

William Tyler | England, France and Spain in America

- It's lovely to see you again.

- Nice to see you, and you're keeping well away from-

- Good, thank you.

- The nasties.

- Yes, yes, I am. Oh, goodness, we've already got 1300 on. I'm going to say welcome, welcome back, and over to you, thank you, William.

- Okay, thank you.

- Thanks.

- So welcome, everyone. And I'm sat here on the south coast of England at Worthing near Brighton. It's rather a cold day here, but bright blue skies. And it's about five o'clock in the afternoon and it's getting dark. And I'm going to enjoy myself for the next hour and I hope you'll enjoy yourself along with me. I'm talking about English America, French America, Spanish America in terms of the United States. Why did the United States end up English rather than French or rather than Spanish? And I want to begin with three words: inquisitiveness, acquisition, and exploitation. Let me repeat those words. Inquisitiveness, acquisition, and exploitation. I think these three words give us a framework in which to discuss why the United States in 1776 as it emerged as an independent nation was rooted in its English past rather than in a French past or in its Spanish past. Inquisitiveness is what drove the peoples of all three of these European nations, once they'd arrived in America, to see for themselves what might lie over the next hill, what might lie across the next river or on the other side of the horizon, inquisitiveness pushed them forward.

The story of 16th century, 17th century, and 18th century colonial America is therefore firstly driven by humankind's inalienable curiosity. Now, given that there were three nations, I know there were Dutch settlers and I know there were Swedish settlers and Danish and all the rest of it, but in truth, the three nations that were competing for territory in what is to become the United States were Britain, originally England, France, and Spain. And perhaps it was inevitable, with three European nations competing, that it would lead to fighting, that it would lead to war, and it would lead to them being enemies of each other. Indeed, in terms of France and Britain, they exported their European enmity over the Atlantic into North America, into Canada, of course, as well as the United States, as it was to become. They brought European war with them. This wasn't a problem for New Zealand or Australia, which was settled by Europeans only from Britain.

The story of the United States and Canada minus the Spanish, the story of the United States is therefore different than those other countries that the British went to in this Age of Exploration, this Age of Discovery, at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century. And as each of these nations was trying to be, as it were, top dog, to be top dog, you needed land and you needed more land than your enemies might get. And in order to claim land, you stuck a flag in and said, this is for England, this is for France, or this is for Spain. And we first hear of the claim from the British, from the English, as early as 1579, June 1579 is the first time that the English claim part of America. And what is so interesting about that is it's not in New England, it's not in Virginia, it's in California. California? Yeah, California, why?

Well, Sir Francis Drake was circumnavigating the globe. And in June 1579, he landed in what is now California. And this is what he himself wrote about that moment. And he writes about it in the third person. And Drake wrote, "This country," that is California, "our general named Albion. And that for two causes, the one in respect to the white banks and cliffs which went forward towards the sea, the other that it might have some affinity even to name also with our own country, which was sometimes so called, Albion. Before we went from thence, our general calls to be set up a monument of our being there as also of her majesty's and successors' right and title to that kingdom, namely a plate of brass fast nailed to a great and firm post whereon is engraven her grace's name and the day and year of our arrival there, and of the free giving up of the province and kingdom, both by the king and people," in other words, the Indigenous tribes, they had no idea, of course, that they were giving anything up.

But that's how Drake chose to interpret the events, they were just being friendly and offering food and drink and so on. "Together with her highness' picture and arms, in a piece of sixpence current English money, showing itself by a hole made of purpose through the plate." Wow. Gosh, if I lived in California, I think I'd spend every weekend trying to find Drake's plate with a hole in it. And the other side of the hole, if the wood was still there of the tree, will be a sixpence, an English silver sixpence of Elizabeth I with her portrait on it. It's an amazing moment, if you think about it, an amazing moment in the history of the United States and the history of Britain, the history of seaborne exploration, reaching California in June 1579. What better example of inquisitiveness? What lies over the horizon? What's on that land that we can see? And it was linked to acquisition. Acquisition by banging in the sixpence of Queen Elizabeth.

Could you hope to find a better example of inquisitiveness and acquisition? But that is in the beginning of the story. The beginning of the story is not English. The beginning of the story is Spanish, no surprise there. For those of you who listened to my lecture on conquistadors who were in South America and Central America, we know that they pressed forward into what we now call Florida. And it was with a man called de Leon, a Spaniard, L-E-O-N. And we have an account of his arrival in what is to become the United States, in his case, on the other coast, on the East Coast, in Florida. And we read this, "De Leon, finding himself without office and seeing himself rich, determined to do something by which he would gain honour and increase his estate. And as he had news that there were lands to the northward, he resolved to go to explore toward that part for which he armed three vessels, well-provided with food, men, and mariners,

which for the purpose of discovery are most necessary."

