1781, in: BRC, serial No. 587, enclosure 1, pp. 1–2, at 1; E. Thompson and J. Berthon, “Articles of Capitulation Berbice”, 16 April 1781, in: BRC, serial No. 587, enclosure 2, pp. 2–3, at 2. See also Captain E. Thompson, “Letter to Lord Sackville”, Ship “Hyana”, River Demerara, 22 April 1781, in: BRC, serial No. 587, p. 1).

**55** Court of Policy, “Digest of Land Grants”, 1720–1771, pp. 168–174.

Hence, Moruca served as military post until the second Dutch surrender to the English in 1796.<sup>56</sup>

In sum, the Dutch had established several temporary outposts along the “Wild Coast” between Essequibo and Orinoco, namely in Barima (1683–c. 1689); Pomeroon (1678–1710/6), Wacupo (1700–1754), and the most stable post in Moruca (1732–1775/96), although the commander in Essequibo between 1746 and 1767 claimed the Barima (and sometimes the Waini) as boundary of the Essequibo colony.<sup>57</sup>

## Moruca and Capuchin Violent Removal (c. 1752–1794)

Meanwhile, the Moruca post between 1752 and 1794 became the attestor of an unbridled violent removal of Warouws, Caribs, Arawaks, and Chiamas by escorted Capuchin missionaries from the junction of the Caroni and Lower Orinoco, such as in August 1752, when “Caribs below Orinoco” had been “driven away” and “all retreated to our [Dutch] side”<sup>58</sup> and October 1754, when the

---

<sup>56</sup> Court of Policy, “Minutes about the Capitulation to commanders of the military posts in Essequibo, Moruca, Courabana, Mahaica, and Mahaycony”, 22 April 1796, in: BRC, serial No. 659, p. 162).

<sup>57</sup> Accordingly, the director general tabled Barima as claimed boundary in December 1748, as old Indigenous Peoples had indicated that “this jurisdiction should begin on the east of the Creek Abary and extend westwards as far as the River Barima, where in old times a post existed” (commander Essequibo, “Letter to WIC”, 2 December 1748, pp. 57–59); and in August 1761, when “this side of Barima” was declared as being “upon the Honourable Company’s territory”, since this “has always been so considered by the oldest settlers”, “all the free Indians” and foreigners, while “some very old Caribs” also mentioned an old Dutch post in Barima (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 12 August 1761, in: BRC, serial No. 357, p. 200). The Barima was also claimed in April 1764, as the “whole jurisdiction of the Company” would extend “from Abary to Barima” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 April 1764, in: BRC, serial No. 394, pp. 105–107, at 107), in October 1764 (Shareholders of the Dutch WIC [Zeeland], “Letter to their High Mightinesses the States General”, 23 October 1764, in: BRC, serial No. 398, p. 116), in April 1766 (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 6 April 1766, in: BB3, serial No. 182, p. 139), May 1766 (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 30 May 1766, p. 139), September 1766 (WIC [Zeeland], “Letter to Director General”, 25 September 1766, in: BRC, serial No. 416, pp. 137–139, at 139), December 1766 and March 1767, when Waini was determined as the boundary “of the two jurisdictions, the east bank [of Barima] being the Company’s territory and the west bank [West wal] Spanish” (Director-General, “Letter to WIC”, 20 March 1767, p. 141).

<sup>58</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 4 August 1752, in: BRC, serial No. 269, pp. 75–76; Director General Essequibo, “Letter to WIC”, 4 August 1752, in: BB3, serial No. 102, p. 96.



Caribs of Barima retreated to Waini,<sup>59</sup> whereas the violent removal in Cuyuni took place since the 1730s. In general, the Dutch remained idle in practice, although written requests were declined, namely the request of French Bishop Nicolas Gervaise Labrid in May 1730<sup>60</sup> and the demand of the Capuchin Fathers in July 1755 to deliver “some Indians of the Chيامa nation, by us called Shiamacotte”, who were dwelling in the vicinity of the Moruca post since “over ten years”, whereupon the Capuchins threatened to fetch “with sufficient force” in case of “reluctance” and “take them away in chains”.<sup>61</sup> In response, the Dutch postholder in Moruca rejected the delivery of the Chiamas in September 1755, as the Chiamas are “have been living here already some years, and being free men I cannot compel them to depart from here, still less can I use any force with them”. At the same time, the postholder emphasized that he was “expressly ordered to protect the free Indians as much as lies in my power, to be of service to them and to ward off from them all violence and injustice”.<sup>62</sup> Also rejected was the request of December 1767,<sup>63</sup> after in July 1767 “hundreds” of Warouws had fled from the islands of the Orinoco mouth to Barima “on account of the bad treatment received at the hands of the present governor of Orinoque”,<sup>64</sup> while

---

**59** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 27 October 1751, p. 100; Director-General Essequibo, “Letter to WIC”, 12 October 1754, p. 98.

**60** Commander Essequibo H. Gelskerke, “Letter to WIC”, 30 May 1730, in: BC, No. 116, pp. 250–251, at 251. In May 1730, the request of the Bishop of Orran to make “a stay in or about this colony and seeing whether there might not be some means of converting the Indians to these lands to Christianity” was refused by the Dutch commander, since “it was not in my power to grant him such permission [ . . . ]” (ibid.).

**61** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 September 1755, in: BRC, serial No. 310, p. 121; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 September 1755, in: BB3, serial No. 121, p. 105.

**62** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 September 1755, p. 105. Furthermore, the Director General (who drafted the postholder’s response to the Capuchins) emphasized, that “[c]oncerning what you write that if they [the Indigenous Peoples] will not come of their own free will, you would come and fetch them with violent measures, I do not think that you meant this seriously, but that you only said so to frighten the Indians. Because I cannot believe that you would undertake to violate in such a manner the jurisdiction of their High Mightiness my Sovereigns, the allies of His Catholic Majesty, and take a step of such immense consequences” (ibid.).

**63** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 6 September 1767, in: BB3, serial No. 195, p. 148. Again, in December 1767 a “missionary priest” from “Orinocque” had requested the delivery of the Chiamas, which was commented by the Director General as followed: “Is it not astonishing, my lords that such a man [ . . . ] still dares to ask that the Indians who have run away from his mission should be sent back to him, the same being free people? Your lordships can see from this how free they hold the Indians who live under them, and who are treated much worse than their slaves” (ibid.).

