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1 Introduction

The United States is in the midst of its fourth major wave of immigration. Today's wave is the largest in absolute numbers, although not as a proportion of the total population. Unlike in previous waves, today's immigrants come from every inhabited continent and represent just about every country in the United Nations. As in previous waves, there is a profound ambivalence about immigration among the American public. Historically, Americans have seen their own immigrant forebears through rose-colored glasses while raising serious concerns about the contributions of current immigrants and the extent to which they will assimilate our values, language, and experiences.

This ambivalence has made immigration policy one of the most difficult on the U.S. political agenda. In the past three Congresses, the Senate and House of Representatives have debated immigration reform but have failed to come to consensus about the policies needed to address today's challenges. The difficulties they are experiencing are by no means new. Immigration reform has always been a difficult issue, requiring years of debate before any comprehensive changes are adopted. Although the problem is often described as a contest between pro- and anti-immigration forces, the reality is much more complex. Even among those who favor large-scale immigration, there are profound differences in views on the purposes of immigration and the contributions that immigrants bring to the country. Understanding the historical roots of American immigration, and American attitudes toward immigrants, helps to place today's policy debate into perspective and provides important insights into the reforms needed to address current problems and opportunities.

It is a truism that the United States is a nation of immigrants.1 Certainly, the United States was settled by successive periods of immigration, from the first wave of
colonization (sixteenth to eighteenth centuries), through the second (1830–1860) and third (1880–1924) waves of mass European migration,


Figure 1.1. Immigration by Decade: 1820–2008.

into what is now the fifth decade of our most recent wave of migration, dominated by movements from Latin America, the Caribbean, Asia and, in smaller numbers, Africa (1965-present) (Figure 1.1).

Immigration has indeed been formative in making America what it is and what it will become. The phrase “a nation of immigrants,” however, hides as much as it illuminates in lumping together all immigrants and all forms of immigration. In fact, this book argues, America has been settled from its very origins by three different models of immigration, all of which persist through the four waves described above. Lawrence Fuchs, in *The American Kaleidoscope* (1990: 8), described each model in relationship to the colony in which it most thrived:

To oversimplify: Pennsylvania sought immigrants who would be good citizens regardless of their religious background; Massachusetts wanted as members only those who were religiously pure; and Virginia, with its increasing reliance on a plantation economy, wanted workers as cheaply as it could get them, without necessarily welcoming them to membership in the community.²

This book traces the evolution of these three models of immigration as they explain the historical roots of current policy debates and options. The focus is on 1) why each
Models of American Immigration

The first permanent English colony was founded in Virginia in 1607. Established by a trading company that was primarily interested in profits, Virginia largely equated immigration with the arrival of laborers. Indentured servants, convict laborers, and, finally, slaves were brought to the colony. Their labor was welcomed but, particularly in the case of slaves, full social membership was denied. Although the colonial leaders sought immigrants and, in the case of convict labor and slavery, compelled both convict laborers and slaves to migrate, few rights were accorded to those who came to be seen as supplying expendable and exploitable labor.

Massachusetts was also settled by a trading company, but its goals were loftier – to establish a colony for coreligionists who shared Puritan theology and values. From the establishment of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in 1630, the colony's immigration model was to welcome the true believer but to exclude and, in certain cases, to expel or even kill those whose views challenged the conventional wisdom.

William Penn was also motivated by religion in establishing the Pennsylvania colony in 1681, but he brought new ideas about religious tolerance and diversity. Although Pennsylvania was to be a haven for Quakers who faced persecution in Britain, Penn extended a welcome to other groups who wished to immigrate to the new colony. Members of religious minorities throughout Europe responded, making Pennsylvania one of the most diverse colonies in religion, language, and culture.

Fuchs (1990) asserts that the Pennsylvania ideal – that immigrants (specifically, white European settlers) would be welcomed on terms of equal rights – prevailed in the making of the new nation. The Massachusetts model “became influential in the development of a national ideology of Americanism, but it was too restrictive to form a dominant immigration and naturalization policy” (Fuchs 1990: 8). He also argues that the Virginia ideal recurs as a model of labor migration, but, having found its most extreme form in slavery, remains suspect.
I agree with Fuchs’ elaboration of these colonial models – although noting that, as archetypes, they have never existed in pure form – as well as his view that the Pennsylvania model reflects what has been best in immigration to the United States. I disagree with him, however, as to the extent that the Pennsylvania model has prevailed. Rather, I propose that each model has had salience throughout our history, with the strength of each model varying in accord with broader currents of thought and events. Each model is basically supportive of immigration, although they cast immigration as serving markedly different purposes. Each has been challenged, not only by the others, but also by more restrictive notions of nation and community. And as concerns about immigration mount, the economic, ideological, and integration arguments of the three models are used as often to justify curbs on immigration as to support continued admissions.

Here are a few examples of the ways in which the three models have played out. Exclusions based on ideological beliefs (alien and sedition acts, bars to admission of anarchists and communists), along with affirmative policies for admission of refugees from communist regimes, formed the nineteenth- and twentieth-century counterpart to the Massachusetts requirement of religious conformity. The importation of Chinese laborers to build the railroads and perform other unskilled jobs, followed by the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, reflected the Virginia idea of immigrants as expendable workers rather than members of the society. The Bracero program, under which Mexican workers were admitted on a temporary basis to fill wartime labor shortages, also followed the Virginia pattern.

The Americanization movement of the early twentieth century, conceived by proponents of immigration as a way to help immigrants achieve the promise of the Pennsylvania movement, was later “hijacked” [to use Barbara Jordan's (1995a) term in calling for a twenty-first-century Americanization movement] by restrictionists who introduced quotas on the admission of immigrants of selected national origins. It was not until the Immigration Amendments of 1965, passed during the height of the civil rights movement, that national origins quotas were eliminated. This opened immigration to new communities and set off the fourth wave of mass migration.

Today's notions and patterns of immigration may be the most complex of all. The threat of terrorism and concerns about fundamentalist Islam have led to new ideological restrictions with new theological overtones. With the end of the Cold War and the demise of Communism in most countries, U.S. refugee programs have lost their Massachusetts-style raison d’être and have still not returned to the levels of the 1980s.

