



HIST 2111

U.S. HISTORY TO THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

Dr. Franklin Williamson
 Assistant Professor of History
 Gordon State College

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Working Draft – Subject to Change

INTRODUCTION.....Background, first contact, and transformation

Video: Natives and Spaniards

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6E9WU9TGrec&index=1&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (11:20)

Primary source: Bartolomeo de las Casas, *A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies* (1542):

<http://web.archive.org/web/19980116133031/http://pluto.clinch.edu/history/wciv2/civ2ref/casas.htm>

CHAPTER ONE..... The Colonial South

Video: Colonial South/Colonial North

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o69TvQqyGdg> (12:26)

Primary source: Nathaniel Bacon, *Declaration in the Name of the People* (July 30, 1676): <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1651-1700/bacons-declaration-in-the-name-of-the-people-30-july-1676.php>

CHAPTER TWO.....The Colonial North

Video: Colonial South/Colonial North

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TTYOQ05oDOI&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=3> (11:27)

Primary source: *Charter of Massachusetts Bay* (1629):

<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1600-1650/charter-of-massachusetts-bay-1629.php>

CHAPTER THREE.....Eighteenth Century Colonial Life

Video: Eighteenth century colonial life

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p47tZLJbdag&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=4> (11:38)

Primary sources: (1) *Gottlieb Mittelberger On the Misfortune of indentured Servants (1754)*: <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1600-1650/gottlieb-mittelberger-on-the-misfortune-indentured-servants.php>

(2) Olaudah Equiano, *The Life of Gustavus Vassa (1789)*: <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/mod/Vassa.asp>

CHAPTER FOUR.....The French and Indian War

Video: The French and Indian War

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5vKGU3aEGss&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=5> (10:40)

Primary source: Governor Glen, *the Role of the Indians in the Rivalry Between France, Spain, and England (1761)*:
<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1751-1775/governor-glen-the-role-of-the-indians-in-the-rivalry-between-france-spain-and-england-1761.php>

CHAPTER FIVE.....The American Revolution-Part One

Video: The American Revolution, part I

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Eytc9ZaNWyc&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=6> (12:19)

Primary source: *Resolutions of the First Continental Congress (October, 1774)*: <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1751-1775/first-continental-congress-october-1774.php>

CHAPTER SIX.....The American Revolution-Part Two

Video: The American Revolution, part II

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3EiSymRrKI4&index=7&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (12:41)

Primary sources: (1) Charles Inglis, *The True Interest of America Impartially Stated* (1776): <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1776-1785/charles-inglis-the-true-interest-of-america-impartially-stated-1776.php>

(2) Thomas Jefferson, *Declaration of Independence* (1776): <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1776-1785/the-final-text-of-the-declaration-of-independence-july-4-1776.php>

CHAPTER SEVEN.....African Americans and Women

Video: African Americans and Women

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bO7FQsCcbD8&index=8&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (13:04)

Primary sources: (1) Thomas Jefferson, *Thoughts on Slavery* (1782): <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/presidents/thomas-jefferson/jefferson-on-slavery.php>

(2) Judith Sargent Murray, *On the Equality of the Sexes* (1790): <http://www.digital.library.upenn.edu/women/murray/equality/equality.html>

CHAPTER EIGHT.....The Early Republic

Video: Early Republic

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r161cLYzuDI&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=9> (13:57)

Primary source: George Washington, *Proclamation on the Whiskey Rebellion* (1794): http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/gwproc03.asp

CHAPTER NINE.....Jeffersonian Democracy

Videos: Jeffersonian Era

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_3Ox6vGteek&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=10 (13:19)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qMXqg2PKJZU&index=11&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (12:43)

Primary sources: (1) *The Sedition Act of 1798:*
<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/the-sedition-act-of-1798.php>

(2) *The Kentucky Resolution of 1799:*
<http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/documents/1786-1800/kentucky-resolution-1799.php>

CHAPTER TEN.....The Market Revolution

Video: Market Revolution

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RNftCCwAol0&index=12&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (14:11)

Primary source: Harriet Hanson Robinson, *The Lowell Mill Girls Go On Strike* (1836): <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5714>

CHAPTER ELEVEN.....The North and Nineteenth Century Thought

Video: The North in the 19th century

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ajn9g5Gsv98&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=13> (14:25)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=beN4qE-e5O8&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=14> (15:05)

Primary source: Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Self-Reliance* (1841):
<https://emersoncentral.com/texts/essays-first-series/self-reliance/>

CHAPTER TWELVE.....The South: Slavery and Southern Life

Video: The South in the 19th century

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t62fUZJvjOs&index=15&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (14:47)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fM1czS_VYDI&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=16 (13:11)