**64** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, Demerary, 24 July 1767, in: BRC, serial No. 427, p. 144. Furthermore, it is in July 1767 indicated that “thousands” of Warouws live in the Orinoco

the Caribs of Barima in September 1768 due to violent removal raids requested the director general in Essequibo for powder and shot, who responded by asking “whether they [the Caribs of Barima] were not men and had no hands to defend themselves”.<sup>65</sup> Again, the Carib Chief of Barima (“Owl”) in May 1769 requested “rifles, powder, and shot”, as they have “only bows and arrows” to defend themselves against the armed attacks and violent removals, which was again declined by the director general, as he had “no further supply of these than just sufficient for the garrison”.<sup>66</sup> Thereupon, the reinforced Spaniards “continued to make raids all around and along the sea-coast” and also “attacked the Caribans themselves, captured several of the same, carried them off, burnt their houses and ruined their plantations”.<sup>67</sup> Previously, in February 1769, Capuchin missionaries had again requested the postholder in Moruca to search for those Indigenous Peoples “belonging to the Missions of the Capuchin Fathers of Catalonia” and carried a Certificate of 28 February 1769 that they were mandated by “our Superior” and would act upon “permission of the Honourable Commandant General of the River Orinoco, Don Manuel Centurion”.<sup>68</sup> In line with the previous

---

mouth islands (*ibid.*), which was confirmed in September 1767 (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 6 September 1767, p. 148; Director General, “Reply to Runaway Slaves Petition”, 1767, p. 158). Moreover, Warouws were recorded in 1763 around the Moruca post, including “the Rivers of Pomeroon and Weyni”, as the area is “full of Indians of the Carib, Arawak, and Warouw nations” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 27 September 1763, in: BRC, serial No. 387, p. 226), the “district” of Mahayka and Maykouny in June 1764 (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 15 June 1764, in: BB3, No. 170, p. 128) and Trinidad in August 1762 (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 28 August 1762, in: BRC, serial No. 372, pp. 216–217, at 216).

<sup>65</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 15 September 1768, in: BRC, serial No. 448, pp. 181–182.

<sup>66</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, Demerary, 12 May 1769, p. 165. Similarly, to prevent Spanish boat captures in August 1762, “[t]he Indians round the post [in Moruca] are continually asking for guns and cutlasses”, which “will be urgently required, especially if the piracies continue, in which case we shall be obliged to employ the Carib nation, who cannot or will not fight without guns” (WIC [Zeeland], “Letter to commander Essequibo”, 8 July 1746, in: BC, No. 154, pp. 304–305). However, the only *de facto* change from Dutch non-interference to support was the provision of three muskets and 50 cartridges from the Moruca postholder to the son of the Carib Chief Paripa from Upper Pomeroon in September 1794 to release his father from the Capuchin mission Tupuquen (Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 22 September 1794, in: BC, No. 343, pp. 632–635, at 633–634).

<sup>67</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, Demerary, 12 May 1769, p. 165; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 15 September 1768, in: BRC, serial No. 448, pp. 181–182. In addition, Caribs were in 1769 recorded for Upper Waini (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 21 February 1769, in: BB3, serial No. 212, pp. 158–159).

<sup>68</sup> Friars F. de Carradar and J. A. de Cerrera, “Certificate of the Capuchin Fathers”, 28 February 1769, in: BRC, serial No. 456, Sub-enclosure, p. 9. Afterwards, the signed certificate caused problems for the Capuchins with the Spanish king, as the Capuchin Prefect justified in July

Dutch practice, the postholder in Moruca also dismissed this request of the Capuchin missionaries, since “such acts were not permitted on Dutch ground and territory”, who responded with “a detachment of soldiers” and “a large party of armed Waykiers”, who “overpowered” the post<sup>69</sup> and captured “all the free Indians” between Pomeroon and Barima.<sup>70</sup> Whereas the Dutch postholder determines then as “Arowaks and Warouws” and “a whole party in Wayne and Maroco”, while “the whole of Wacquepo and Corey” had “entirely fled”,<sup>71</sup> respectively 170 Aruacas and Chiamas of the Moruca,<sup>72</sup> the Prefect of Capuchin missions Fray Benito de La Garriga in July 1769 reported to the King of Spain that “140 Indians” were captured “between the Rivers Wayne and Moruca”, after “some Aruaca and Guarauno Indians” had “fled from our Missions of Piacoa and San Joaquin”.<sup>73</sup>

After the attack, the Moruca post was “entirely ruined” and “all the Indians who still remained having fled”, which had in May 1769 spread to the Pomeroon, as “these in Pomeroon have also departed and abandoned their dwellings, with the exceptions of the Caraiabans, who hold their ground, and whom up to the present they have not dared to insult”,<sup>74</sup> after in March 1769 the Moruca postholder Diederick Neelis had already raised his “fear that all the Indians of the Marocco coast will depart”, despite that “(t)he Indians here entreat a helping hand of your Excellency to save their freedom that they may again have their captured friends, seeing that they do not dwell on Spanish soil” [sic].<sup>75</sup>

---

1769 that admittedly “the Fathers did not act well in mistakenly giving to the Dutchman of the post a paper, in which they stated that they were sent by order of the above-named commander, when it was by my order. I am sure that I should not have complied with my obligations and the duty of my office, if I had not sent the said Fathers on that mission, and as to what they have done in bringing the Indians to the Mission, I consider it is quite lawful” (De la Garriga, “Report to King of Spain”, Alta Gracia [Guayana], 6 July 1769, pp. 19–20).

**69** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 15 March 1769, p. 7. At the Moruca post, the Capuchins signed the Certificate and took “two female slaves with their children, two free maids – one boy of mine is still missing” (postholder Neelis, “Letter to Director General”, 7 March 1769, p. 9), whereas the Prefect of Capuchin missions claims, they were “enslaved and taken from the mouths of the Orinoco, as they explained to us, and from the River Massaruni” (De la Garriga, “Report to King of Spain”, Alta Gracia, 6 July 1769, p. 20).

**70** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 15 March 1769, p. 7.

**71** Postholder Neelis, “Letter to Director General”, 7 March 1769, pp. 8–9.

**72** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 15 March 1769, pp. 6–7.

**73** De la Garriga, “Report to King of Spain”, Alta Gracia, 6 July 1769, p. 19. The missionaries had entered via the Barima until they “reached the savannah”, which was perceived as “territory under the jurisdiction of this [Spanish] province” (ibid.).

**74** Court of Policy, “Letter to WIC”, May 1769, in: BB3, No. 219, p. 164. At the same time, the Dutch fisheries in Orinoco were “entirely knocked on the head and lost” (ibid.).