The date, April 1513, he reaches Florida. Inquisitive, he'd heard of lands to the north. Acquisition certainly for Spain, but also exploitation. The very words used, to gain honour by giving this land to the king of Spain, but also to increase his estate. We would say to get rich. The Spaniards with their experiences in Central and South America believed that the whole of the Americas were just gold and silver waiting to be picked up. So he thought, by going to Florida, there would be gold and silver to pick up. He's disappointed, of course, but it is the Spanish that reach Florida and remain there until 1821, this is no short period of time. That's after, of course, American independence and the United States of America has been formed, 1821. It's important to note, neither Drake nor de Leon ever gave a moment's thought when they claimed land, California, Florida, when they claimed land in the name of their royal rulers back home in Europe. They never gave thought to the fact that they were already peoples living there, Indigenous peoples who've been there for generation upon generation upon generation. In the book *The American West* by Stephen Aron, he has an extremely interesting short sentence. Aron writes, "Columbus, we now appreciate, discovered an Old World in 1492."

Not the New World, as Europeans called it, New England, New France, New Spain, but an old world. But they had no awareness of that. They saw the Indigenous people either as naive or as savages or as both. They did not see them as having any rights, rights to the land. Inquisitiveness, acquisition, and exploitation. Of course, with exploitation came resistance from those very peoples that they described as savages and naive. Of course, all the way through to after the independence of the United States, right through to the 19th century, unequal treaties were signed with Indigenous peoples in which they gave up good land in return for poorer land and eventually, for reservations. A few days ago was the anniversary of the notorious Marias, I hope I pronounced that correctly for Americans who are listening, I do apologise if you pronounce it differently, I did try and find out on the internet the American pronunciation, so forgive me if it's wrong, M-A-R-I-A-S, the massacre of Blackfeet tribe in Montana. 200 women, children, and old men were massacred. It occurred in 1870, not 1670 or even 1770, but 1870, reminding us if we ever needed reminding that the attitudes of the early European settlers in North America, whether Spanish or English or French, towards the Indigenous people, continued well into the 19th century in a country whose constitution proudly boasted that everyone was equal.

In Alan Axelrod, the American historian's book, in English, it's called *The Complete Idiot's Guide to American History*, I think it has a different title in the States. He writes this, I like Axelrod, he writes so beautifully. "Momentously and tragically, the time of the Old World would collide with the time of the New. For 400 years, from a clash between," inverted commas, "Indians and Christopher Columbus' men in 1493, right through to the massacre of Native Americans by the US 7th Cavalry at Wounded Knee on the 29th of December, 1890, the history of America will be in large part the history of racial warfare between the white and the red." We who were together looking at the history of the conquistadors in Central and Southern America will remember that we began to look at the impact of European colonisation empires, wherever they were. And in

truth, French America, Spanish America, and British America was followed by American America. But the attitudes remained the same. And indeed, of course, as many of you will know, the Americans took those attitudes with them to the Philippines.

Filipinos said, we lived centuries in a Spanish monastery and then we lived decades in an American whorehouse. They saw no distinction between Spanish imperialism and American. And here, in regard to the Indigenous peoples, the story goes right through to the 1890s and, as American listeners but I guess others will also note, the story doesn't really end there. It goes on into the 20th century to get the vote and continues in the 21st century in terms of living conditions and so on. Imperial Europe carries a long tail, T-A-I-L, as well as T-A-L-E, of woe. As regards to Marias Massacre, in 1870, there was a public outcry, I'm pleased to say, in the United States, and the matter was even debated in the House of Representatives. But the US Army stood by the officer in charge and indeed regarded him as a hero that had not done anything wrong in massacring women, children, or old men.

And that army view became the official view. Let me turn a page, as it were, and refer you to that interesting concept explained by Turner in 1898 that the interpretation of American history right the way through from the first arrivals of the Europeans through to the late 19th century was a story of an advancing frontier. Now, others, historians today sort of question that. I still find it a very useful view about the gradual colonisation of what is to become the United States, the frontier, inquisitiveness, what's over the next horizon, what's beyond? Acquisition, I'll take this land and if Indigenous peoples are there, well, we do a treaty and we give them that land where the cattle can't grow, cattle can't live, or the wheat can't grow. We will exploit this land. And if you are a Trekkie, a follower of Star Trek, you will know, Star Trek is marvellous as a source for American attitudes towards history.

There's a PhD in it for someone to follow that through. But you remember that every episode began with space, the final frontier, frontier, the final frontier, was Trump thinking in the same way when he set up this new group, this new military group, this new military space group? And then it says, to boldly go where no man has gone before. Well, forget the split infinitive, it's an excellent description of inquisitiveness, acquisition, and exploitation, to boldly go when no man has gone before. I give you that as a title for your PhD on American history. So let me return to the story of the first English and Spanish arrivals in North America. Both nations sought to explore this unknown territory, to plant their flags and hopefully, to exploit its riches. They didn't know what they might find, but they were confident that they would find them.