Primary source: Richard Furman, *Exposition of The Views of the Baptists Relative to the Coloured Population in the United States in a Communication to the Governor of South Carolina* (1838):
<http://eweb.furman.edu/~benson/docs/rcd-fmn1.htm>

CHAPTER THIRTEEN.....Western Expansion

Video: Western Expansion

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tkdF8pOFUfl&index=17&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (12:47)

Primary source: John O'Sullivan on *Manifest Destiny* (1839):
<https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/osulliva.htm>

CHAPTER FOURTEEN....Sectional Conflict

Video: Sectional Conflict

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=roNmeOOJCDY&index=18&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (14:16)

Primary sources: (1) *The Fugitive Slave Act* (September 18, 1850):
<https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/mod/1850fugitive.asp>

CHAPTER FIFTEEN.....Civil War

Video: Civil War

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rY9zHNOjGrs&index=20&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (12:01)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GzTrKccmj_l&index=22&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s (10:54)

Primary sources: (1) Alexander H. Stephens, *Cornerstone Address* (March 21, 1861): <https://sourcebooks.fordham.edu/mod/1861stephens.asp>

(2) Abraham Lincoln, *Emancipation Proclamation* (1862): <http://www.let.rug.nl/usa/presidents/abraham-lincoln/the-emancipation-proclamation-1863.php>

YouTube Crash Course in U.S. History videos

Introduction: Natives and Spaniards

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6E9WU9TGrec&index=1&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (11:20)

Chapter One and Chapter Two: Colonial South/Colonial North

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o69TvQgyGdg> (12:26)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TTYOQ05oDOI&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=3> (11:27)

Chapter Three: Eighteenth century colonial life

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p47tZLJbdag&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=4> (11:38)

Chapter Four: The French and Indian War

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5vKGU3aEGss&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=5> (10:40)

Chapter Five and Chapter Six: The American Revolution, part I/II

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Eytc9ZaNWyc&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=6> (12:19)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3EiSymRrKI4&index=7&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (12:41)

Chapter Seven and Chapter Eight: African Americans and Women/Early Republic

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bO7FQsCcbD8&index=8&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (13:04)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r161cLYzuDI&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=9> (13:57)

Chapter Nine: Jeffersonian Era

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3Ox6vGteek&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=10> (13:19)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qMXqg2PKJZU&index=11&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (12:43)

Chapter Ten: Market Revolution

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RNftCCwAol0&index=12&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (14:11)

Chapter Eleven and Chapter Twelve: The North and the South in the 19th century

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ajn9g5Gsv98&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=13> (14:25)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=beN4qE-e5O8&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=14> (15:05)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t62fUZJvOs&index=15&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (14:47)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fM1czS_VYDI&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=16 (13:11)

Chapter Thirteen: Western Expansion

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tkdF8pOFUfI&index=17&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (12:47)

Chapter Fourteen: Sectional Conflict

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=roNmeOOJCDY&index=18&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (14:16)

Chapter Fifteen: Civil War

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rY9zHNOjGrs&index=20&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s> (12:01)

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GzTrKccmj_I&index=22&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s (10:54)

I. Virginia

A. Jamestown Settlement

The failure of the Roanoke colony was not the end of English colonial ambitions. In 1607, a group of businessmen established the **Virginia Company**, and secured a charter from King James I. They decided to plant a settlement this time at the Chesapeake Bay, which offered better harbors, many rivers, and fertile land. The company sent 104 men and boys where they established a small settlement called Jamestown on a swampy peninsula in a river. The goal of the colony was to find gold or other precious natural resources, perhaps trade with the Indians, and otherwise make money for the Virginia Company.

The English settlers successfully built small houses and a Church of England chapel but they simultaneously faced numerous challenges. The early settlers suffered from disease and a crisis of leadership. They also suffered from Indian attacks, many of which they themselves (the English) provoked. By January 1608, only thirty-eight of the original 104 survived. Many were gentlemen unaccustomed to working with their hands and others were military officers who insisted upon wearing their military armor around. They resisted hard labor and retained elaborate styles of dress. Only when Captain John Smith emerged as a leader, and imposed strict regulations on the colonists, did Jamestown have a chance to survive. But John Smith was injured in a gunpowder explosion and had to return to England. In his absence the winter of 1609-1610 was also difficult.

B. Relations with Indians

Maintaining peaceful relations with the Indians was another continual challenge to the English settlers (though the English themselves were often the aggressors). The **Powhatan Confederacy**, a group of six Eastern Woodlands Indians (the Algonquian Indians), traded some excess corn and food in exchange for guns, and this helped the settlers out. But the initially friendly relationship soured, and the Indians' crops failed during a drought, and the Indians became frustrated.