**75** Postholder Neelis, “Letter to Director General”, 7 March 1769, p. 9.

Likewise, the Caribs of Essequibo had faced an attack by Cerekon Chief Maripurma of the Orinoco, who according to the “Headman-General or Great Owl of the Caribs up in Essequibo” had in March 1769 also “slain” Arinda postholder Jansen and “all the Caribs which were with him” in the “Rupunnuny”.<sup>76</sup> Still in November 1769, Caribs were fleeing from the raids of the Capuchin missionaries on the “Wild Coast” between the Orinoco and Essequibo, when “a very large number” had then arrived in Mahaicony to “live in that river” and thereupon “commenced to make their houses” and “laid out some plantations”.<sup>77</sup> Furthermore, still in September 1774, the director general Georg Trotz reported about “the intolerable outrages of the Spaniards, particularly those committed at the post of Moruca, in whose neighbourhood they have forcibly carried off or killed all the Indians”,<sup>78</sup> after 40 “Spaniards” had “carr[ied] off with violence or killing all the free Indians in those parts” and “at once driven out of our land”, as “they [are] fleeing in whole troops to the river Corentyn”.<sup>79</sup> Again, the Capuchin missionaries in October 1774 had “kidnapped Indians as far as Pomeroon”,<sup>80</sup> which was in October 1775 repeated by the “Spanish” Captain Matteo. Thereon, the postholder indicated that “there is no longer an Indian to be found in these parts”,<sup>81</sup> whereas Matteo at least until November 1785 “continue[d] with brutal and rest-destroying threats against the Indians”.<sup>82</sup> Finally, in September 1794 the Carib Chief Paripa from Upper Pomeroon, occupying the area “from the creek Aripiba, a distance of about 8 hours [from the Moruca post]”, was violently captured and brought to Tupuquen, whereupon his son, supported by 3 muskets and 50 cartridges from the Moruca postholder, released his father soon afterwards from the Capuchin mission.<sup>83</sup>

<sup>76</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 15 March 1769, pp. 161–162; 12 May 1769, p. 165.

<sup>77</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 30 November 1769, in: BB3, serial No. 229, pp. 174–175. According to the Director General, those Caribs “were merely all dressed, and even had priestly garments and ornaments”, which made him believe that “they had been ill-treated by the Spaniards to such an extent that they had at last adopted measures of reprisal and had raided some of the missions” (ibid.).

<sup>78</sup> WIC, “Letter to Director General G. Trotz”, 16 March 1775, in: BC, No. 290, p. 503.

<sup>79</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 30 September 1774, in: BB3, serial No. 262, p. 186.

<sup>80</sup> In 1772, the number of Indigenous Peoples “around the post” in Moruca was estimated as “700” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 6 January 1772, in: BRC, serial No. 244, p. 179).

<sup>81</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 22 October 1775, in: BB3, serial No. 270, p. 190; postholder P. Vermeere, “Letter to Director General”, Maroekka, 11 October 1775, in: BB3, serial No. 270, enclosure, p. 190.

<sup>82</sup> Commander, “Journal”, Essequibo, 10 November 1785, in: BRC, serial No. 618, pp. 41–44, at 42.

<sup>83</sup> Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 22 September 1794, in: BC, No. 343, pp. 632–637; Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 22 September 1794, in: BRC, serial No. 654, p. 156.

Meanwhile, the Dutch States General since February 1768 had issued several remonstrances at the Court in Madrid,<sup>84</sup> which also had contained complaints about the violent removal of Caribs in Cuyuni, and in March 1769 had demanded redress for the violent removal of Indigenous Peoples on the sea-coast.<sup>85</sup> However, the remonstrances of the States General between 1786 and 1790<sup>86</sup> changed their focus from demands of “prompt reparation of the acts of hostility committed” to gaining redress for all African slaves, who had deserted out of the Dutch colony, in particular for the escaped slaves from St. Eustatius/Porto Rico; Curaçao/Coro and Essequibo-Demerara/Oronoque.<sup>87</sup> Finally, the Dutch and Spanish signed the Convention of Aranjuez of 23 June 1791, concluded for “reciprocal restitution and exchange of deserted slaves” between “the Colonies of the State and those of His Majesty the King of Spain in the West Indies”, which excluded redress demands for violently removed Indigenous Peoples.<sup>88</sup>

## From Collars to Knobs: The Limits of Alliance (1763–1814)

In 1763, the Dutch colony of Berbice was facing a massive uprising of African slaves (Berbice Rebellion), which was most likely encouraged by the Spanish Secret Boundary Expedition<sup>89</sup> and triggered by the murder of two plantation owners in Canje by Coffy in February 1763.<sup>90</sup> The suppression of the rebellion was supported by the neighbouring Essequibo colony with a hired military force of Caribs and Acowaio, who had in March 1763 “take[n] up arms” in exchange for “the promise of recompense”.<sup>91</sup> Hence, the Caribs of Upper Essequibo<sup>92</sup>

---

**84** Previously, the States General claimed redress for the Cuyuni raid in 1758 and Spanish attacks upon the post in Moruca (WIC [Zeeland], “Letter to Director General”, 26 July 1769, in: BB3, No. 223, p. 168; States General, “Remonstrance”, 2 August 1769, in: BB3, No. 224, pp. 169–172, at 170).

**85** States General, “Remonstrance”, 2 August 1769, in: BB3, No. 224, pp. 169–172, at 169.

**86** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 1 May 1786, in: BRC, serial No. 617, pp. 41–44; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 12 May 1790, in: BB3, No. 279, p. 193.

**87** Dutch States General, “Resolution”, 16 November 1790, in: BRC, serial No. 639, p. 120.

**88** Court of Policy, “Minutes”, Capital Stabroek, 27 February 1792, in: BRC, serial No. 648, p. 132.

**89** Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 4 June 1741, in: BRC, serial No. 217, p. 35.

**90** Director General, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 9 March 1763, in: BRC, serial No. 378, p. 223.

**91** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 March 1763, in: BB3, serial No. 159, p. 124; Director General, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 9 March 1763, p. 223; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 2 May 1763, in: BB3, serial No. 160, p. 124; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 2 May 1763, in: BRC, serial No. 380, p. 224.