The early history of the modern state of Virginia, slightly expanded to what it was originally, but Virginia, North Carolina, provides a really interesting insight to Spanish and English settlement in what is to become the United States. As early as 1540, so that's long after de Leon but long before Drake, in 1540, a party of Spaniards entered what is now Virginia. And they entered it and they were quite clear why they were going, they were looking for gold. But it was the English in 1584 and again in 1587 that sought to establish a settlement, a colony in what is Virginia at Roanoke. The man behind it, of course, was Raleigh. And what was Raleigh hoping

to do? Make money out of it. Make money. And you all know that the Roanoke Colony failed. But in 1603, the first year of King James I reign in England, he established the Virginia Company. There were a huge number of companies being established at the end of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century in England, the Muscovy Company, for example, the East India Company is another one. And slightly later on in the century, the Hudson Bay Company. All of these companies, private companies but given royal charters.

The Virginia Company was established for colonisation of Virginia. And in 1606, 3 years after the company was formed, three little ships sailed from England, the Susan Constant, the Godspeed, and the Discovery. I've stood on board a replica of one of those ships that indeed made the journey across the Atlantic. All I can say is I don't know how they ever managed it, how they ever managed it. The ships are so small, so tiny, they could be blown away by this simple gust of a wind. And yet these people set out, inquisitive for the unknown, acquisition of land, and exploitation to make money. And of course, they landed at Plymouth, as everyone knows. But men went and women didn't go. And in 1619, the Virginia Company recruited potential wives for the male colonists, do not ask, please, what sort of women volunteered to go. It's not your auntie who volunteered to go, let's put it quite like that. And that same year that the women arrived from England in 1619, so did a ship from a different part of the world arrive in Virginia to the British colony. And that was a ship that had sailed from Angola with slaves, the first such slave ship. Black slaves.

So we add to the Europeans' dismissal of Indigenous populations now the Europeans' dismissal of their African slave populations too. A problem that is going to haunt America right into the 21st century. And why do they bring them? They bring them because the Indigenous tribal folk, they find, are not good workers. And so what have they got to work on? Well, it's, of course, Virginian tobacco. That's what they've got to work on. Now, there's a problem about tobacco. As tobacco flows into Europe from England, originally, of course, from Virginia, the demand for tobacco grows. And Virginians can grow tobacco, it grows easily. But in order to do so, they have to push out. They have to push out and bring more land under cultivation for tobacco plantations. And in pushing out, they push the Indigenous tribal people out as well, but they don't count, you see, they're merely savages and Europeans are so much more, was their view. Devastated by smallpox and measles brought by the English to Virginia, the Powhatans and their allied tribes are reduced in size and lose a great deal of self-esteem as well as their land. The story, if you like, of America.

And then, then there's a huge change, everything changes for America then and for America today. Away with all these Spanish, English, French exploiters, furs, gold, tobacco, what you will. They're sailed in 1620, first from Harwich on the East Coast and then from Plymouth on the south coast. They're sailed, the Pilgrim Fathers. And they're different. They sail because they want out of England. They want a place where they might worship their God in their own way, not constrained by the establishment of the Church of England. Moreover, they want to rule themselves and govern themselves and not live in an authoritarian country of James I and Charles I. They set out believing God has directed them across the Atlantic, men, women,

children. These women are quite different. This is your tough auntie that comes prepared for any hardship. It's the great seismic shift. It gives a quite different dimension to American colonial life. These people are different people. These people who arrive in New England are different. Their motivation is different. And they can never, ever go home.

To go back to England would not only be admitting their own failure, but would be admitting that God had failed, because God had provided them a city built upon a hill and all the other words that they used, a new Jerusalem. And God could not fail. So they could never, ever return, however tough it was, they would have to stay, they would have to tough it out. And by God, they did. They were in North America not for the short haul of making money and going back home again, Madrid, Paris, London, they're there forever. And that is a difference. It's a seismic difference in the history of America. It's different than English colonisation of Canada. It's different than English colonisation of New Zealand later and of Australia and certainly South Africa, this is very different. This has a quite different feel about it. And those, one of the things that, some of you heard me give a talk about democracy, one of the things they bring with them, this idea that you could govern yourselves.

And so when they write the constitutions of Connecticut and Massachusetts, these are Englishmen writing these, Englishmen who could not abide the rule of James I and Charles I, but in America, they can write these rules. And Connecticut and Massachusetts are the first and huge development in the world. This is long, long before the French Revolution and indeed, long before the American Revolution as well. I can't emphasise too much the importance of this moment. An American writer, Robert McCracken, has written, "We on this continent," America, "We on this continent should never forget that men first crossed the Atlantic not to find soil for their ploughs, but to secure liberty for their souls." Isn't that lovely? Not to find soil for their ploughs, but to secure liberty for their souls. These are a different people. These are a people who bring a moral message, an idealistic message, which remains in the United States to this day. I like to think that many of those Puritans, if they could have listened to Biden's inaugural speech, might well have applauded, despite the fact that Biden was Catholic, they would've applauded, because the things that they believed in were alive and well centuries after they arrived and struggled so hard.

Now, I'm going to do more about the Puritans 'cause it's so important both to British history but also to American history, and I'm going to talk about that when I next speak to all of you on Thursday, the 18th of February. So it's something to look forward to or something to avoid, however you want to take it. Now, up to this point, I've not said much or at all about the French. Now, you can, if you so choose, put it down to British prejudice. And my British friends listening will say, oh, that's typical of William, he's being anti-French. Well, no, not really. If you put the joke aside, it's key to an understanding of the history of why America became English America and not French America. Because the English and the French exported their traditional antipathy towards each other as well as their wars from Europe into North America, into Canada, as well as to the United States. In doing so, both recruited Indigenous Native Americans to fight for one side against the other.