Pocahontas, meaning "playful one," was the nickname of the daughter of the Powhatan leader. As a child she was sent as an ambassador to Jamestown. She befriended the colonists and risked her life on several occasions to warn them of Indian attacks. The most famous incident was her intervention to save the life of Captain John Smith. She probably did it for humanitarian reasons rather than the romantic ones of legend, because she was only twelve at the time. In 1613 the English kidnapped her, but her father refused their demand for ransom. Left to live with the English, she adopted many of their ways. In 1614, at the age of nineteen, she married John Rolfe, perhaps as a form of diplomatic alliance.

Baptized a Christian, and taking the name Rebecca Rolfe, she was regarded as an example of the possibilities of converting the Indians. In fact, she was almost the only Indian ever converted, and nothing but total immersion in English culture brought it about. But in their day Rebecca and John Rolfe and their infant son seemed the perfect family to promote Virginia in England. They were entertained as celebrities in London. He sought to relieve fears about disease, the climate, and Indian hostility in Virginia. She impressed Londoners with her grace, intelligence, and competent English. She was touted as a princess, a European misconception about Indian society that persists to this day. She died suddenly -- possibly of tuberculosis or smallpox -- as she prepared to return to Virginia. She was just twenty-two, and Anglo-Powhatan relations deteriorated soon afterward.

C. Social, Economic, Legal Changes

Later generations of Americans would often look to Jamestown as a monumental example of free people exercising the right to govern themselves, and this is partly true. The first representative assembly in the New World convened in the Jamestown church on July 30, 1619. The General Assembly (later called the House of Burgesses) met in response to orders from the Virginia Company "to establish one equal and uniform government over all Virginia" which would provide "just laws for the happy guiding and governing of the people there inhabiting." However, the other crucial event that would play a role in the development of America was the arrival of Africans to Jamestown. All we know is that 19 Africans arrived in Jamestown on a Dutch ship. The Africans became indentured servants.

Fifteen years after its founding, Virginia was a difficult place to live. Tensions between the Indians and the settlers began to increase as the English encroached further and further upon the Indians' land and tried to convert more and more Indians to Christianity. Powhatan's brother coordinated a series of attacks all along the James River in 1622, and killed 347 settlers (1/4 of the total). This 1623 letter of Richard Frethorne, a young immigrant to Virginia shows one first-hand view of the colonists' troubles:

Loveing and kind father and mother my most humble duty remembered to you hoping in God of your good health, as I my selfe am at the makeing hereof, this is to let you understand that I your Child am in a most heavie Case by reason of the nature of the Country is such that it Causeth much sicknes [including scurvy and "the bloody flux"] . . . and when wee are sicke there is nothing to comfort us; for since I came out of the ship, I never at anie thing but pease, and loblollie (that is water gruell)[.] as for deare or venison I never saw anie since I came into this land there is indeed some foule, but Wee are not allowed to goe, and get yt, but must Worke hard both earelie, and late for a messe of water gruell, and a mouthfull of bread, and beife[.] a mouthfull of bread for a pennie loafe must serve for 4 men which is most pitifull if you did knowe as much as I, when people crie out day, and night, Oh that they were in England without their lymbes and would not care to loose anie lymbe to bee in England againe, yea though they beg from doore to doore. . . . I have nothing at all, no not a shirt to my backe, but two Ragges nor no Clothes, but one poore suite, nor but one paire of shooes, but one paire of stockins, but one Capp, but two bands, my Cloke is stollen by one of my owne fellowes, and to his dying hower would not tell mee what he did with it [although some friends saw the "fellowe" buy butter and beef from a ship, probably purchased with Frethorne's cloak]. . . . but I am not halfe a quarter so strong as I was in England, and all is for want of victualls, for I doe protest unto you, that I have eaten more in a day at home than I have allowed me here for a Weeke. . . .

O that you did see may daylie and hourelie sighes, grones, and teares, and thumpes that I afford mine owne brest, and rue and Curse the time of my birth with holy Job. I thought no head had beene able to hold so much water as hath and doth dailie flow from mine eyes.

It was becoming clear that Jamestown was wilting. Even though a last minute warning had spared the colony from another Indian attack, the threats posed by the Indians and the mismanagement of the Virginia Company at home together convinced the King that he should revoke the Virginia Company Charter. Of the 8,500 colonists who had been sent to Jamestown by the

Virginia Company, only 1,218 were left by 1624. Virginia became a royal colony in 1624 and under Crown leadership, Virginia began to prosper.

This turn of fortunes was due in large part to Virginian colonists' discovery of how to grow **tobacco**. As the tobacco boomed, and with a rising demand from Europe, the colony grew quickly by the 1630s. Once small English settlements began to increase, tobacco was established as the staple crop. The planting, cultivation, and harvesting of tobacco were time-consuming and required tough labor. Nearby Indians were reduced by war and disease and were hostile to the English in any event. The Virginians couldn't enslave them because they would just run away, and plus, men did not farm in Indian culture. Few slaves arrived until the 1650s, because the slave traders preferred to go to the Caribbean, where they could make more money.