**92** Director General, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 9 March 1763, in: BRC, serial No. 378, p. 223.

had in May 1763 blocked the passage in Upper Berbice,<sup>93</sup> while both the Carib Chief of Barima and the Acowaio Chief Condo of Upper Demerara were in August and September 1763 involved at the plantation De Savonette and the Caribs of Waini had passed Essequibo in September 1763 “on their way to Corentine”.<sup>94</sup> In November 1763, the Carib Owl Jourawarie from Demerara and Arawaks had attacked the African slaves of Hendrik van Dalen’s plantation in Berbice, where they had “killed an innumerable number of slaves” and immediately received payment from the commander in Demerara, after they had brought “with them a large quantity of right hands from the rebels whom they killed” according to “the custom in the Colonies to pay as much for a runaway’s head or hand as for a slave”. At the same time, five African children and five runaway-slaves were delivered to the WIC plantation New Duynenburgh on Flag Island in the Lower Essequibo.

Thereupon, “fully 100” Caribs had, after “two successful expeditions to Berbices”, appeared at the house of director general Laurens van’s Gravesande with “a quantity of guns, powder, shot and flints” and again “set out for Berbice” in order “to keep a look-out for the fugitives in the forests and other places there”.<sup>95</sup> They returned to Essequibo in February 1764, when the Caribs of Barima again departed for Upper Demerara to capture African slaves who “far up in Demerara have swum across the river and taken their way direct to Orinoco”.<sup>96</sup> Hence, the Caribs of Mazaruni in April 1764 went “overland to Demerara”, where “about 300 rebels” had been already attacked at a place, “not quite ten hours” away from the Demerara towards Berbice, where “affairs [. . .] are beginning once more to take a tolerably satisfactory turn”.<sup>97</sup> However, again in December 1767 another attack took place in the palisade village of African slaves between Upper Demerara and Essequibo, situated “some distance inland behind the plantation of the Widow Hook”<sup>98</sup> and discovered by two slaves of

---

<sup>93</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 2 May 1763, in: BB3, No. 160, p. 124; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 2 May 1763, in: BRC, serial No. 380, p. 224; commander Demerary, “Journal”, 20 June 1763, in: BB3, serial No. 161, enclosure, p. 125.

<sup>94</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 27 September 1763, in: BB3, serial No. 164, p. 126.

<sup>95</sup> Commander L. van Bercheyck, “Journal”, Demerara, 2–27 November 1763, in: BB3, serial No. 168, enclosure, p. 127.

<sup>96</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 13 December 1765, in: BB3, serial No. 179, p. 137.

<sup>97</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 April 1764, in: BRC, serial No. 394, pp. 105–106. In this context, the Director General was on 9 April 1764 astonished about the number of the Mazaruni Caribs, as “at the beginning of the last war [. . .] I once had their number taken *grosso modo*, and it then amounted to 1,100 men capable of bearing arms; but this was the whole jurisdiction of the Company, from Abary to Barima. But now, I find that I did not have the fourth part, or else they must have increased extraordinarily” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 April 1764, p. 105).

<sup>98</sup> Director General, “Letter to commander”, 13 December 1767, in: BB3, No. 197, pp. 149–150.

Essequibo plantation Osterbeek (St. Jan),<sup>99</sup> whereupon both the Caribs from Mazaruni with the Company’s creole Tampoko and the Acowaio Chief Condo of Upper Demerara were requested to “attack it from two sides”<sup>100</sup> in exchange for canoes, powder and shot.<sup>101</sup> In result, the attack was in March 1768 carried out “very successfully”, since “the nest” was found, nine African slaves killed and “three men and four women escaped”, who are pursued by Acowaio,<sup>102</sup> after the Mazaruni Caribs had “assembled above Fort Kijkoveral” in February 1768.<sup>103</sup>

Meanwhile, in December 1765 six silver-collars had arrived in Essequibo from the West India Company in Zeeland, but considered by the director general as “too pretty, in fact, and too heavy for Indians”, as “(t)hose which they use are on an average about as thick as a shilling and set in a piece of wood to make them stronger”.<sup>104</sup> Hence, the silver-collars were arguably never distributed to the Chiefs of the Caribs, Arawak or Acowaio, involved in the suppression of the Berbice Rebellion, as resulting from an incident of 15 and 16 March 1769, when one silver ring-collar was promised to the “chief of the Caraibans, who is now here [at the Dutch fort], [and] goes up the river [Essequibo] to-day” in order “to attack the [alleged] murderers of the postholder, and to hold all his people in readiness in case we might have need of them”,<sup>105</sup> after the “Headman-General or Great Owl of the Caribs up in Essequibo” had reported to the director general that the Cerekon Chief Maripurma of Orinoco had attacked several Caribs accompanying Arinda postholder Janse on the return way from a second expedition to the Crystelberg in

---

**99** WIC (Zeeland), “Letter to Director General”, 18 July 1768, in: BRC, serial No. 446, pp. 179–181, at 181. Furthermore, it was indicated that the village’s “cassava is already fairly high, and up to the present they have obtained their bread from the Acuways [Acowaio] up in Demerary, and have already had a skirmish with some Caraibans and carried off an Aruwak woman, who has again escaped” (Director General, “Letter to commander Demerary”, 13 December 1767, pp. 149–150).

**100** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 December 1767, p. 148.

**101** Director General, “Letter to commander Demerary”, 13 December 1767, p. 149; commander Demerara, “Letter to WIC”, 18 February 1768, in: BB3, serial No. 202, p. 152.

**102** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 and 10 February 1768, p. 151; 8 March 1768, p. 152; WIC (Zeeland), “Letter to Director General”, 18 July 1768, in: BRC, serial No. 446, pp. 179–181, at 179–180. Nevertheless, a rumour emerged that the Tampoko expedition had killed Indigenous Peoples instead of African slaves (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, Demerary, 12 May 1769, p. 155; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 21 February 1769, in: BB3, serial No. 212, pp. 158–159, at 158), which was, however, never confirmed, since neither the concerned Arawak nor the Acowaio “appeared to make any complaint” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 21 February 1769, p. 158).