At the same time, the apparently insatiable demand for labor has led to a tolerance of large-scale undocumented immigration and a proliferation of temporary worker programs, mirroring earlier periods of unfettered, Virginia-style migration. Another manifestation of the Virginia model has been a series of federal laws that have
restricted the rights of immigrants (for example, to public welfare benefits and due process of law) just as their numbers have increased substantially.

**Numbers and Trends in Immigration**

Statistics on the number of immigrants coming to America are weak even today. Although there are reliable administrative records on the number of persons who come through legal channels, determining how many persons arrive without authorization requires sophisticated estimation techniques combined with leaps of faith in the assumptions that underlie the estimates. No records are kept today on levels of emigration – that is, the number of persons who leave the United States – although such information was collected in the past. The decennial census offers information on the stock of foreign-born persons in the United States, but immigrants are an obvious source of the census undercount, given language, cultural and legal barriers to participation in the census.

With all of these caveats about the quality of the data, it is still possible to construct a picture of the scale of immigration during the past four hundred years. Klein (2004: 58) estimates that 198,000 Europeans and African slaves came to the American colonies during the seventeenth century. Most went to the southern colonies but a high proportion was male, and death rates, at least initially, were also high. Smaller numbers migrated to New England and the mid-Atlantic colonies, but as a result of lower death rates and a more balanced male-female population, there were more opportunities for natural growth than in the south. During the eighteenth century, immigration increased. Klein estimates that 586,000 immigrants (again from both Europe and Africa) arrived between 1700 and 1775.

The first U.S. census, carried out in 1790, found a population of 3.8 million persons. The census did not ask where inhabitants had been born but did ask about national origins. The largest proportion was of English and Welsh descent, with Scottish and German descent contributing sizable proportions. In 1820, the federal government began collecting data on arriving passengers, which provides useful perspective on immigration levels. Figure 1.1 shows the number of immigrants admitted during the period from 1820 to the present. The data map the various waves of immigration.

Into the third decade of the new republic, immigration levels were modest. They began to increase in the 1830s and grew substantially in the 1840s and 1850s, only to fall during the Civil War. Immigration during this period was primarily from Britain, Ireland, Germany, and the Scandinavian countries, although Chinese and Mexican laborers also arrived.

After the Civil War, immigration began to increase again, except during the 1890s, when the United States suffered several major economic crises. With recovery came record levels of immigration in the first two decades of the twentieth century, with
more than 1 million immigrants arriving in six of the years between 1905 and 1914. Emigrants during this period came mostly from southern and eastern Europe, and brought people who shared neither the language nor the religion of the majority Anglo-Protestant population of the United States. With the outbreak of World War I, events in Europe precluded mass emigration, reducing immigration levels from that continent. The United States recruited temporary workers from Mexico to fill the gap.

In the 1920s, immigration from Europe began to increase again, only to be permanently reduced by the imposition of numerical restrictions and national origin quotas that effectively ended the opportunity of southern and eastern Europeans to enter. As these new immigration policies went into effect, the Great Depression further suppressed immigration levels and, for the first time, levels of return migration to Europe exceeded new arrivals. Throughout the 1930s, the quota for Germany went unfilled as the U.S. State Department imposed administrative barriers to the admission of refugees from Nazi persecution, effectively precluding the resettlement in the United States of large numbers of Jews and other victims of fascism.

Low levels of permanent immigrant and refugee admissions persisted throughout the 1940s, but with U.S. entry into World War II, attention turned, as it had in World War I, to admission of temporary workers from Mexico. This program operated until 1964, employing between 4 million and 5 million Mexicans during the twenty-two-year period. Illegal immigration from Mexico also grew in those years, setting the stage for today's high levels of unauthorized entries.

With mass population displacement in Europe as a result of World War II and the Cold War, the United States reversed its refugee policies, allowing migration to increase during the 1950s and early 1960s. Congress did not agree to lift the national origins quotas, but ways were found to circumvent the restrictions for the admission of refugees and displaced persons.

More fundamental change in U.S. policies occurred with passage of the 1965 Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act. This legislation eliminated the national origins quotas as well as earlier restrictions on the admission of Asian immigrants. By the time of its implementation, few Europeans were able or willing to immigrate to the United States. Western Europe was importing temporary workers from southern Europe. Most of eastern Europe was behind an Iron Curtain that prevented emigration. Instead, immigrants’ origins shifted to Latin America, the Caribbean, and Asia. Immigration began to increase in the 1970s but did not reach the levels of the early twentieth century, in absolute numbers, until the 1990s. As a percentage of the total population immigration is still not at nineteenth-century levels, when the overall U.S. population was much smaller. Significant levels of legal admissions have persisted into the first decade of the twenty-first century (although, at this writing, it appears that the economic recession may have reduced the numbers attempting to enter illegally).
Background to the Research

The research for this project has been almost thirty years in the making. A word about the author may be in order here. My early training was as an historian, specializing in the colonial period. My first venture into research on immigration was a series of studies for the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy (1979–1981). These studies traced issues of recurrent concern regarding immigration (language, public health, crime, and return migration), to help inform the commissioners about the issues they were addressing. This research was collected into a volume on immigration history published by the commission. In 1980, I became the research director for the commission, taking lead responsibility for the staff report that explained the reasoning behind the commission's recommendations. This role gave me insights into the formulation of policies that would form the basis of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 and the Immigration Act of 1990.

After the commission ended in 1981, I spent the next decade as policy and research director at the Refugee Policy Group, a think tank on refugee issues. During that pivotal period in refugee policy, I focused initially on the resettlement of refugees to the United States. Later, I turned my attention to asylum issues as well as to international refugee assistance issues. During this period, I had the opportunity to visit refugee camps in Southeast Asia, Central America, and Africa. I also interviewed federal, state, and local government officials, representatives of private resettlement agencies, refugees, and asylum applicants in numerous states.