In order to maximize the tobacco harvests (and, thus, profits), the colonists brought **indentured servants** to America. These servants were mainly English men. In return for their passage, they (the servant) signed a contract agreeing to work for between 4-7 years. 75% of the indentured servants were males between 15 and 24, and 15-20% were women (therefore the remaining 5-10% of indentured servants were men over age 24). These servants were from poor families in poor regions of England, and were people desperate to get across the Atlantic to try to improve their fortunes. Though their day-to-day experience was similar to that of African slaves (see below), it is important to point out the several differences between indentured servants and slaves.

First of all, indentured servants voluntarily entered into an indenture contract. True, they may have been facing starvation and destitution in England, so they may have felt they had no other choice but death or indenture, but they were not captured and forced into bondage. In fact, after serving their required terms, indentured servants would receive clothes, tools, livestock, corn and tobacco, and usually a small farm. Yet it was difficult work—6 days a week, 10-14 hours a day, in a warmer climate than England. Their masters could discipline or sell them, as they saw fit. If the servants ran away, their terms of services were lengthened. They were not allowed to marry. If women got pregnant, their terms of service were extended, and their children could even be taken away from them. They suffered from malaria, dysentery, typhoid, and other illnesses, and life expectancy was very low. Thus the indentured servant faced any number of hurdles in trying to survive and win their freedom.

By now, as the profit motive for the colony was being borne increasingly by tobacco farming, settlers intensively sought after increasing amounts of farmland. By the late 1600s, "free" land in Virginia was becoming less and less available to these English colonists. Consequently, England attracted fewer indentured servants. At this point, slavery became more attractive and more desirable to the larger and wealthier tobacco planters. This was partly due to the need to grant land to emancipated indentured servants; it was also due to tensions between poor former indentured servants-turned-farmers and their wealthier former masters. With the increasing presence of Africans and African-Americans in the late 1600s, Virginia began passing laws that made hereditary slavery binding on all African-Americans in the colony. Those who had once served as indentured servants alongside whites, and could own land and even their own slaves once their contracts were up, gradually found themselves discriminated against. Increasingly, the African-American population in Virginia became slave-based. Here are some examples:

1662-1705: the Virginia **House of Burgesses** (the colonial legislature) passed a series of laws defining slavery:

1662: Children born to Negro women were free or bonded according to the condition of the mother.

1667: The baptism of slaves as Christians did not alter their status as slaves.

1669: A master who killed a disobedient slave could not be accused of a felony.

1670: Free Negroes and Indians were prohibited from buying Christian indentured servants.

Even if white Virginians could agree on the second-class status of African-Americans (not to mention Indians), these free white colonists did not always form a united bloc on other issues, specifically economic ones. Since commodities are subject to the whims of supply and demand, prices can vary wildly, leaving farmers to get rich quick or fall into poverty suddenly. In the case of Virginia, tobacco prices fell, which made times tough. King Charles II passed a series of trade restrictions on the colonies, which hurt the economy further. A great depression set in, and the wealthy planters with the large farms began to clash with the poorer indentured servants and former indentured servants (who became small farmers after gaining their freedom). By 1674, $\frac{1}{4}$ of the former indentured servant population had no land, and the social stratification in Virginia was beginning to look like that in England. Dangerous, impatient, rebellious, and armed, these poor men presented a serious threat to the ruling elites. Plus, a renewed series of Indian attacks by the miniscule Indian population against the poorer farmers led these poorer whites to believe that the rich leaders of Virginia did nothing to protect them.

D. Bacon's Rebellion and the triumph of the Gentry

In 1676, a disgruntled planter who had an axe to grind, Nathaniel Bacon, led an insurrection that led to some changes in Virginia. Although Bacon died of dysentery and his movement quickly fell apart, **Bacon's Rebellion** had long-term effects. Because slaves had helped in the riot, the House of Burgesses worked even harder to place restrictions on African Americans, and they hoped also that it would gain the allegiance of all the poor whites—that is, that all whites, rich and poor alike, would make African-Americans their enemy and not each other. Second, they reduced taxes to try to help the poorer whites out of their financial difficulties. They lowered property qualifications for voting, too. So whiteness became even more strongly tied to power and freedom, while non-whiteness was increasingly tied to powerlessness and bondage.