**103** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 9 and 10 February 1768, p. 151; 8 March 1768, p. 152.

**104** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 13 December 1765, in: BB3, serial No. 179, p. 137.

**105** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 4 April 1769, in: BB3, serial No. 217, pp. 163–164.

Rupununi and, thereupon, would have had requested “permission to attack this Maripurma to avenge this”, which the Carib Chief had assertively not yet “dared to do this because he is below the [Arinda] post near the Acuwayas, whom he also much molested and plagued”.<sup>106</sup> Thereupon, the Carib Chief had, in contrast, rejected commander Backer’s request “whether he [the Carib] would [. . .] let him [Backer] be master” by responding: “No, I am master of the Caraibans. You can be master of the whites and of the other nations, and then we can together become masters of everything”, which clearly indicates the Carib’s perception as being independent. Hence, Backer attempted to win him over with the silver-collars, since the commander had “let him [the Carib] see one of the silver ring-collars which I still have [sic!], and promised to give it to him, and to give him some clothes (of which they are very fond)”.<sup>107</sup>

Again, Georg Trotz, in February 1774 requested WIC Zeeland “what is to be done with [. . .] the six silver ring-collars sent for the Owls (but not given them)”, which “are still in my possession”,<sup>108</sup> after WIC Zeeland had in 1773 even sent more silver ring-collars to be distributed after the Seacoast Revolt of August 1772, in April 1773 had given “positive orders” to “distribute the silver ring-collars, *salempouris*, combs, beads, mouth-drums, and mirrors”, and by resolution of 22 September 1774 demanded to either return the ring-collars to Zeeland (both those of the 1760s and those sent in 1773) or distribute them among the indigenous Chiefs and in 1775 again requested “an explanation” for the “non-distribution to the Caribans according to the directions of the Chamber of Ten”,<sup>109</sup> whereupon the director general in May 1775 declared to “obey by the first opportunity that presents itself”. Prior, the Court of Policy had ignored “respected commands” until the Court’s resolution of 31 January 1774 that the silver ring-collars were “intended as

---

**106** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 15 March 1769, pp. 161–162. Initially, it was reported that Janse and several Caribs were slain in this attack (*ibid.*, p. 162), which was corrected, since Janse was captured, brought to the Orinoco and “fortunately escaped” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, Demerary, 12 May 1769, p. 165). Moreover, the Director General in response to a murder case had made the “express” order “to do the least harm to the Acuwayas” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 15 March 1769, pp. 161–162). Similarly, he asserted on 30 November 1769, that the Caribs, who arrived at the post in Mahaicony in “a very large number” had asked the postholder “for permission to come and live in that river”, which was “immediately accorded” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 30 November 1769, in: BB3, serial No. 229, 174–175, at 174), which was notable practiced, after the Director General had in February 1769 declared the Essequibo colony as “finished” (Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 3 March 1769, p. 159).

**107** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 4 April 1769, p. 164.

**108** Director General G. Trotz, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 1 February 1774, in: BB3, serial No. 258, p. 184.

**109** Director General G. Trotz, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 27 May 1775, in: BB3, serial No. 268, p. 189.



a present for the Indian chiefs (commonly called (Owls) [. . .] are not well suited for that purpose, since it would not be very fitting if one of those chiefs should come to the Fort here and wore an ornament similar to that worn by the officers of the militia”.<sup>110</sup>

Meanwhile, the Caribs from Essequibo, Mazaruni, Demerara and Pomeroon and Acowaio from Demerara were involved in the suppression of the Seacoast Revolt in August 1772, where in the night from 12 to 13 August the African slaves of the plantation of P. C. Hoofd had “kill[ed] their master and his wife and another planter” and burnt the houses of several plantations. Thereupon, the “majority of planters” had fled to Bourasirie, except Clinton and William Williams, who defended themselves “for thirty-six hours against the rebels”. Hence, the “slaves of the plantation of Mr. Backer” murdered two plantation directors and “retire[d] to the bush”, whereupon the Caribs “on all sides” conducted two attacks on 24 and 26 August, after “more than two hundred” Caribs would be “assembled under van der Heyde[n]”, whose plantations were located at the Essequibo and Mazaruni junction and one Carib Owl was “engaged in trying to discover the place where the rebels were concealed”. The Essequibo colony perceived as being “on the brink of total ruin”, on 27 August 1772 “five Acuways” had also offered to “come down the Demerary” in order to assist the Dutch “with arms”, who were until mid-September joined by Caribs from Pomeroon, Demerara and Upper Essequibo “to put an end to the matter”.<sup>111</sup>

Instead, the colonist James George Williams was in December 1774 rewarded for his involvement in the suppression of the Seacoast Revolt with a grant for “2,000 acres of land in the river Bouweron, on the east side”, after he had already received a “silver sword bearing the mark of the Honourable West India Company”,<sup>112</sup> whereas Councillor van der Heijden was already rewarded in March 1774.<sup>113</sup> By contrast, in September 1772 just “eight Caraibans, who killed four rebels” had been paid, when it was likewise indicated that “it is their custom that those who have killed a man go away and do not fight for some time”.<sup>114</sup> Hence, the Court of Policy on 10 July 1775 was of opinion to cancel

---

**110** Court of Policy and Justice, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 10 July 1775, p. 137.

**111** Director General Laurens Storm van’s Gravesande, “Letter to WIC”, 27 August 1772, in: BB3, serial No. 248, pp. 180–181, at 181; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 29 August 1772, in: BB3, serial No. 249, p. 181; Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 24 September 1772, in: BB3, serial No. 250, p. 181.

**112** Essequibo colonist J. G. Williams, “Letter to WIC”, 1 December 1774, in: BB3, serial No. 263, p. 186.

**113** Commander Demerary J. de Winter, “Letter to WIC”, 19 March 1774, in: BB3, serial No. 260, p. 185.

**114** Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 24 September 1772, in: BB3, serial No. 250, p. 181.

the reward for the “common Caraibans”, since the Caraibans “having already been sufficiently rewarded at the time of the revolt”.<sup>115</sup> Moreover, no reward was until March 1778 distributed to the Chiefs of the Caribs of Essequibo, Mazaruni, Demerara and Pomeroon and Acowaio of Demerara, since the Court of Policy on 31 January 1774 had ignored the order of the WIC Ten and instead requested “to send us at the first opportunity Twelve ordinary canes with knobs covered with thin silver and twelve common hats with broad sham silver brims or points d’Espagne, it being our opinion and that of Mr. Van der Heyden that this would be a particularly acceptable present to these Indian Owls”<sup>116</sup> and still in July had “await[ed] the twelve canes with silver knobs and the twelve hats with false silver trimmings or point d’Espagne, and when we receive the same we shall distribute them [among the Caribs]”,<sup>117</sup> after the director general Georg Trotz on 27 May 1775 had voiced the opinion that “the Caraibans had already been satisfied long ago” and, therefore, considered it “best to divide the trinkets, & c., among the slaves belonging to the Honourable Company, who had distinguished themselves in the revolt instead of among the Carai-bans”,<sup>118</sup> which was repeated by the Court of Policy on 10 July 1775,<sup>119</sup> and “done as your lordships will see from the lists of goods and provisions kept in the factory”,<sup>120</sup> although the WIC had in September 1774 insisted to distribute the “gifts of ring-collars and *salempouris* & c.” among the Caribs and Acowaio.<sup>121</sup>

Instead, in November 1777 the Court of Policy resolved to distribute “the canes [sic!] and other presents conferred (on them)” and “for this purpose” to summon the Indigenous Chiefs “as early as was feasible” at Fort Zeelandia,<sup>122</sup> which was carried out on three occasions in March 1778 and again in July 1779. Accordingly, on 6 March 1778 “sticks with large silver knobs, bearing the impression of the seal of the West India Company, hats with large silver pointed plumes, blue drill coloured clothes, axes, ribbons, looking-glasses, and other articles” were bestowed to the Chiefs of the Caribs from Mazaruni (Awamca, Mecura), Essequibo (Argy Man-are, Maniwara, Oerakaja and Awamuroe) and Cuyuni (Caerewan and Cajaromare),

**115** Court of Policy and Justice, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 10 July 1775, p. 137.

**116** Court of Policy, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 31 January 1774, in: BRC, serial No. 522, p. 122.