They might have been savages, but they're our savages. Just a little aside. When I was a little boy and excited at playing Cowboys and Indians, as we did in the 1950s, we were always, little boys were always intrigued by horror. And we were absolutely enthralled by the horror of scalping. We were told that that's what the tribes did. What we weren't told is the tribes copied it from the English because the English had scalped people in Ireland. It was like horses for the native Indigenous peoples who had no horses until the Spanish brought them, and they didn't scalp until the English taught them how. So much, so much for civilised Europeans. Tonight is Burns Night in Scotland. And Robbie Burns wrote, "Give us eyes to see ourselves as others see us." Give us eyes to see ourselves as others see us.

And if, like me, you're white European, white American with a European background, we have to see ourselves as others see us, as Black Americans see white Americans, as black British see white British, as Indigenous people see white Americans, as Indigenous people see white Canadians, as Indigenous peoples in Australia see Australians and in all places, the British too. We need to understand, and I tried to say a little bit about that when I was talking about the conquistadors. Most of the French exploration took part in what is today Canada, and the French were interested in the fur trade, that is what got them interested. The Spanish were interested in gold and silver. The English settlers were interested in land and freedom. And in other places like Virginia, in crops that made money, in tobacco and later, of course, in cotton. The first major French exploration took place in 1524, again, before Drake.

And they employed an Italian, well, those days, a lot of the Italians were the better sailors. After all, John Cabot, who sailed from my home city of Bristol to Newfoundland, was Italian. And he was given the task of exploring the coastline from Florida to Newfoundland because the French were seeking a quick way through to the Pacific. And they thought there simply must be a channel somewhere between Florida and Newfoundland through which the ships could sail. In other words, a natural Panama Canal, they didn't find it. Instead of which, they find in the north of that, in Canada, the fur trade. In 1534, the king of France, a man called Francis I, sent a Frenchman, Jacques Cartier, on the first of three voyages he undertook around the coast of Newfoundland and up the Saint Lawrence River. He attempted to create a settlement, rather like Raleigh had attempted to create a settlement at Roanoke in Virginia. So Cartier attempted to set up a settlement at what is now Quebec, Quebec City, in 1541. He called it Cap-Rouge, the Red Cape. And he had 400 settlers. But they abandoned it the next year in the same way that Roanoke was abandoned.

They had suffered from bad weather, they couldn't plant crops and eat, and they were hounded by Native Indigenous tribes. So that first French settlement failed. In the end, the French controlled three areas of North America. And I've always found this quite difficult. The first area is easy, it's Quebec, so think of French-speaking Quebec in Canada today, so that's it, that's Quebec. The second area was Acadia. And that was the maritime provinces of Canada on the East Coast and a large part of the modern American state of Maine. That was Acadia. And the third is the most complicated, Acadia I'll come back to because there's complication there. But

the most confusing of all is Louisiana. The French had a part of North America they called Louisiana. It included the modern American state of Louisiana, but it is totally wrong to think of it as Louisiana, the American state of the 21st century. It was a huge area.

It laid to the west of where the British had settled. And they basically claimed the whole of central North America, of the United States, and anything, well, they didn't know what, but anything to the west of that. Technically, it extended from the Gulf of Mexico to Vincennes, now in Indiana, it was a huge area, but they didn't settle it. They had a few forts there. And which there is, if you think of the forts, you think of Beau Geste and the forts that the French built in North Africa in the 19th century, these desert forts, these prairie forts, but they didn't control it in the same way that the Spanish didn't control the West Coast on which they were pressing up from Central America. And they didn't control it because their biggest problem was they didn't have anyone settling there. The French simply didn't want to go to America. Remember that the English who come to New England have no choice but to go because it's what they're escaping and then what they're planning to build. And of course, once you get into the position of having constitutions in Massachusetts and Connecticut and you begin to have cities like Boston, then people want to move across.

Sometimes in Britain, when you're teaching early American history, people ask you, "What would have Boston been like just before American Independence?" And my answer is always, well, like my city of Bristol. It would've been just like Bristol. And what do you mean by that? Well, it would've had the same books that people read. It had furniture imported from England. It even had newspapers imported from England. They were English, Boston was an English city, like Dublin was a British city and Edinburgh was a British city. So Boston you would compare to Bristol. No, true, there weren't Bristolians there, if you want to find west country people speaking in a west country accent, well, my dears, you got to go north, you got to go up to Newfoundland. And there, in quite modern times, people who've been researching western England folk songs have found them alive and well in Canada, in the same way that Scottish folklore experts, academics, have found them alive and well in Nova Scotia.