In the 1990s, I served as the executive director of the next major federal body that reviewed immigration policy, the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform (often referred to as the Jordan Commission after its chair, Barbara Jordan). During five years, the Jordan Commission held hearings and consultations in communities throughout the United States. This provided me with the opportunity to hear from experts as well as from ordinary Americans who spoke during the open microphone sessions. The commission's field visits provided further opportunities to learn about immigration in the 1990s. Whether I was accompanying the Border Patrol along the United States–Mexico border, observing refugee adjudications in Kenya, or speaking at naturalization ceremonies, these experiences gave me a unique perspective on the implementation of U.S. immigration policies. I also had the good fortune to serve as the U.S. coordinator for a binational study team with Mexico, which allowed me to visit emigrant communities in Jalisco and Oaxaca and to tour the border from the Mexican side. The dozens of congressional hearings at which I testified and the numerous personal briefings I gave to members of Congress provided me with further insights into the key issues that were on the legislative agenda. When the Jordan Commission ended in 1997, I returned to academia where I have continued to undertake research on immigration to the United States at Georgetown University. Recent projects have studied the impact of immigration on new settlement
communities, efforts to address unauthorized migration at the worksite, and the admission of temporary foreign workers to the United States.

Thus, having spent much of the past 30 years intimately involved in the immigration policy process, I bring my personal experiences and perspectives to this volume. I also draw upon previously published books and articles that I have written on a range of immigration issues. This volume has made extensive use of primary sources materials, including letters, diaries, journals and other personal records, contemporary newspapers, magazines and journals, public immigration records, and the papers of the Dillingham Immigration Commission (which submitted 41 volumes to Congress in 1911). I also used analyses of laws, regulations, policies, and testimony, and consulted the *Congressional Record*, court cases, and other relevant materials that lead to an informed understanding of immigration policies. I have also analyzed census and administrative data on immigration patterns and immigrant experiences. Chapters 10 and 12 draw heavily on the public and personal records of the two commissions in which I served in senior capacities (including field visit notes, public hearings, background papers, decision memos, and commissioned research) and interviews I have conducted with policy makers and implementers at federal, state, and local levels.

The book builds upon a distinguished body of recent publications on U.S. immigration history, which has been invaluable to my research. I am indebted to two books in particular. Aristide R. Zolberg, *A Nation by Design: Immigration Policy in the Fashioning of America* (2006) and Daniel J. Tichenor, *Dividing Lines: The Politics of Immigration Control in America* (2002) meticulously analyzed the formulation of American immigration policy. Tichenor's analysis of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy and Commission on Immigration Reform were particularly helpful in confirming conclusions I had reached as an insider. It was reassuring to know that an independent assessment had come to similar views about the aims of these commissions. This book has a broader scope, however, than these excellent volumes, in that it discusses the interplay between immigration policy and immigrant experiences, focusing on differences that emerge from the three models discussed herein.

**A Roadmap to the Book**

Chapters 2, 3, and 4 present the Virginia, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania models, respectively. They describe the origins of the colonies, the aims of their founders, and the major migrations that took place during this first wave of immigration. These chapters highlight the push-and-pull factors that encouraged and, in the case of African slaves and English prisoners, forced movements across the Atlantic.

Immigration in the founding of the republic is discussed in Chapter 5. The chapter pays particular attention to evolving notions of membership in the American polity.
and how immigration fit into the process of nation building. The second major wave of immigration, which took place between 1830 and 1880, is examined in Chapter 6. The chapter focuses on the new Catholic immigration, particularly from Ireland and Germany, which was greeted with suspicion by the largely Protestant native population.

Chapters 7 and 8 focus on the third major wave of immigration, which began in the 1880s. Chapter 7 discusses the experiences of the immigrants as well as initiatives, such as the Americanization movement, to help them adjust to life in the United States. Chapter 8 discusses the movement to restrict immigration. It traces legislative actions to improve the “quality” of the immigrants to be admitted and then, in the 1920s, to impose national origins quotas.

The period from 1924 to 1965 is discussed in Chapter 9. The chapter examines the very restrictive refugee policy of the 1930s, comparing it with Cold War refugee admissions of the 1950s and early 1960s. It also discusses the reemergence of the Virginia model with the admission of Mexican temporary workers.

Chapters 10 and 11 recount the resurgence of the Pennsylvania model in the period from 1965 to 1994. Chapter 10 examines the new immigration emerging from passage of the Immigration Amendments of 1965, which eliminated the national origins quotas. The growth in immigration from Latin America and Asia are of particular focus. The chapter highlights the work of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy and the two major pieces of legislation – the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 and the Immigration Act of 1990 – that flowed from its recommendations. Chapter 11 focuses on U.S. refugee and asylum policy, discussing particularly the impact of the Refugee Act of 1980 which sought to bring U.S. policies and practices into conformity with evolving international norms and standards. The experiences of refugees from Cuba, Southeast Asia, and the former Soviet Union receive specific attention.

In Chapter 12, the immigration story is brought to the present. Unauthorized migration and post-September 11 policies are discussed as new manifestations of the Virginia and Massachusetts models, respectively. The chapter focuses particularly on the growth of undocumented migration, as well as such landmark, but ultimately ineffective, legislation as the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act (IIRIRA) of 1996.

Finally, Chapter 13 looks to the future, setting out my recommendations to return immigration to the United States to the Pennsylvania model. The chapter argues that America has benefited the most from immigration when we as a nation, and the immigrant newcomers, both take seriously our mutual responsibilities – what the U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform referred to as a covenant between immigrant and country. The final chapter describes four prerequisites for an immigration system that fulfills the aims of the Pennsylvania model: the curbing of illegal immigration; the revitalization of legal immigration; the reassertion of U.S. leadership on refugee and
asylum policies; and a renewed commitment to the full integration of immigrants into
American society.

1 In one of the most quoted uses of the term, John F. Kennedy's *A Nation of Immigrants*
made the case for repealing the national origins quotas.

2 In *Albion's Seed*, David Hackett Fischer (1991) also emphasizes differences in values and
what he refers to as folkways in the settlement of Virginia, Massachusetts, and
Pennsylvania. He adds a fourth folkway, represented by the settlement of the
Appalachian region.