**117** Court of Policy and Justice in Essequibo, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 10 July 1775, p. 137.

**118** Director General Trotz, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 27 May 1775, p. 189.

**119** Court of Policy and Justice, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 10 July 1775, p. 137.

**120** Director General Trotz, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 27 May 1775, p. 189.

**121** Court of Policy and Justice, “Letter to WIC Zeeland”, 10 July 1775, p. 137. In addition, the WIC ordered the Director General “to return to the Chamber of Zeeland the ring-collars sent there both in the year 1773 and in former times, which order the Director General will obey by the first opportunity that presents itself” (ibid.).

**122** Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 11 November 1777, in: BRC, serial No. 562, p. 184.

along with the Chiefs of the Arawaks (Koeyonwa, Woera Jaroe and Semetie), Aco-waio (Jam Jamba and Ankouw) and the Warouw Chief Kaikwan.<sup>123</sup> The same was repeated with the Chiefs Marawari/Warawari, Jurmare/Jarimare, Maraywirany, Massuckury, Mawara/Maaru, and Massieeuw on 9 March 1778 “as a proof [. . .] to cultivate that [“old”] friendship”<sup>124</sup> and completed by “a joeling (revel)” at the plantation Duynenburg on 16 March 1778, when “(s)ome” Owls attended, “were provided [. . .] with what was necessary for their customs”<sup>125</sup> and an attending Chief had requested “the protection of the Government in order that he may establish himself here, having expressly come away from the Oronoque”.<sup>126</sup> Finally, items were in July 1779 distributed to the Carib Owls Perivuris, Arroywaynima, Maycoannaree, Moraru, and Morawary, the Arawak Chief Carrouwe and Warouws Abraham and Cloos.<sup>127</sup>

In contrast to the 1760s and 1770s, when the (not-distributed) silver ring-collars were meant as rewards for the involvement of the indigenous Chiefs in suppressing “revolting” African slaves, in 1778 and 1779 the items were mainly distributed as “token of friendship”, that is an assurance about “the continuance of the existing friendly relations”, whereas only “the hats and sticks were given to the Chiefs as a token that they are recognized as such by the Government”, which was connected with the request “to visit the fort from time to time and keep up existing friendly relations”. Furthermore, the Dutch expressed the expectation that the indigenous Chiefs “will always be true and faithful to the Government and the inhabitants of this Colony, and, when called upon to give all help and assistance”,<sup>128</sup> such as “to check the slaves hoarding together, to decrease desertion, and make the Colony formidable”.<sup>129</sup> In response, the

<sup>123</sup> Court of Policy, “Minutes”, Fort Zeelandia Essequibo, 6 March 1778, in: BRC, serial No. 566, p. 187.

<sup>124</sup> Court of Policy, “Proceedings”, 10 March 1778, in: BC, No. 305, pp. 544–545. The Dutch original reads: “hoofden der Indianen” (ibid.).

<sup>125</sup> Administrator of the Company’s Plantation C. Boter, “Letter to WIC (the Ten)”, 16 March 1778, in: BC, No. 306, pp. 545–546, at 546; Manager of Duynenberg Estate, “Letter”, Essequibo, 16 March 1778, in: BRC, serial No. 567, p. 188.

<sup>126</sup> Administrator of the Company’s Plantation C. Boter, “Letter to WIC (the Ten)”, 16 March 1778, in: BC, No. 306, pp. 545–546, at 546; Manager of Duynenberg Estate, “Letter”, Essequibo, 16 March 1778, in: BRC, serial No. 567, p. 188.

<sup>127</sup> Governor Demerary, “Journal of Government”, 9 July 1779, in: BB3, serial No. 273, p. 191.

<sup>128</sup> Court of Policy, “Minutes”, Fort Zeelandia Essequibo, 6 March 1778, in: BRC, serial No. 566, p. 187.

<sup>129</sup> Administrator of the Company’s Plantation C. Boter, “Letter to WIC (the Ten)”, 16 March 1778, in: BC, No. 306, pp. 545–546, at 546; Manager of Duynenberg Estate, “Letter”, Essequibo, 16 March 1778, in: BRC, serial No. 567, p. 188.

present Carib, Arawak, Acowaio, and Warouw Chiefs on 6 March 1778, nevertheless, had just agreed to offer assistance, as they would have been

well pleased with their gifts [and would have had] promised to be always ready and willing in rendering every assistance whenever required and called upon by the Government, and further to keep their present abode where they shall be found, whereupon they were dismissed.<sup>130</sup>

Hence, another significant change happened, after the Dutch had regained possession after the English and French interludes between 13/14 March 1781<sup>131</sup> and April 1783,<sup>132</sup> which demarcated the starting point of the Dutch violation of the European colonial law, which had just granted them land as property by occupation, but not sovereignty or jurisdiction, which remained with the respective Indigenous Peoples. Despite, the WIC Assembly of the Ten on 30 September 1781 ordered the director general to “try to make those people understand that the Dutch, now being again in possession of the colony” and “would desire to live with them in a greater and more familiar friendship; that we had observed that they were withdrawing more and more, which we ascribed to the uncertainty in which they hitherto had been with respect to their possessions [sic!]”. Hence, items as “presents” were distributed to “all the chiefs or Owls of that [Carib] nation and all others”, that is the “cane with a silver knob bearing the arms or the monogram of the Company or something of that sort, and a dozen ring-collars of silver with the Company’s arms or monogram, and by rum”. Most notably, those “presents” came with the (unlawful) Dutch attempt to distribute “certain pieces