But in terms of the French, they don't settle. They're there because if they're not there, the English will take it, they can't have that. And of course, they're seeking, well, El Dorado, if you like, they might suddenly hit something more valuable even than fur. When war breaks out in North America between England and France in 1754, part of what is going to become a wider Seven Years' War in Europe between England and France, when it breaks out in 1754, the American population English to French is on a ratio of 20 English to one French. Other academic research in America give different estimates. One estimate is there were two million British to 60,000 French. Well, 60,000 are never going to make it. Two million not only will make it, but do make it. The French, of course, the French government back in Paris tries to do things about this. Cardinal Richelieu issued an act in Paris which said that any Native Americans who converted to Catholicism would be regarded as Frenchmen in order to boost the numbers. And that was issued as early as 1627.



The British never needed to do that. Louis XIV tried to increase the population by sending 800 young women, known rather euphemistically as the king's daughters. Well, we'll cast a poll over whom they might actually be, they're prostitutes, basically, who are given money to go. And it's never going to work. The French are never going to win, now, Quebec is different. Quebec is different. And had it not been for Wolfe in Quebec, you might well have seen Canada split. After all, de Gaulle is still going on about that in the 20th century. But in terms of the United States, no, there's no chance. If it isn't going to be an English America, it will be a Spanish America. At the end of the war that was started in the States and in Canada in 1754 between England and France, it ended, as did the war in Europe, in 1763. And France is defeated everywhere. And France is forced to cede what it caused New France to Great Britain, except for two little islands which it still holds off Canada, Saint Pierre and Miquelon.

They surrender the rest at the Treaty of Paris, which ended the war, and Britain retained Canada. No opportunity now for Quebec to turn part of Canada or even the whole of Canada French, that's gone, Canada is British. And Acadia on that maritime coast of Canada and down to Maine disappears. And where do the Acadians go? Well, most of them move south into what is to become the United States and to what is to become the state of Louisiana. And there, because the English, British Americans couldn't get their tongues around French, they ceased to be Acadians and become Cajuns. It's the Cajun population of Louisiana. Spain got a bit of Louisiana, it's true, in 1763, but they sold it back to Bonaparte, and Bonaparte sold all remaining French possessions in the Louisiana Purchase in 1803 to the recently established independent United States government. So in 1803, France is kaput in North America. But it was the victory in the Seven Years' War that made sure that both Canada and the States would not be French. And there's a little parenthesis, where do you think George Washington learned his skills as a military commander?

Well, as an officer within the British army fighting the French in that Seven Years' War. What an irony that is, that we trained Washington to be such an outstanding general who then defeats the British. After all, he knew exactly the sort of men he was up against and he knew exactly their thinking, or perhaps lack of thinking is more to the point. So France is a busted flush by 1763 and totally busted by 1803. But what of Spanish North America? Well, the Spaniards, as I said, had advanced not only on the East Coast in Florida, but on the West Coast as well. And the Spaniards are always searching for gold and silver. Of course, little did they know that there was gold to be found in California, they weren't to find it. They established, they attempted to establish colonies, but rather like the French, they were small, tiny, little more than forts. We're told by, I quote, "By 1750, what remained of the Spanish in North America amounted to little more than military outposts." And why? Spain could have done better. It could have pushed up the West Coast, leave Florida on one side, it could have pushed up the West Coast.

And with the plains and the centre of North America being unexplored for, until the 19th century, it would've meant that the West Coast would've been Spanish and the East Coast British. Thus, when the United States was formed in 1776, the West Coast could have remained Spanish and presumably would've gained its independence at the beginning of the 19th century, rather like

the Spanish possessions in South and Central America. And so you would've landed up by middle of the 19th century with what we call the United States in two parts, an east and a west. But it didn't work out like that, because of Spanish didn't find the gold and the silver they hoped for, they lost interest. They lost interest. The British never lost interest. And the Americans after them never lost interest. What's over that hill? What's across that river? What's beyond that horizon? Go west, young man, was the cry.

And go west they did, frontier after frontier collapsed, sometimes the frontiers were a barrier for quite a time like the Appalachians. And then you push through and then you push on. And if it was difficult in the 17th century in New England, my God, it must have been difficult on the plains as they pushed ever westwards. Spain, like France, had failed to establish itself as the European power or the European people or the European culture that would dominate the United States. What dominates the United States is the English culture, and I use the word English advisedly, I'm not talking about British. Canada's story is different, lots of Scots in Canada. But in terms of United States, it's English culture, it's English culture that provides Massachusetts, Connecticut, with its constitution, and it's the constitutions of Massachusetts and Connecticut that provide the United States of America with its constitution. So its English basis is firmly established. However, in the 21st century, America has become more polyglot, has become more ethnically diverse than ever. Why?

Well, we know why. Because of the massive immigration from poor areas of Europe, think Italians, for example, in the 19th century, from Central Europe. And then, of course, continuing right through today, from Asia, from Central and South America. The whole demography of the United States has changed. And to call the United States now an English nation would be nonsense, would it not? That does not mean that the ideas and beliefs, morality and culture of the East Coast New Englanders, the Puritans, is not of enormous significance in terms of modern-day American culture, of course it's important. But if you look at the demographics, in an American demographic survey, it estimates that by 2050, the population of Hispanics and Latino Americans will rise to 30% as opposed to just roughly over 15% today, it's going to double by 2050, nearly double. So you could argue that it's becoming more Hispanic.