3 Among the more relevant articles and books, “Quaker Tribalism” (Forbes [Martin] 1982)
explores the response of one Pennsylvania community to the growing diversity that
(Martin 2003) and “The Attack on Social Rights: U.S. Citizenship Devalued” (Martin
2002) explore the pressures on the Pennsylvania integration model since 1996. “A
History of American Language Policy” (Forbes [Martin] and Lemos 1981) and
“Language and Immigration” (Martin 2005) explores the reasons that English
language acquisition has been a “hot button” immigration issue since the beginnings
and Lowell 2005) and “U.S. Immigration Policy: Admission of High Skilled
Workers” (Martin et al. 2002) examines labor migration policies. “Beyond the
Gateway: Immigrants in a Changing America” (Gozdziak and Martin 2005) assesses
the impact of today's immigration on new settlement areas in the United States.
“International Migration and Terrorism: Prevention, Prosecution and Protection”
(Martin and Martin 2004) discusses U.S. policy responses to the events of September

4 In the years leading up to the 1965 immigration reforms, a number of important
immigration histories were published that are at one and the same time predecessors
and source materials for this book, including Oscar Handlin's *The Uprooted* (1952);
John Higham, *Strangers in the Land* (1955); and Maldwyn Jones's *American
Immigration* (1960).

**2 “Gentlemen, Tradesmen, Serving-men, Libertines”**

The title of this chapter comes from a passage in John Smith's *General History of
Virginia* in which he rues the paucity of laborers among the early colonizers in
Jamestown. The expense of migrating, as well as the conditions found in the colony,
restricted movements to the colonies. Within a few decades, as the tobacco economy
developed, Virginia had identified several sources of foreign labor. The first was
indentured servants. The employer paid the migrant's passage in exchange for
indented labor, which was usually for a term of from four to seven years. On release
from the indenture, the worker was to be provided with tools, clothing, and land or
other means of self-support, although these terms were by no means always upheld. There were prominent cases in which released servants experienced upward mobility, including landownership and political participation; but in many cases, the freed worker remained dependent on the former employer for continued employment.

The second category of “labor migrant” was composed of convicts and debtors. The governor of Virginia sought the transfer to the colony of convicts who had been condemned to death in England. Orphans were also sent to the colony, with girls particularly valuable as “breeders” because so few Virginia colonists were female. In the most celebrated case, Georgia's charter promoted the immigration of debtors and convicts who would be able to redeem themselves in the new colony while forming a barrier between the more populous British colonies and the Spanish in Florida.

The third category, and the epitome of the Virginia model, was slavery – the forced migration of Africans to the American colonies. The slave trade predated the establishment of Virginia and the large majority of slaves transported to the New World went to the Caribbean islands, Brazil, and the Spanish colonies. As early as 1670, the British had determined that active engagement in the slave trade was necessary to the growth of the colonies, leading to a royal charter for the “Company of Royall Adventurers of England trading into Africa.” Later legislation broke the Royal Africa Company's monopoly and contributed to further growth in the slave trade. By the mid-eighteenth century, about 250,000 Africans had been transported to the British colonies in mainland North America. Most, but not all, went to the southern settlements.

The Founding of Virginia

On April 10, 1606, James I, King of England, granted the first Charter of Virginia to a group of “knights, gentlemen, merchants and other adventurers,” later known as the Virginia Company, to establish a colony in “that part of America commonly called VIRGINIA, and other parts and Territories in America, either appertaining unto us, or which are not now actually possessed by any Christian Prince or People, situate, lying, and being all along the Sea Coasts” (First Charter of Virginia 1606). Although it was not the first attempt by the British crown to colonize the American mainland, the colony established the following year in Jamestown proved to be the first permanent English settlement in what later became the United States.

The charter recognized multiple purposes of the Virginia Company's colonization efforts. Certainly religion played a role. The colonists were to “propagate Christian Religion to such People, as yet live in Darkness and miserable Ignorance of the true Knowledge and Worship of God” (First Charter 1606). However, economic concerns were at the heart of the charter. Those granted the charter sought a financial return on their investment in colonizing the New World. The charter granted the Virginia Company all of the “Lands, Woods, Soil, Grounds, Havens, Ports, Rivers, Mines,
Minerals, Marshes, Waters, Fishings, Commodities, and Hereditaments” to be found in the territory covered by the charter (First Charter 1606). The territory was to comprise two colonies, divided geographically and designated by the principal origins of the investors. The southern colony was granted to the London Company, and was to be established between “four and thirty and one and forty Degrees” latitude; the northern colony was granted to the Plymouth Company, and was to be established between “eight and thirty Degrees and five and forty Degrees of the said Latitude” (First Charter 1606). The Virginia Company was to establish a 13-person Council, operating in England, that would have the responsibility for managing the colonies. The Council would name a 13-person body, also referred to as a council, for each colony that had authority to govern, to mine for gold, silver, and copper, to mint coins, and to tax and defend the colony.

In December 1606, three ships set sail for Virginia – the Sarah Constant, the Goodspeed, and the Discovery, arriving in the Chesapeake Bay in April 1607 after a journey through the West Indies. After exploring the bay and making the colonists’ first contacts with the indigenous population, the ships’ captains settled on the James River as their point of disembarkation. Some 104 passengers disembarked in what would become the settlement of Jamestown (Bernhard 1992: 601). The sealed box they carried from England named seven men who were to form the nucleus of the council. Edward-María Wingfield was named president of the council, but his responsibilities were only to preside and to cast a double vote in case of a tie. The council itself had the authority to remove its president, and any member, by majority vote. The council's first such act was to remove Captain John Smith from its membership because of what they considered to be mutinous acts during the trans-Atlantic voyage (Andrews 1964: 99). Smith was restored to the council in June, however – a good move, because his leadership certainly helped the colonists survive the early months of the settlement.

These first settlers had few of the skills needed to establish a successful colony. They were knights, gentlemen, merchants, and adventurers; they knew little about farming, fishing, or foraging for food. They quickly exhausted the few supplies that had survived the long trip from England to Virginia. They had the great misfortune to arrive in Jamestown at the height of one of the worst droughts on record, which affected food supply and water quality (Stahle 1998). Dependent largely on food supplied by the Native American tribes in the area, they bickered among themselves and succumbed to disease. By the end of 1607, only 38 men survived. The arrival of a supply ship from England and Smith's tough actions as president of the council were all that brought the remaining colonists through the first winter.

In September 1608, a third supply ship arrived at Jamestown, this time bringing not only commodities needed by the colonists but also artisans and laborers. The ship also brought two women, who were the only women in the colony for about one year (Bernhard 1992: 603). The colonists began to construct buildings, plant fields, and
raise livestock. According to his own journal, Smith threatened to expel any colonist who did not provide the labor needed to secure the settlement. As word got back to the Council in England, it was clear that more needed to be done if the colony was to survive and to provide a return on the investment made by members of the company.