---

**130** Court of Policy, “Minutes”, Fort Zeelandia Essequibo, 6 March 1778, in: BRC, serial No. 566, p. 187.

**131** Accordingly, Essequibo, Demerara (14 March 1781) and Berbice (13 March 1781) had surrendered “to the arms of His Britannic Majesty” (G. B. Rodney and J. Vaughan, “Articles of Capitulation”, St. Eustatius, 14 March 1781, p. 1), whereas Demerara and Essequibo had signed the “Articles of Capitulation” on 14 March 1781 at St. Eustatius (G. B. Rodney and J. Vaughan, “Articles of Capitulation”, St. Eustatius, 14 March 1781, p. 2), while the “covenant and terms” for Berbice (13 March 1781) were declared “expunged and void” and instead the “terms of Capitulation” on 9 April 1781 “unanimously approved” (E. Thompson and J. E. F. Berthon, “Articles of Capitulation Berbice”, 16 April 1781, p. 2). Thereupon, Admiral Edward Thompson, who anchored with his ship *Hyana* on 22 April 1781 in Demerara gave “a vague idea” about the colonies, namely “100 plantations” in Berbice (“inhabited 100 [English] miles up”) and Demerara (“divided into plantations on both sides the river 160 [English] miles inland”) and Essequibo with “seventy plantations”, extending “from Demerara to Fort Zelandia”, including the store-houses of the government and residences of officers, as well as “from that parallel on the west coast as low as the River Pomeroon, besides the Islands Liguana, Wackingham, & c” (E. Thompson, “Letter to Lord Sackville”, Ship *Hyana* Demerara, 22 April 1781, in: BRC, serial No. 587, p. 1).

**132** Court of Justice, “Minutes”, 8 April 1783, in: BRC, serial No. 589, p. 10.

of land in full and free ownership [to indigenous Chiefs], there to dwell and do whatever they might choose, without being by anyone driven from this their possession; that, in order to make them understand this the more vividly, he, the governor, ought to give them a deed of grant of such piece of land in such creek as he [sic!] should select, but that they on the other hand should be obliged to pledge themselves to come to the fort once every year, in order to hand to the governor a list or enumeration of their men in each village, and that in case of revolt they should be under obligation to aid us at the first summons”, as well as “to renew this compact and their deed of grant, for which trouble, some presents could also be made to them every year”.<sup>133</sup>

Thereupon, in March 1786 upmarket products were distributed, since “each [of the Chiefs] obtained a silver metal collar [sic!], a half piece of salampore (cloth), two flasks gunpowder, and the others each 5 ells of salampore, besides salt fish, soopie, and bananas, wherewith they all departed very satisfied”, after “108 free Indian Caribs with three of their commanders” from Essequibo “came to the seat of Government” in order to “present their service and fidelity, seeking presents as tokens of friendship”, whereas the deeds of land of 1781 are not mentioned again. Instead, the director general indicated that “there are three more of these chain of metal collars, besides the remaining metal collars,” which he requested to “now keep for our officer”, whereas “(t)he canes for the Indian captain must be a genuine cane, otherwise they will despise them, and they know quite well how to distinguish them”.<sup>134</sup> In contrast, indigenous “Owls” on 26 October 1795 received monetary payment for African slaves (same as Dutch colonists), when “2,893 guilders” were distributed among “De Scharde, Allert, Macaraba, Carrowe, Hendrik, Jan Bergeyck, Arcoeri, Jansen, Starrenberg, Joram, Henrik, Peggy, Pieter”, whereof the “Owls” Carrowe (Arawak), Henrik and Allert received 44 guilders (2 johannesses), Captains 22 guilders and another 231 Indigenous Peoples 11 guilders each.<sup>135</sup> Thereupon, the Owl Henrik also emerged on the list of granted “gratifications” In January 1803, as well as Captain Piramus, 5 other Captains and 68 Indigenous Peoples.<sup>136</sup>

Meanwhile, the violation pattern of both European colonial law and the intertemporal law rule continued after the final Dutch surrender to the English on

<sup>133</sup> WIC (The Ten), “Proceedings”, 30 September 1781, pp. 577–578. The Dutch original reads “dit contract en hun acte van concessie zoude moeten kjomen vernieuwen”. The instruction also stated that those lands should be “such pieces of land as can be spared without prejudice to anyone” (ibid., p. 579).

<sup>134</sup> Director General, “Letter to WIC”, 27 March 1786, in: BRC, serial No. 616, pp. 40–41, at 40.

<sup>135</sup> Court of Policy, “Report”, 26 October 1795, in: BRC, serial No. 657, pp. 159–160).

<sup>136</sup> Court of Policy, “Minutes”, 1 January 1803, in: BRC, serial No. 678, pp. 179–180.

22 April 1796,<sup>137</sup> notably by the transfer of the Supplementary Convention of 30 May 1814 and Convention of London (Anglo-Dutch Treaty) of 13 August 1814, when the Dutch handed over “the Settlements of Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice” (similar to the Treaty of Amiens for Trinidad and Tobago) in “full sovereignty to His Britannic Majesty”, provided that “the subjects of the said Sovereign Prince [of the Netherlands]” remain “at liberty (under such regulations as may hereafter be agreed upon in a Supplementary Convention) to carry on trade between the said settlements and the territories in Europe of the said Sovereign Prince”, whereas “the subjects of the said Sovereign Prince [of Orange]” were then indicated as “proprietors in the said Colonies or settlements [sic!]”.<sup>138</sup> Instead, the Dutch had just acquired land as property by occupation, wherefore the bilateral agreement between the English and Dutch violates both the European colonial law of acquisition and the intertemporal law rule.

Thereupon, the historical boundary dispute between the Dutch and Spanish (ongoing since 1746) continued between the English unified settlements of Essequibo, Demerara and Berbice (British Guiana) and then independent Venezuela in 1841, when Venezuela proposed the conclusion of a Treaty of Limits and establishment of a Joint Boundary Commission,<sup>139</sup> after the English had notified Venezuela in November 1840 about Robert Schomburgk’s intention to carry out

---

**137** Court of Policy, “Minutes about the Capitulation to commanders of the military posts”, 22 April 1796, p. 162. The “Articles of Capitulation” were made known by the commanders of the military posts in Essequibo, Moruca, Courabana, Majaica, and Mahaycony, while the annexed Articles are not transmitted. By contrast, the Spaniards in Orinoco were still in June 1796 uncertain about “the conquest or occupation of the Dutch Colonies of Demerara and Essequibo by the English troops” (Spanish Ambassador London, “Draft Letter to Spanish Secretary of State, Prince de la Paz”, 10 June 1796, in: BRC, serial No. 660, pp. 163), while the Court of Madrid “declared war against England” in October 1796, since England had “showed openly her views against my dominions by the great expeditions and armaments sent to the West Indies” and had “by the conquest she has just made on the continent of South America of the Colony and River of Demerari belonging to the Dutch, which advantageous situation puts her in the way to occupy other important points” (King of Spain, “Declaration of War against Great Britain”, 5 October 1796, in: BRC, serial No. 662, p. 164).