What does that, is that important? Well, in some ways, it's not important. It's only important, perhaps, well, to Britain, it's important because it may be that the United States looks to Spain as its European ally rather than to Britain. I know that the United States has looked to France because of the French support at independence, but in truth, the United States has found, like everyone else, that the French were a busted flush really internationally. And they've stuck with Britain. But what about Spain? What about the future of that? How interesting. We've yet to have a Hispanic president or vice president, but Kamala Harris shows that the changes are happening. And Biden as the second Catholic with Irish background president is certainly not New England. So things are changing. But the truth is, always comes back to, it's the New Englanders that put their mark on the country that's going to become the United States of America in 1776. The future, who knows? The future, who knows?

Will we see a Hispanic president in our lifetimes? Will we see a Black American president in our lifetimes? That's more likely, I think. Will we see an Indigenous Native American president? Probably very unlikely. Will we see America stay together or will we see America split, as it tried to split in 1860? Will we see further split? Will it be an east-west split rather than a south-north split? Will it be a, who knows? Everything might be up for grabs. And Biden's presidency may be absolutely central to the future of America this century. If unity means more than words, it's going to be fascinating. Now, I thought that sounded awfully serious to end on, and I probably incensed in large numbers of you, particularly Americans. So I thought I must finish on a lighter note. And I mentioned Star Trek earlier. To boldly go where no man and so on.

The late actor Leonard Nimoy from the series Star Trek once said this, which I find absolutely fantastic, it's very funny and it said a great deal about American population. Leonard Nimoy said, "My folks came to the US as immigrants, as aliens, and they became citizens. I," says Nimoy, "I was born in Boston, a citizen. I went to Hollywood and I became an alien." Thanks very much indeed. You may have some points, you may have some questions. And I'm open to emails after it's all over, please don't leave a message on my blog, if you want to get in touch with me, just send an email, I promise I will reply. Can we open up, Judi, to anyone who wants to ask a question?

- [Judi] Yes, the Q&A, hi, the Q&A is at the bottom.

- Oh, I've got, yes, I've got some here, sorry.

- [Judi] There should be at least 54 in your Q&A.

Q&A and Comments:

Q: I have some. Oh, could I share the name of the book I was quoting?

A: I think it's a, if it's the one with the reference, The American West is on my blog. The other book I quoted from is a book of primary sources. It's called How It Happened in America and it edited by Jon Lewis, L-E-W-I-S. How It Happened in America edited by Jon Lewis is a book of primary sources, that's where I read Drake and de Leon from.

Q: What route did Drake take?

A: Well, he went around, to get from England to California, well, he went around the Cape Horn. And yes, you're right, around the coast of South America.

Q: Why do I think the term Indian is still used?

A: Well, if you are American or Canadian, you have to tell me why the term Indian is still used. I think we would not use it in Britain, it would be considered very non-PC to refer to Indian. I have

to say that I found it very difficult when speaking because I'm not quite sure how you refer to it. I think Canadians would say First, the First People. It's, and I hope I haven't offended anyone with the language I used, but I wouldn't use Indian. And I think most Americans and almost all Canadians would not use the word. Don't ask me why suddenly, words become words we can't use. Those of you who are my age, whichever country you are in, there are certain words now that we cannot use, and I don't just mean referring to Black people, but words in general that you can't use. There's been a big argument in England over the last week about the phrase nitty-gritty, which was said to be racist, about slavery. But as far as I'm aware, it actually refers to having lice in your hair. But who knows? It gets very confusing.

Oh, somebody's just put a point on, oh, I like people who put points without asking questions. When the Americans wanted to buy the freehold of their embassy in Grosvenor Square in London, the Grosvenors who owned it were reluctant to sell it. After much pressure from the Americans, they said they would swap, I like that. Oh. You mentioned that America conveyed its racism from the initial nub of the colonists throughout its expansion to include the Philippines. Please expand on the influence of England to this racism. No, England's, the Philippines, I'm sorry to say, was entirely American racism and was nothing to do with us. But on the other hand, the racism of 19th century America is exactly the same as the racism of 19th century Britain, there is no difference. That is how we regarded non-Europeans.

And the actions of America in the Philippines were no different than the actions of the British across their empire. I only mention it because, really, because it underpins this business about America being so European and so English European. But by the time we get to the Philippines story, which is at the end of the Spanish-American War, then we really are in different territories. Oh, as I mentioned the Spanish-American War, would you like a little Churchill story? Churchill went to Cuba in the Spanish-American War and he fought alongside and observed alongside the Spanish against the Americans. That isn't so important or interesting as the fact that he was absolutely intrigued that the Cuban women rolled cigars on their bare thighs. Remember, he was young. And it was seeing the women with the cigars on their bare thighs that apparently led Churchill to smoke cigars for the rest of his life. I bet he never told Clemmy that story, but it's true. Somebody's saying about Florida, I think you're probably asking if the land was stolen from the Indigenous Americans, what were they given, there was no deal.