The investors sought a new charter from the Crown, one that would provide for a more effective system of governance for the colony. In the second charter, granted in May 1609, the Virginia Company was established as a joint stock company, with a treasurer and members of the Council appointed by the Crown. Subsequently, the members, or stockholders, would elect the treasurer and Council members when there were vacancies (Second Charter 1609). The Council had authority to make laws for the colony, as long as these did not contravene the laws of England. The Council also had the authority to raise funds by selling shares in the Virginia Company and to promote settlement of the colony. The new charter expanded the territory under the control of the Virginia Company.

Perhaps the most significant change resulting from the second charter was the appointment of a governor of the new colony with wide powers over all of the colonists. Lord De la Warr (Delaware) was named the first governor. The new charter and De la Warr's appointment raised hopes for the ultimate success of the colony, leading some 800 persons to set sail for Virginia. De la Warr himself did not arrive until June 1610. In the interim, Jamestown continued to experience difficult times, with disease and hunger causing high levels of mortality. De la Warr restored some order, but he was forced to leave the colony because of serious illness. His successors, Sir Thomas Gates and Sir Thomas Dale, finally had some success in stemming the high death rates, making peace with the native population, and establishing a new settlement, Henrico, at a higher and healthier altitude than Jamestown's.

The colony still faced crisis, however, stemming from the colonists’ unfitness for the work that had to be done. Although arriving boats continued to bring artisans to settle, too many colonists were described as “lascivious sonnes, masters of bad servants, and wives of ill husbands” who were unable or unwilling to work (Andrews 1964: 113, quoting Brown). The Virginia Company Council set out to correct this situation, examining more closely the background and skills of those seeking to emigrate. Gates and Dale also promulgated a series of laws to ensure discipline within the colony. Compiled into a compendium called “Laws Divine, Morall and Martiall,” the new laws were published in London in 1612, part of a strategy to convince investors and would-be colonists alike that the Virginia colony was well governed and successful. Implemented with some degree of arbitrariness and harshness, though, these laws were themselves controversial.

By 1611, the colony appeared to be over the worst of the crises, having endured the “starving times.” The Virginia Company sought a third charter (1611) to address some of the new challenges it was facing. Again, the company sought expanded boundaries, and again it succeeded; Bermuda was included in the Virginia Company's
The new charter also required regular meetings of the members of the company to oversee the work of the Council. The 1611 charter increased the power of the courts established by the company to punish offenders, including those who took “wages, apparel and other entertainment” from the Company but refused to go to the colony; those who misbehaved in the settlement; and those who returned to England and slandered the colony. Finally, the new charter allowed the Virginia Company to use lotteries to raise additional funds for the colony.

Perhaps the most important innovation in the period after the third charter was the transition from joint ownership to private ownership of land. Initially, each man in Jamestown was given three acres to farm in exchange for one month's service to the colony and a payment in corn (Andrews 1964: 124). In 1616, the Company offered 50 acres to those who subscribed £12 10s. In 1618, land was apportioned for various public purposes and grants of 50 acres were made to those who did special service to the company or would agree to settle in the colony with family and servants. In this way, grants of land became a lure to increase the number of permanent settlers. At first, the cultivation was for subsistence, with the colony exporting little to England. With the planting of tobacco, however, Virginia found its export commodity.

During this early period, the Virginia Company still suffered from a lack of colonists who intended to reside permanently in the colony. Disease remained a problem. In 1616, there were about 125 fewer colonists in Virginia than had been there in 1611 – 324 compared with 450. The numbers began to increase, albeit slowly, to a total of about 600 in 1618 (Andrews 1964: 134). The company attempted to build up the population, pledging to send 300 tenants to land in Henrico, an incorporated area that was under the company's direct control. The company also sent apprentices and servants and “young and uncorrupt maids to make wives to the inhabitants” (Andrews 1964: 134). If the women married tenants who farmed company land, the company would pay for the cost of transport. Otherwise, the husbands were to reimburse the travel costs with tobacco. Orphans, paupers, and convicts were also transported to the colony, an arrangement attractive to municipal authorities who could rid themselves of needy and criminal populations.

Yet the colony's population continued to stagnate, largely because of high death rates on board ship and in the colony. Some settlers returned to England, unwilling to remain in the colony for one reason or another. After hundreds of new settlers had been sent across the Atlantic, the population in Virginia had fallen from 1,000 in 1619 to 843 in 1620 (Andrews 1964). More troubles befell the colony in 1622 when tensions between the colonists and the native population reached new heights. A massacre followed, with almost 350 colonists killed. Outright warfare ensued, by and large won by the colonists with firearms imported from England.

The troubles affecting the colony eventually caused the downfall of the Virginia Company. The Crown established a board of inquiry to determine whether the situation could be remedied. Letters from the colonists complaining of neglect and
deprivation reinforced the board's view that the company had mismanaged the colony. In fact, the company was torn apart by internal dissension and mismanagement of funds. It tried to build a profitable enterprise with too little capital and a precarious source of funding. The inquiry board recommended that the Crown issue a new charter giving itself greater authority over the dealings of the Virginia Company. After a court hearing that went against the company, its charter was vacated and the company dispersed. Virginia became a royal colony.

**Populating the Colony**

As in all large-scale population movements, a combination of push-and-pull factors affected migration. Economic, political, and religious changes in Britain produced emigration pressures that led to rural to urban migration within Britain as well as movements to the colonies. As discussed earlier, the Virginia Company, for its part, attempted to populate the colony with an assortment of strategies. Immigrants were lured to the colony by promises of land and wealth. When an insufficient number of people volunteered to migrate, the company encouraged municipalities to send orphans, paupers, and criminals to the colony. (The first convicts transported to the colony are believed to have come in 1617.) Not all of these early settlers chose to migrate. As early as 1618, there were reports of women who were kidnapped in England and sold in Virginia. And the first Africans arrived in Virginia in 1619; they are believed to have been brought on a Dutch ship. This section discusses the emigration pressures that prompted movement and then turns to specific forms of migration.