Virginia continued to develop under plantation slavery, and increasingly by the 1720s, a wealthy class of elite planters emerged—the **gentry**. These people controlled the politics, the economy, and the high society of Virginia's capital, Williamsburg. At cockfights, court days, military drills, and elections, the gentry asserted their control of society. They included families like the Byrds, Randolphs, and Carters; and later Custis, Lee, Washington and Jefferson. They lived in huge homes, with imported possessions, hundreds of slaves. They modeled themselves after wealthy English, lived luxuriously, gambled, competed to marry the most beautiful women, and adopted foxhunting, the game of cricket, pool, partridge hunting, and various other hobbies. Perhaps the best example of this is William Byrd, whose diaries give us a revealing look into the life of one of these Virginia Gentry. In some ways, the triumph of the gentry are metaphors for the entire colonial project in Virginia – as it was wealthier men who first came to Roanoke, then who paid the transit fees for the indentured servants, then who imported slaves, all to garner greater and greater wealth. That is not to say that poor whites, Indians, and slaves are not part of the Virginia story – quite the opposite – but that economics and class are important elements in explaining this colony's story.

60-Second Quiz #1a: Which of the following factors was NOT important in understanding the founding and growth of the Virginia colony?

- a. search for profits
- b. search for religious liberty
- c. relations with Indians
- d. growth of plantation agriculture

II. Maryland

Maryland was almost identical to Virginia in its history, although it began as a gift from the King of England to Cecilius Calvert, **Lord Baltimore** in the 1630s. So unlike Virginia, Maryland was under the control of an individual, not a private company or the Crown. And yet, Maryland was another colony with an agricultural economy that ultimately centered on plantation slavery.

At the outset, Maryland was also designed to serve a religious purpose. Lord Baltimore, a Catholic and the proprietor of the colony, had desired to make Maryland a haven for English Catholics. Roman Catholics in England could not worship in public and had to pay taxes to the Anglican Church. As Lord Proprietor, Baltimore received 10 million acres, and in turn awarded large manors to each settler who brought 20 servants to the colony. Unfortunately, most of the settlers that came to Maryland were Protestant, and bought land. With growing numbers of Protestants coming, Lord Baltimore was forced in 1649 to grant freedom of religion, and the Protestants soon became a majority and even persecuted the Catholics. Baltimore's goals of creating a Catholic haven and a manor system failed. Maryland developed its tobacco and slave-based economy almost exactly like Virginia.

Maryland is also a good example of the connectedness that existed between the colonies and the mother country. In 1688, during the Glorious Revolution, William and Mary became King and Queen of England, and they revoked Maryland's charter. Protestants and Catholics fought an all-out civil war in Maryland; the result was that the Protestants won and persecuted the Catholics. Maryland became a royal colony. Catholicism was outlawed in Maryland until after the Revolutionary War. Many wealthy plantation owners built chapels on their land so that they could practice their Catholicism in relative secrecy. During the persecution of Maryland Catholics by the Puritan revolutionary government, all of the original Catholic churches of southern Maryland were burned down. The capital, which was in St. Mary's, a Catholic area, moved to Annapolis in 1708. In 1715, Charles Calvert died and his son Benedict became the fourth Lord Baltimore. He had become a Protestant, and the government of Maryland was now restored to him. The colony remained in the hands of the Calverts from this time until the war of the Revolution.

60-Second Quiz #1b: Which of the following factors was NOT important in understanding the founding and growth of the Maryland colony?

- a. search for profits
- b. search for religious liberty
- c. relations with Indians
- d. growth of plantation agriculture

III. Florida

Florida did NOT start out as an English colony! Florida had been settled by the Spanish to protect itself against French pirate ships and to bail out shipwrecked sailors in the Caribbean. The French had actually built a settlement near present-day Jacksonville, called Fort Caroline, in the mid-1500s. The Spanish crown attacked and destroyed Fort Caroline, and killed most of the 300

residents there. Under the leadership of navy officer Pedro Menendez, the Spanish established a fortified colony along the Atlantic Coast in 1565 called **St. Augustine**, 40 miles to the South, the first lasting settlement within the borders of the future United States. Menendez also built a series of small forts as far north as Beaufort, South Carolina.

The Spanish experience in Florida was in some ways similar to that of the English. Most of the small Spanish posts and missions in Florida succumbed to French or Indian attack. Menendez ran out of money, found no gold or silver, and in 1574, only two towns still stood; by 1587, only St. Augustine remained. Unable to attract colonists to Florida, the Spanish brought missionaries and the Franciscans (a Catholic religious order) set up a series of missions along the entire coast of Florida. At its peak in 1675, 40 friars ministered to 20,000 Native Americans in 36 churches. After failing to establish a settlement colony, the Spanish had apparently succeeded in Florida by pursuing the Franciscan mode of conversion. Yet Spanish Florida declined in the early 1700s, and the Indian population dwindled from disease, while the missions shut down.