No, there wasn't necessarily deals everywhere simply because the tribes moved of their own volition or entirely decimated by European illnesses. That's true along most of the East Coast of America, not just Florida, it's true in New England. It's when we get later to the conflict in the plains that we get these treaties. There were treaties but not quite the same as these very formal treaties between the US government and people like the Soo, for example, which is much later. In the east, no, it was by fighting, by disease, and by pushing people westwards. But of course, then there was westwards to go. Eventually, there's nowhere for the Indigenous peoples to go further west. Oh. That's right, somebody from Canada says, "In Canada, we use the term contact as the time when Europeans met Indigenous people." Absolutely right, and the Australians do that as well, first contact. I'm actually, I'm so pleased you mentioned that because

I'm actually thinking at the moment of preparing a course here in Britain called First Contact of Europeans, not just British, but Europeans in general who made first contact with Indigenous peoples and how they reacted to that. But of course, the Romans had that first contact with the Celts here when they came into Britain in 43 AD. And their contact was because they were fed up with the British Celts stirring up the Celts to fight Rome in what is now France.

Yes, now, that's very interesting. Somebody, now, that is a very interesting point that Elliot makes. So the Puritans were God-fearing settlers, yes, that's true, who did not come to America in quest of treasure, true. But within a few years, they were engaged in massacres of Native Americans, also true. Do not expect from Evangelical Christians that they are free of hypocrisy. They saw nothing wrong in attacking Native Americans and massacring them. Did they not see them as God's people? No, they didn't. They saw them as savages. And we find all of that extremely difficult to understand, but that is the mindset of the 17th century. You're absolutely right, do not look for consistency of morality, if you want to take the point further, think of the witchcraft trials at Salem in Massachusetts, again, imported from Europe. It was nonsense, absolute nonsense. And yet women were killed because they were accused of witchcraft. So yeah, absolutely right.

Q: Oh, where did the English scalping come from?

A: It's sort of well-documented, I haven't quickly got a source off the top. Oh, but can I do a personal thing? Apparently, last week, I missed a question and answer, which was a comment from somebody listening, I don't know where, maybe in England, who said they remembered me from the past at the City Lit. I didn't see it, I don't remember your name, so I don't know your name. If you want to get in contact, just email me, and the email's on Judi Ferreira's site. So just give me an email, I look forward to hearing from you. Oh, Huguenots. Yeah, the Huguenots are later. Yes, there are moves by Huguenots to Canada, for example. Huguenots, the French Protestants thrown out by Louis XIV. But most of them settled here, many of them settled here in England. And they brought skills that were well-paid in England. Lace-making, hairdressing, I love that, hairdressing, and copper work, all sorts of things, but not a big story for the States. It's different. Somebody said, when I was young, oh no, when I taught, there was a wonderful book called Explorers Got Lost, the French were looking for China.

And when they came up the Saint Lawrence, Cartier thought he'd found China and he called the first. Oh, wonderful, I love that. Well, typical of the French, isn't it? I'm sorry. I think that's absolutely fantastic. Oh, thank you so much for that, I didn't know that. Yeah, you're right, with a great number of Spanish-speaking people, America might well become a Spanish America in the future. Well, my argument is it won't, and it won't because they will accept the infrastructure of America in however you wish to define infrastructure, constitutionally or just in terms of outlook, which is, and I don't think will change, is English. Can I share a little story with my American friends who are listening? At the time of 9/11, which was horrifying for everyone across the world, as we watched it on television here in Britain. And I was doing a lot of lecturing around the county of Essex, north of London at the time, out every night to different parts of

Essex.

I never realised there were so many stars and stripe flags actually held in the county where every little village seemed to be flying stars and stripes in support. And when we went to our local supermarket, our fire brigade was collecting money in buckets for the New York fire brigade, and it's the only time I've ever known British people throw in notes rather than coins. It was quite amazing, the outpouring. And to say that there isn't that link is nonsensical. There is, from a British point of view, there is a very, it's nothing to do with politicians, it's nothing to do with politics and Boris and Biden and the rest of it, nothing to do with that. It was actually that we felt that these were our kith and kin. And it was an extraordinary moment, I never expected it. Of course, if you do come to Essex, you need to go to one of the little villages. And if you go into the pub, it's got a stars and stripes that flew over the White House 'cause it was presented by Bush. Because the Bush family, unlike Biden, who comes from a very poor background in Ireland, the Bushes were gentry in England, by no means were they poor, they were gentry, they were Puritan gentry who travelled, very interesting.

Yes, Richelieu also, what, good point, good point, Maryanne. Richelieu also decreed that only Catholics could settle in New France. That is no Protestants or Jews. That is why, to this day, only Catholics consider themselves true Quebecians, I'm not going to pronounce it as you've spelled it, I will pronounce it wrong. Absolutely, that's very interesting. It's the same as Richelieu saying that, if you converted Indigenous peoples to Catholicism, they became French. And no, they could not, Stan. Do I know the Massachusetts and Connecticut? Yeah, Connecticut, do I know the origin of the names? I'm not going to put my neck on the block. I think Connecticut is a local Indian tribe. Massachusetts, I'd have to check on that. Yeah, no, somebody's put correctly. They were not all prostitutes, many young girls were orphans, illegitimate girls who were abandoned. Yeah, that's fine. I'm not going to comment on the seigneurial system. We're not past, in Britain, the nine o'clock watershed. Somebody's recommended... It sounds like cricket in India, the British taught the Indians how to play cricket. Well, if everybody played cricket, we would be in a happier place, shall I say?