**Emigration Pressures**

Prevailing theories about the causes of migration suggest that households engage in migration to minimize economic risk, especially risk from agricultural losses in subsistence farming communities (Massey 1993). In the absence of other forms of insurance, migration to cities or to agricultural communities in other regions or countries enables families to withstand shocks from loss of crops because of weather, failures in markets caused by recessions, and loss of livelihoods caused by conflict and political instability and similar occurrences.

Societies that are attempting transformation from largely subsistence to a largely mercantile or industrial organization are particularly prone to migration pressures of this type, with new towns and cities arising to offer an alternative to the much more chancy subsistence farming. England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was just such a society. Rapid population growth in combination with poor crop yields created economic dislocations for many English farmers. As Clark and Souden (1988; 30) describe in the introduction to their edited volume on migration and society in early modern England, “higher prices, declining real wages, under- and un-
employment, together with rising rents and land shortages, all conspired to make poorer people leave home.” Many moved locally in search of better economic opportunities; others migrated long distances to escape such severe conditions as massive famine (Clark and Souden 1988). These movements were mostly from north to south in England, but also included movements to Ireland and to the American colonies.

It was not until English population growth stalled, and even reversed in the late 1600s, that long-distance movements slowed down. As Whyte (2000: 116) posits, “a fall in the numbers of indentured servants emigrating in the later 1660s may have been related to the slackening of demographic growth within England, and the increased demand for labour in London after the Great Plague and Great Fire.”

Accompanying these demographic and economic changes were reforms in the British poor laws that reduced the need for mobility and, at the same time, may have made mobility more difficult (Whyte 2000: 57–62). Medieval laws, which treated able-bodied unemployed persons as unworthy and people moving to seek work as vagrants, proved unable to counter severe economic downturns. The Poor Act of 1601 gave responsibility for providing poor relief to each township. This raised issues of residency – how long did someone have to live in a township to become eligible for relief? The 1662 “Act for the Better Reliefe of the Poore of this Kingdom” and its successor, the 1697 “Act for Supplying some Defectes in the Laws for the Relief of the Poor” established criteria for determining who was settled in a particular parish and therefore could qualify for the township's assistance (Whyte 2000). Parishes could issue settlement certificates to those who qualified by birth, land rental, tax payment, completion of an apprenticeship, or service to the township. In many cases, new townships would refuse to admit migrants without a certificate, which held the original township liable if the newcomer came upon bad times. The new laws also authorized townships to take securities from migrants to ensure that they did not become public charges.

Souden (1988: 167), examining registrations of emigrants to North America via Bristol, concludes that movements to the colonies in the seventeenth century (1654–1662, more specifically) was an extension of long-distance internal migration. Looking at the movements of indentured servants, he found that a disproportionately large number came from London. About 75 percent came from more than 20 miles away from Bristol. Significant numbers of emigrating servants had lived previously in towns or cities, although many would be working in agriculture in the colonies. Another significant number of emigrants came from marginal forest areas with poor agricultural prospects (Souden 1988 and Whyte 2000: 36 on more general patterns).

In addition to economic pressures, movements, particularly to Ireland and then the Americas, were spawned by growing British nationalism as this was manifested in the search for empire. The establishment in 1603 of the Stuart dynasty, when James VI of Scotland became James I of England, heralded a new concept of “Britain” – although...
it took almost a century to join the two kingdoms under a single unified crown. As was remarked by Alexander Murdoch (2004: 13) of the settlement of Ireland, but was equally true of the Americas, “For James, British plantation…held the key to consolidation of a British Empire that was not so much a bastion of Protestantism as of ‘civilitie’ and growing commercial wealth through trade.” Key players in this process were the merchants and speculators who recruited emigrants to work the land so that a multitude of commodities could be shipped back to European markets. In this respect, empire and mercantilism went hand in hand to create an environment conducive to emigration. This pattern of movement is consistent with the “world systems” theory of international migration, which posits that “driven by a desire for higher profits and greater wealth, owners and managers of capitalist firms enter poor countries on the periphery of the world economy in search of land, raw materials, labor, and new consumer markets” (Massey 1993: 444–45). Initially, the movements were from England to the nearer parts of the expanding Britain – mainly toward Ireland. But, as Britain incorporated other provinces into the mainstream, emigration to the American colonies grew, and increasingly, emigrants were recruited from throughout the British Isles. In fact, by the eighteenth century, emigration from England began to decline in favor of movements from Scotland, Ireland, and Wales.

Estimates of emigration from Britain to America in the seventeenth century range from 250,000 to 500,000, a considerable proportion of an area with a total population of about 5 million. Menard's (2001: 102) best estimate is that 123,200 white persons immigrated to the Chesapeake colonies in the seventeenth century. Given the great difficulties faced by colonists, many of whom died or returned because of the hostile environment, the scale of migration during the seventeenth century is impressive. Immigration increased in the eighteenth century. Gemery (1989) estimates that there were more than 650,000 immigrants between 1700 and 1790. An estimated 216,500 English, Welsh, Scottish, and Irish people emigrated from 1700 to 1775 (Menard 2001). Only 44,000 of the eighteenth-century emigrants were from England. The reduced emigration pressures in Britain did not mean that the colonies ceased to grow, but new sources of migration were needed. For Virginia and the southern colonies, a major new source was the slave trade, as discussed later. Emigrants from continental Europe also filled some of the gap, with migrants from Germany settling throughout the colonies.

To better understand the peopling of the southern colonies, and the role of the Virginia model, we turn to a more detailed discussion of the three principal forms of emigration: indenture, deportation, and slavery.

**Indentured Servants**

The system of indentured servitude that populated the colony during much of the seventeenth century was established in 1620. Galenson (1984: 6) describes it in simple terms: “The cost of passage was advanced to the migrants by the Company,
and the recruits in turn promised to work for stated periods; in Virginia, title to the migrants’ labor during these periods was transferred to individual planters upon the planters’ reimbursement of transportation costs to the Company.”

Passage to the New World was expensive. Whyte (2000: 126) estimates transport across the Atlantic to cost £30–50 for a family and their possessions in the early seventeenth century. Only those with considerable fortunes could afford to pay for their own passage. For most would-be emigrants, indentured servitude proved to be a more realistic way to reach the New World. Some historians estimate that at least half of all colonists arrived as indentured servants (Campbell 1959).