St. Augustine remained and Spain was determined to bolster its New World Empire. St. Augustine was still a military outpost yet the arrival of African slaves led to more growth in ranching and farming. Black slaves and a scattering of free blacks, most from Mexico, Haiti and Cuba, constructed and maintained the military fortifications in Florida. Blacks served in the military. Free blacks also worked in St. Augustine as soldiers, sailors, privateers, and trackers, artisans, laborers, and house servants. They were even allowed to purchase property. Thus Florida became a safe-haven for slaves escaping from South Carolina (see below), since the Spanish allowed the slaves to work for wages, instructed them in Catholicism, allowed them to marry, and by the late-1600s, offered them freedom. As slavery expanded in South Carolina, the stream of fugitives grew.

As much as race became linked to power and bondage in Virginia and other English colonies in the south, the experience of blacks in Spanish Florida appeared to be much different. To better protect St. Augustine, the governor of Florida established an all-black settlement to the North of the City, called Mose for short. It was a military and agricultural settlement and became the center of black life in colonial Florida, with something like 100 free black men and women. In 1746, there were 1,500 people in St. Augustine and about 350 were blacks. And yet, in 1749, a new Spanish governor of Florida segregated St. Augustine. Then in 1763, as the result of an Imperial War with Spain, the British gained control of Florida. At this time, Spain evacuated Florida, and the inhabitants returned to Cuba. At that time, there were only about 500 houses there. The British split Florida into parts, with the panhandle being West Florida, and the rest of it East Florida.

For two hundred years, Spain had ruled Florida, yet there was little to view by the 1750's. St. Augustine remained a small garrison town of two thousand soldiers and settlers. The most prosperous merchants were those who operated food services for the troops. On the Gulf side, Pensacola was barely more than a few wooden houses and a fort. The mission system was in ruins. The greatest weakness of Spanish Florida was its inability to attract families to live there. The rules of Spain forbade the colonialization of non-Catholics and any trade with English America. Spaniards refused to settle in Florida. Investors felt their money would be better spent in Cuba and Mexico. This was Spanish Florida, obviously underpopulated and underdeveloped. Its cultural and economic contributions limited to a few places. This would not have been a dangerous situation if the growing English colonies would not have been so close and so well-prepared to one day overrun the Florida peninsula.

IV. Georgia

Up to now, we have seen the English plant Virginia as essentially a business venture, settle Maryland as a religious haven-turned-plantation colony, and then capture Florida from Spain (who had initially sought riches but also to spread Catholicism). Georgia would begin with yet a different mission but eventually assume a similar pattern. **James Oglethorpe**, a retired army officer and Member of Parliament, devoted his life to relieving the poor of London, especially those people imprisoned for debt. He devised a plan to transport the inmates to the wilderness of America. Oglethorpe became the governor of Georgia, and would rule with a group of advisors to run the colony called the Georgia Trustees, a mix of wealthy merchants, landowners, and Anglican ministers. They hoped to minimize English urban poverty by shipping poor people and convicted felons to a new Southern colony, where hard work might turn their lives around and could also defend the empire—because Georgia bordered on Spanish Florida, South Carolina was vulnerable to Spanish or Indian attack, and South Carolina slaves were running away (see above).

In 1733, Oglethorpe and the first colonists founded the city of Savannah (they called it “savannah,” because of the vast marshlands and tall grass) and religious groups settled a few additional other towns. George Whitefield came together with James Habersham in 1737 to Savannah, where they started the nation's first orphanage, Bethesda, in 1740. The majority of Georgian immigrants were poor. There was a vast mix of settlers to Georgia—from poor, thirty year old men to entire families; they represented a variety of backgrounds in Europe. The Trustees were fairly welcoming to different religions, and as a result, many Jewish merchants arrived in Savannah during the following decades. Some German Lutherans arrived as well.

As mentioned above, the Georgia colony's purpose(s) departed from the earlier English colonies' goals in a number of important ways; yet there were still some similarities. England's reasons for the founding of the colony of Georgia included the following:

- To provide relief to the debtors of England,
- To help the English poor and unemployed,
- To remove the poor, so England would not have to support them,
- To provide relief to persecuted Protestants such as the Salzburgers,
- To act as a buffer to protect South Carolina from Spaniards in Florida,
- To strengthen the British Empire by the success of the colony and its population,
- To have the colony supply raw products such as wine, hemp, silk, flax, etc. to manufacturers in England,
- To establish another market for exported English made products.

Although agricultural production was part of Georgia's plan, the Trustees had initially banned slavery, because slavery threatened to undermine the white work ethic that they hoped to promote. Thus, Instead of planting rice and indigo with slave labor, the Georgians were encouraged to cultivate high-value crops like hemp (used to make rope), flax (for linen), mulberry (to feed to silkworms), and grapes (to make wine). They would ideally settle close together for protection. Having a bunch of hardworking small farmers would create a peaceful society of equals, and would foster cooperation, not competition, or so the Trustees hoped. It should be noted that, because the Trustees were driven by concerns for military security and to make whites work hard, the antislavery policy was *not* out of sympathy for enslaved Africans, nor was it an attempt to convince other colonies to follow suit. Everyone in the South at this point pretty much accepted the use of African slavery as the best means of making the colonial economies work.