Afghanistan plays cricket, I think that's a big hope for Afghanistan. Trouble is, they all become better than we are. And no, I didn't talk about how the Founding Fathers treated Native Americans because I'm going to do that on Thursday, the 18th of February when I talk about the Puritans and try and say that it's not all sweetness and light. And I shall also mention witchcraft as well as attitudes towards Native Americans, absolutely right. And I just short-circuited it for today. Was the, oh, that's a very good thought.

Q: Was the French support of the Revolutionary War integral to its success?

A: My answer, no. What was integral to its success was the sheer incompetence of the British. It was not possible, as it was not possible in India, once the Americans wanted out, and same in 1930s, once the Indians want out, there is no way that Britain can hang on. What do we do, pour more and more troops into America? It wasn't possible. We tried to do that, of course, and

found that the lines of communication were far too long. It was not ever going to be possible. The only way that America could ever have been held within the Empire is if we had modern methods of communication and indeed, that we had American Members of Parliament. In the Middle Ages, for example, when Britain held part of Northern France, there were Northern French MPs sat in Westminster. So there was an MP, for example, from the town of Tourne. Now, if we could have had the MP for Boston West, well, maybe, but that was never going to be possible. And if you say, well, what about Canada? Well, Canada was very tiny in comparison in terms of population. The story of Canada is on a different time scale. So when the time scale catches up, then Canada can remain within the Commonwealth in a different way, that was never, ever going to be possible. But it also is impossible because of these Puritans, they hate their country they've come from. These are not people who liked us.

These are people who went, Oliver Cromwell said they were the very best of us that left. Well, that's an interesting thought. But they certainly weren't going to return, they'd had'n't, they wanted to wash Britain from their soles of their feet. The Canadians are not in the same position. And then, of course, after the American War of Independence, so many empire loyalists who were loyal to Britain, many of them Scots, actually moved to Canada, reinforcing that and then reinforcing the view. You remember that the French Catholic Church said very clearly to Canadian Catholics, to French Canadian Catholics after 1776, do not rebel, stay with King George, because the alternative is, quote, "those damn Yankees." And so there's a very big difference there that develops. The Empire, just thinking about the Empire loyalists after 1776, a lot of, as I say, Scots, the last claymore charge, like the charge at the Battle of Cologne, never took place in Scotland. It actually took place in the southern states of America, fighting for the British against the revolutionaries in America, against the Americans, even though many of them had fought earlier for Bonnie Prince Charlie in 1746 against the English, in America, they fight for the English against the Americans.

So they're quite happy to become Canadian. And what defines Canada is it remains British. Now I've annoyed everyone, I've annoyed all the Americans, I've annoyed all the Canadians. I think I better stop shortly. I shall annoy, I've got some South Africans to annoy yet and some English, or I probably annoyed the English before I started. Oh, I did not quite get how those Spaniards got to the West Coast, they came up from Central America. It's by foot, it's not by boat. They come up into those southwestern states. They move up the West Coast in search, as I say, of gold and silver, which they don't find, they lose interest. And remember that, by the time you get to the 1820s when Florida ceases to be Spanish, it is because of the Napoleonic Wars in Europe where the Spaniards are defeated. And over in the South American colonies is their opportunity to break free, people like Simon Bolivar. And so after 1820, you can forget the Spanish. Please include in the diversity of America on cultural basis of freed slaves. Yes, of course, that's outside the period that I was talking about. And that feeds in, as I said, a quite different dimension today. That, absolutely true. Thank you, people who put nice things on and thank you, people who've corrected me. Yes, in Canada, they use the term First Nations. Oh yeah, we've seen a Black American US president, Barack Obama, yeah, that's true, of course.

- William, I'm going to jump in now and just say-

- Yes, okay.

- I'm going to let you off the hook. I just want to say, thank you very, very much. And also just to mention that there were almost 1800 people on devices today, so maybe you shouldn't be promising to answer every single email. Maybe best to say, I'll do my best.

- I will try, I will try to answer.

- Yeah, you can just say, I'll do my very best to answer because...

- Well, if I get 1800... I have three proposals of marriage, but I'm already married, so that was no-

- I've had many requests, I've had many questions asking whether you're married, so you've certainly captivated the hearts, not only the minds, upon many of the participants. So thanks again for a really, truly fascinating presentation and to be continued.

- To be continued, thank you ever so much, Wendy, I've enjoyed it, I hope everyone else has.

- Good, so now have a glass of whiskey or a glass of wine and relax, and thank you very, very much.

- Bye, everyone.

- Goodnight, everybody, bye-bye.

- Bye.