An employer, or, more likely, an agent paid the passage, which would be repaid by the servant by working for a fixed number of years. The indenture system loosely followed the practices of apprenticeships and agriculture service in England (Whyte 2000). The term of indenture varied. In one sample of indentured servants leaving Bristol for the Americas, the majority committed to four years of indenture (Souden 1988: 153). Six or seven years were not uncommon terms, particularly for those who emigrated at a younger age (Whyte 2000: 127). The London registrations include the age of the indentured servants; typically, the term of service for minors was 7–10 years, depending on their age (Campbell 1959: 77). Those with skills for which the colonies had demand would likely be able to negotiate shorter indentures and more favorable terms (Souden 1988: 154). In the sample of those leaving Bristol, the largest numbers of indentured servants were yeomen (35 percent) and laborers (10 percent), but appreciable numbers were in the building trades (3.4 percent) and in the clothing (4.8 percent), leather (3.3 percent), and textile (4.5 percent) industries. Milling, metal working, stoneworking, and building trades rounded out the numbers. Less than 2 percent were characterized as professionals and gentlemen/planters (Souden 1988: 155). By contrast, indentured servants leaving from London showed the opposite occupational distribution, with more skilled workers than yeomen and husbandmen (Campbell 1958: 71). Menard (2001: 127), examining not only those who came under contract but also those who immigrated on their own and then became servants, concluded that “many, perhaps the majority, who came, both with indentures and without, lived near the margin of British society.”

Menard (2001: 128–29) also emphasizes the sex and age composition of the servants who came to the Chesapeake area. During the seventeenth century, an increasing share of the migrants was younger males, under the age of 16. By the 1690s, 40 percent of the male servants were in this age group. The proportion of women increased over time, but even at the end of the century, there were two and a half times as many men as women in the Chesapeake area.

During the period studied by Souden (1988), 1654–1662, about 62 percent of the indentured servants who left Bristol went to the West Indies and the remaining 38 percent to the mainland, with the vast majority of the latter continuing on to Virginia. About 35 percent of the indentured servants accompanied masters who were sending
more than 10 servants to the colonies, where, presumably, their indentures would be sold. Almost half of all masters (43.8 percent), however, had only one accompanying servant.

Reflecting the overall gender composition, about 25 percent of the indentured servants were women in the Bristol sample; there was a slightly lower proportion in the London records. Several young women from the same village often emigrated together. Some women were recruited to be house servants. Many of the women expected to marry when they arrived in the colonies. In some cases, the colonist who paid with cash or tobacco for her passage intended to marry the indentured servant when she arrived in the colony (Campbell 1959: 75).

Souden (1988: 167) points out that the indentured servants did not fit the stereotypes often heard about these migrants to the American colonies – “they were not the rogues, the whores and the vagabonds that the prevailing mythology might still lead us to believe.” Instead, they were workers with low-status and low-paid occupations. As is true of most migrants, they were probably not the poorest of the poor, who would have had difficulty in reaching Bristol or other ports of emigration to arrange contracts to pay for their further transport.

Life in the colonies proved exceedingly difficult for these indentured servants, especially in the West Indies. By some estimates, mortality rates for indentured British and Irish servants working on the sugar plantations in the West Indies was higher than that of slaves (Murdoch 2004: 27). Fear of slave rebellions prompted plantation owners to continue to import indentured servants despite the high death rates. In Maryland, 40 percent of indentured servants in the 1640s did not survive their period of indenture (Whyte 2000: 128). Indentured servants to the Chesapeake area, as well as those sent to the West Indies, were “rudely thrust as isolated individuals into environments and communities that would be dramatically different from those they knew in England” (Murdoch 2004: 25). Games (1999: 89) puts it succinctly: “Servants were just another commodity, bartered freely by their masters for goods and land.”

Treatment of indentured servants could be harsh. Edmund Morgan (1975) observed the perverse incentives of the system, which he believed led to the use of violence to stimulate productivity. Employers knew that workers would leave at the end of their contract and had no incentive to treat them well during the period of the contract. The workers had no wish to remain under the terms of the contract and so had few incentives to perform. Galenson (1978) points out, however, that violence was not a particularly effective way to gain greater productivity and argues that employers offered financial and other rewards to servants who performed well during the indenture.

Colonial assemblies did take action to improve the circumstances of indentured servants. Under some of these laws, servants could not be severely punished without the permission of a justice of the peace. Compensation upon completion of the
indenture was established by custom, generally not by law (Andrews 1964: 209). In sixteenth-century Virginia, servants were to receive 50 acres of land, clothing, and a musket upon expiration of their term of indenture. As land filled up, though, some colonies changed to a system of cash payment. Servants in eighteenth-century North Carolina received £3 and a suit of clothes.

Although some migrants who completed their term of service then embarked on a path of upward mobility, owning land and becoming tobacco planters with their own servants (or slaves), many formerly indentured workers continued to earn wages working for others (Whyte 2000: 128). One study of 158 servants who survived servitude in Maryland in the seventeenth century found that about 50 percent eventually acquired land (Menard 2001: 40). Many of those who did not own land died or left the colony soon after completion of their indenture. Less than 15 percent of those known to have lived in Maryland for more than a decade as free men owned no land (Menard 2001).

Those who did not own or rent land could work for wages or serve as sharecroppers. Some of the wage-earners were artisans, who generally had little difficulty in selling their services. Others performed short- or long-term wage labor on plantations, often under a contract that specified the terms and length of service. These contract laborers had more rights than indentured servants and, given the labor shortages in the colonies, were often able to negotiate high wages. These contract workers received wages for their labor; the sharecroppers received a portion of the crops that they produced.

Political participation was a major difference in defining the rights of indentured servants, freeholders, tenants, sharecroppers, and wage-earners. Male indentured servants in Virginia were permitted to vote for the members of the House of Burgesses until 1655, when they were disenfranchised (Andrews 1964: 184). Freed servants were generally able to participate in civic affairs. In Menard's (2001: 42–43) sample of Maryland freeholders, the former servants served as jurors, constables and members of the militia. Some former servants even attained the rank of justice of the peace, burgess, sheriff, councilor, or officer in the militia (Menard 2001: 43). However, the franchise was generally extended only to the heads of households, limiting the access of wage-earners to the political process (Menard 2001: 51).