Restricting slavery was not the only limit that the Trustees placed on the settlers there—in fact, they kept the number of acres people could own small (which in turn limited land ownership), they banned rum, and prohibited lawyers. They permitted no elected assembly, because they did not want the (mostly poorer) residents to gain too much power and prestige; that is, the Trustees wanted to remain in control. Instead of an Assembly, they appointed four administrators to run the colony, sort of like a board of directors. These Georgia Trustees were powerful and distant elites who put too many restrictions on their colonial subjects. And the colonists came to see their overlords as unrealistic, domineering, and unfair. The colonists in Georgia increasingly demanded the right to own slaves, and rallied behind the slogan, “Liberty and Property without restrictions.” If they could not own slaves and own large plantations, they did not consider themselves truly “free.”

Georgians soon rejected the Trustees’ model and created a plantation society modeled after Carolina. Under increasing pressure, the Trustees gave in, permitting slavery in 1752, and at this point, they gave back control to the Crown. So Georgia became a royal colony, with an assembly, a crown-appointed council, and a royal governor. At this point, Georgia began to develop by copying South Carolina as a model. After 1752, slavery expanded rapidly in Georgia. From 3,000 whites and 600 blacks in 1752, the Georgian population numbered 18,000 whites and 15,000 blacks by 1775(!). Georgia began to develop rice and indigo and stopped growing wine, silk, hemp, and flax. Large plantations meant the emergence of wealthy planters, and of vast differences between rich and poor. To the end of the colonial era, Georgia was essentially the southern frontier of South Carolina, as North Carolina was of Virginia. The social condition of Georgia resembled that of North Carolina. There were no schools, and the mails seldom or never reached the inland settlements. The people were mostly small farmers, with here and there a rich planter. There was little town life. Savannah was the only town of importance, and it was still a wooden village at the time of the Revolution. The roads were mere Indian trails, and the settlers saw little of one another.

60-second Quiz #2: In what way(s) were Florida’s and Georgia’s histories, together, different from the Chesapeake colonies?

- a. Florida and Georgia both saw completely peaceful relations with Indians, at least initially
- b. Florida and Georgia both developed large plantation economies to grow wine, hemp, and silk, at least initially
- c. Florida and Georgia both did not welcome religious minorities to their colonies
- d. Florida and Georgia both did not extensively practice African slavery, at least initially

V. The Carolinas

The first permanent English settlers in North Carolina were immigrants from the tidewater area of southeastern Virginia. That is, they had come to Virginia and then moved southward. The first of these “overflow” settlers moved into the Albemarle area of (modern-day) northeast North Carolina around 1650. At this time, there was only one “Carolina” colony – it would later split into “North Carolina” and “South Carolina.” What is important to remember is that the northern part of Carolina remained a thinly populated area throughout its history. In fact, these early settlers into Carolina came before the colony was formally established – that did not happen until the 1670s, when, wealthy planters from Barbados (at this time another British colony, an island in the south Caribbean) established a new colony (called “**Carolina**”). A group of 200 English colonists from Barbados founded Charleston, and for the next thirty or forty years, settlers slowly trickled in, setting up plantations in the low country, most within 30 miles of Charleston. North and South Carolina split in 1712.

A. North Carolina

North Carolina's eastern region was home to expansive forests, which were useful to the British navy for naval stores (raw materials that would be used to build ships). North Carolinians tapped the pitch from pine trees to make **tar**, which became used for waterproofing ropes and ships. Trees with the tallest and straightest trunks would be used for masts. In fact, one naval historian claims that there are still a few 200+ year old trees growing in North Carolina's forests, bearing the mark of the royal navy – these would be trees the British government claimed but never came back to chop down. Aside from naval stores, Carolina also became the preeminent cattle country in the English empire. Many owners entrusted the roaming cattle to African-American cowboys. Additionally, North Carolina also grew some tobacco and grain.

In the backcountry (the western regions, beyond the coastal plain), which remained sparsely populated, lived poor white people in terrible conditions—mostly Scotch-Irish immigrants, various religious groups, and simple corn farmers. They lived in virtual isolation; there were no cities, just small villages. They were farmers and woodmen, scattered across the wilderness. On a surveying expedition in North Carolina, the Virginian William Byrd made the following observations:

The inhabitants suffer disadvantages natural to their place of residence - swampy, mosquitoes.

Nature in North Carolina favors laziness.

Religion does not thrive there. There is no place to worship. The law empowers a justice of peace to marry, and christening depends on the casual arrival of a visiting churchman. Government is weak there; laws are feebly executed and magistrates have little authority.

Such a province is a natural asylum for outcasts.