**138** Prince of Orange and King of Great Britain, “Convention”, 13 August 1814, in: BRC, serial No. 723, p. 228, Additional Article 1. This is to be distinguished from the Anglo–Dutch–Slave Treaty of 1818. However, the Treaty of Amiens of 25 March 1802, which restored the French, Spain and the Batavian Republic “all the possessions and colonies which respectively belonged to them, and which have been either occupied or conquered by the British forces, during the course of the present war”, excluded Trinidad (and Ceylon) and had not considered Essequibo, Demerara and Berbice (Kings of France and Great Britain, “Treaty of Amiens”, 25 March 1802, Articles 2–4, <http://www.napoleon-empire.com/official-texts/treaty-of-amiens.php>, (accessed 10 October 2018).

**139** G. Smith, “Letter to Mr. O’Leary”, 28 January 1841, in: BRC, No. 3, enclosure 1, pp. 71–72.

a boundary survey, in particular “the territories near the frontier which have been hitherto occupied by independent Indian tribes.”<sup>140</sup> In result, the conclusion of an agreement failed on 30 March 1844, when Venezuela complained about Robert Schomburgk’s practices in setting up “marks [. . .] upon the territory of the Republic [of Venezuela]” and instead claimed the Essequibo as “the natural boundary”, while Great Britain had suggested the Moruca river as “compromising boundary-line” and declared their willingness “to waive their [insubstantial] claim to the Amacura as the western boundary of the British territory”.<sup>141</sup>

Hence, negotiations were resumed in November 1876 about “the pending question concerning the boundaries between Venezuelan Guiana and English Guiana”,<sup>142</sup> whereupon Venezuela in February 1881 repeated their boundary claim of the Essequibo mouth upwards until “it’s confluence with the Rivers Rupununi and Rewa”, after Great Britain in January 1880 had suggested “the mouths of the Orinoco to the west of Barima point” as “point of departure”,<sup>143</sup> while Venezuela in April 1879 suggested the Moruca as a compromise,<sup>144</sup> as the English did in March 1844. Nevertheless, Great Britain repeated their claim to “the right bank of the River Barima” in September 1881,<sup>145</sup> after a vital communication took place throughout the year 1883.<sup>146</sup> Finally, Venezuela in November 1883 suggested “arbitration” as “the only solution”, due to the “inability, within the

---

**140** Viscount Palmerston, “Letter to Sir Porter”, Foreign Office, 28 November 1840, in: BRC, No. 1, p. 71.

**141** Earl of Aberdeen, “Letter to Senor Fortique”, Foreign Office, 30 March 1844, in: BRC, No. 26, pp. 88–90. The English proposed “the mouth of the Moroco River” as “the limit of her majesty’s possessions on the sea-coast” (*ibid.*).

**142** Senor E. Calcano, “Letter to Earl of Derby”, Carácas, 14 November 1876, in: BRC, No. 27, pp. 90–94, at 90. Meanwhile, gold was discovered in both “French Guiana and Venezuela” in June 1857 and Essequibo/Demerara in August 1857 (Lieutenant-Governor Walker, “Letter to Secretary of State”, 24 August 1857, in: BRC, No. 889, pp. 202).

**143** Senor J. de Rojas, “Letter to Earl Granville”, Paris, 21 February 1881, in: BRC, No. 34, p. 98.

**144** Senor J. de Rojas, “Letter to Earl Granville”, Paris, 23 September 1880, in: BRC, No. 32, p. 97.

**145** Earl Granville, “Memorandum on the Question of Boundaries between British Guiana and Venezuela to Senor J. de Rojas”, London, 15 September 1881, in: BRC, No. 35, enclosure 1, pp. 100–101, at 100.

**146** Earl Granville, “Letter to Colonel Mansfield”, London, 1 February 1883, in: BRC, serial No. 42, p. 102; Earl Granville, “Letter to Senor J. de Rojas”, London, 1 February 1883, p. 102; Senor J. M. Rojas, “Letter to Earl Granville”, Paris, 7 February 1883, in: BRC, No. 44, p. 102; Colonel Mansfield, “Letter to Earl Granville”, Carácas, 7 March 1883, in: BRC, No. 45, p. 103; Senor J. M. de Rojas, “Letter to Earl Granville”, Paris, 28 March 1883, in: BRC, No. 46, p. 103; Colonel Mansfield, “Letter to Earl Granville”, Carácas, 9 April 1883, in: BRC, No. 47, p. 103; Earl Granville, “Letter to Colonel Mansfield”, London, 25 May 1883, in: BRC, No. 48, p. 103; Colonel Mansfield, “Letter to Earl Granville”, Carácas, 2 July 1883, in: BRC, No. 49, p. 104; Earl Granville, “Letter to Colonel Mansfield”, London, 7 September 1883, No. 50, p. 104.

limits of their Constitution, of any power, whether executive or legislative, to alienate by Act or Treaty territory which has been assumed to constitute an integral part of the dominions of the Republic”.<sup>147</sup>

In result, the Washington Treaty of Arbitration was concluded on 2 February 1897 to

ascertain the extent of the territories belonging to or that might lawfully be claimed by the United Netherlands or by the kingdom of Spain respectively at the time of the appropriation by Great Britain of the Colony of British Guiana – and shall determine the boundary line between the United States of Venezuela and the Colony of British Guiana,<sup>148</sup>

resulting in the Boundary Award of Paris of 3 October 1899. As argued in concluding chapter 13, both are repeating the pattern of violating both the European colonial law of the time of initial colonial acquisition, that is Indigenous Peoples’ jurisdiction and sovereignty, and the intertemporal law rule.

---

**147** Colonel Mansfield, “Letter to Granville”, Carácas, 22 November 1883, in: BRC, serial No. 51, p. 104.

**148** “Washington Treaty of Arbitration”, available from [peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/GB-VE\\_970202\\_Treaty%20of%20Arbitration.pdf](https://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/GB-VE_970202_Treaty%20of%20Arbitration.pdf) (accessed 7 October 2018), Articles 2–4.