In Menard's (2001) sample of Maryland servants who attained freedom, the median number of years between servitude and land ownership was 7.5 years. Although custom dictated that servants should have the right to 50 acres of land, it would take time and resources to pay the surveyor's and clerk's fees for a patent, clear the land, erect housing, pay for seeds and tools, and survive until the crops could be harvested. The majority had small holdings of about 50–400 acres. Menard found 14 former servants, however, who owned at least one thousand acres at the time of their death. One of the largest landowners in Maryland was in his sample (Menard 2001: 41).
The majority of the freed servants in Menard's sample initially leased land. As leaseholders, the men were able to form their own households, with all of the rights that accrued to heads of households. They generally could pay the first year's rent with the proceeds of the first harvest in exchange for making improvements in the land (Menard 2001: 53). As Menard argues, the system proved beneficial for owner and renter alike. Leasing land gave former servants the time to create assets that could later be used to purchase land. The capacity of the leasers to accumulate assets, however, was based on the price of crops, particularly tobacco, and the price of land. When tobacco was scarce and prices were high, and land was abundant and cheap, upward mobility was a realistic goal. As the seventeenth century progressed, such opportunities diminished, both because of overproduction of tobacco and increasing scarcity of land (Menard 2001: 59–60). At the same time, opportunities began to open in other colonies, to the north and south of the Chesapeake, giving servants a greater likelihood of moving from indenture to freehold. And, in Virginia and elsewhere in the South, slaves became a more frequent source of labor, as discussed later.

**Convict Labor**

As early as 1611, the Virginia Company petitioned the British crown for the transport of convicts to people the colony. As described in Butler's (1896: 16) early article on convict labor in the Americas, “Governor Dale wrote from Virginia begging the king to ‘banish hither all offenders condemned to die out of common goales, and likewise to continue that grant for three years unto the colonie (and thus doth the Spaniard people his Indes) it would be a readie way to furnish us with men, and not allways with the worst kind of men.’ ” Starting as early as 1617, a small but steady stream of convicts was transported to the colony each year. As the century progressed, convicts were also sold to brokers in the other colonies, but for much of this period, the Chesapeake Bay colonies remained the principal destination on the North American mainland (Butler 1896).

Despite the need for labor, the settlers were ambivalent about the transport of criminals. Early entreaties by leaders of the Virginia Company urged that only those of good moral character be sent to the colony. Later in the sixteenth century, Virginia passed legislation to outlaw the immigration of convicts. By then, however, the British government had found transport of convicts and debtors to be a convenient way to be rid of the costs of incarceration. The Crown generally overruled colonial sentiment, developing mechanisms to permit a smooth flow of convicts. In the Transportation Act of 1718, the British codified the practice. The act covered two types of offenses: those that were under benefit of clergy and those that were not. Benefit of clergy was afforded to lesser crimes that nevertheless could result in capital punishment. According to Kercher (2003: 530), “When a court found a person guilty of a clergyable offense, the Transportation Act of 1718 gave it the discretion to transport the prisoner to America for seven years instead of ordering a burning or
flogging. A judge could also order the transportation of those found guilty of petty larceny, which was not even nominally capital.” In non-clergyable offenses, capital punishment was required but the Crown could offer a pardon if the convicted person accepted transportation to the colonies.

In both cases, merchants entered into agreements with the government to transport convicts in exchange for a property interest in their labor (Kercher 2003: 530–31). Generally, migration for convicts followed patterns similar to those for migration of indentured servants. Often the same companies and brokers shipped both types of laborers (Grubb 2000: 113–14). In the eighteenth century, the British government subsidized the shipments in order to ensure they continued. The merchant who agreed to transport these criminals would receive £5 per capita plus the additional money obtained on selling the convicts’ labor once they arrived in the colonies.

Grubb (2000) compared differences between indentured servants and convict laborers, finding that servants commanded a higher price than convicts. He attributed the differential to different perceptions about productivity, including a greater tendency of convicts to abscond from their contracts. Most convicts were sentenced to seven years of contract labor in the New World, a term that did not differ significantly from the terms of apprentices or of younger, unskilled indentured servants (Grubb 2000: 114). Generally, the convicts were more likely to be male and more likely to be older than members of the other groups.

The seriousness of the crimes that merited transportation varied by jurisdiction. As quoted by Ekirch (1985: 368), “At least an element of truth lay in the later observation that ‘a man is banished from Scotland for a great crime, from England for a small one, and from Ireland, morally speaking for no crime at all.’” There were many reasons that convicts chose transportation over other punishments, including, for the most serious crimes, hanging or lengthy imprisonment. Even for crimes that warranted lesser punishment, transportation offered the possibility of escaping the situation that might have prompted the criminal behavior and greater opportunity to succeed economically in the New World. Conversely, transportation held great risks, particularly of dying from diseases on route or in the colonies. Moreover, convicts sometimes stayed in prison for months while awaiting transport to the colonies, and many were shackled while on board the ships.

Slavery

The “peculiar institution” of slavery ingrained itself as the principal labor recruitment mechanism several decades after the first indentured servants and the first Africans arrived in Virginia. During the early decades of the 1600s, Africans were not necessarily enslaved in Virginia. Often, they had a term of servitude that was longer than that of British servants, but still limited in time.

Menard (2001) suggests that the transition from a largely British workforce of indentured servants to a largely African slave workforce occurred in the late 1600s.
Looking at probate inventories and tax lists in Virginia and Maryland, he finds that the ratio of servants to slaves shifts in the 1680s and 1690s. In the 1670s, in Maryland, there were almost four servants for each slave; by the 1690s, there were four slaves for every servant (Menard 2001: 360). Similar patterns can be found in Virginia records. He attributes the shift to a decline in the supply of servants, an increase in the price of indentured labor, and an increase in the supply of slaves. Population growth slowed in Britain, and additional colonies began to attract those who planned to migrate, lessening the pool of servants who came to the southern colonies. Direct shipment of slaves from Africa began in 1674, replacing the earlier and more costly transport via the West Indies. With the end of the Royal African Company's monopoly in 1698, he concludes, the stage was set for major increases in supply as independent traders sought to meet the demand for labor (Menard 2001: 366–67).

Although Menard (2001) explains the shift toward an African workforce, he does not explain the shift toward a slave workforce, nor the spread of slavery to other colonies. To a large extent, the motivation was economic.