In view of all this, it is not surprising that the borderers, when the line (between Virginia and North Carolina) is run, hope to find themselves on the Carolina side.

Marginally better off were the coastal settlements in North Carolina, which were few, and which featured small slaveholding plantations, none of which became as wealthy as Virginia or Carolina.

North Carolina was not free of Indian encounters. In the autumn of 1711 a terrible Indian massacre took place in North Carolina. Hundreds of settlers fell victims of the merciless tomahawk. The chief sufferers were the inoffensive Germans at New Berne, where one hundred and thirty people were slaughtered within two hours after the signal for the massacre was given. Various tribes, led by the Tuscaroras, engaged in the massacre. But the European people rallied, and, receiving aid from South Carolina, and at length the Tuscaroras themselves. The Tuscaroras' ancestors had come from New York, and they now resolved to abandon their southern home and return to the land of their fathers. They removed in 1714 and joined the Iroquois or Five Nations of New York, and that confederation was afterward known as the Six Nations.

Of all the thirteen colonies, North Carolina was the least commercial, the most provincial, the farthest removed from European influences. North Carolina was probably, with exception of possibly Maine, the poorest colony.

B. South Carolina

South Carolina developed much differently. It offered abundant land, had a broad fertile coast, large muddy rivers, and despite its hot, humid, mosquito-infested summers, the rest of the year was much milder. South Carolina was too far north to grow sugar, and could not compete with the already established tobacco plantations in Virginia and Maryland. Initially, the Carolina planters had supplied

livestock and lumber to the West Indies. In the early years, it too was a place of deerskin trappers, cowboys, and men that traded with Indians. There was some farming, but not large, plantation-based labor yet. This would change, in time.

During the early-1700s, numerous problems plagued South Carolina, especially Indians. In 1715, claiming that South Carolina owed them money for 100,000 deerskins, the Yamassee Indians rebelled, killing traders, slaughtering cattle, and burning plantations around Beaufort. The rebels recruited Catawba and Creek Indians to join them, and Carolina (still one colony at that time) faced a united Indian attack. The Indians killed about four hundred colonists, and the rest fled to Charleston. As the Indians ran low on guns and gunpowder, and Virginia helped Carolina with weapons and troops, the Carolinians turned the tide. They got the support of enemies of the Indians. Despite their pleas to England for help, though, the Lords Proprietors (the board of governors in charge of the colony) did nothing. This convinced South Carolina that they did not need the Lords Proprietors at all, and so South Carolina became a royal colony soon after.

The Carolinians also subdued the Catawba Indians, and suppressed and enslaved many others. The Carolina Indians dwindled from a combination of disease epidemics, rum consumption, and being seized as slaves. As they eliminated the Indian problem, the colony attracted more settlers, and began to thrive.

To be able to prosper, Carolina needed a staple crop, a major export crop. It finally developed that crop: **rice**. Beginning in the 1690s, Carolina imported slaves, who had knowledge of rice from their time in West Africa. George Town became the center of rice production in the colony. Due to this new technology, rice became so profitable that many merchants, physicians and attorneys left their professions, purchased land and slaves and became rice planters. They built irrigation systems. After planting the crop in April and May, they flooded the rice fields in the summer, and harvested in September and October. Removing the husk from the grain was difficult work, and required long hours of pounding. Finally by December or January, they could ship off the rice. Carolina's rice economy grew rapidly in the 1730s. Not a coincidence, by the 1730s, the majority of South Carolina's inhabitants was African Americans.

Despite these accomplishments, Carolina had a period of three hardships: (1) In 1738, Charleston was hit with a deadly smallpox epidemic. (2) In 1739, a slave rebellion called the **Stono Rebellion** broke out about 20 miles south of Charleston. Roughly 100 enslaved Africans, led by Jemmy, captured firearms and marched south, killing colonists and attempting to rally more slaves to join them. They planned to escape to St. Augustine, Florida, where the Spanish promised freedom. Whites notified authorities and South Carolina forcefully put down the rebellion and executed sixty of the rebels. (3) In 1740, a deadly fire hit Charleston. Despite these hardships, Carolina bounced back. During the 1750s, Carolina developed a second valuable plantation crop, **indigo**, a plant that produced a blue dye in great demand by the clothing industry in England. In the 1750s, indigo thrived. Carolina's planters, growing rice and indigo, became the wealthiest colonists in America.

60-second Quiz #3: What characteristic(s) united the southern colonies?

- a. Virginia, Maryland, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina were all initially settled as military outposts
- b. Virginia, Maryland, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina all initially relied initially on indentured servants, and later on slaves, as the major source of labor
- c. Virginia, Maryland, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina all crafted laws giving colonists unrestricted freedom of religion at the time of their founding

d. Virginia, Maryland, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, and South Carolina all had economies in which agriculture played an important role, at one time or another.

KEY to 60-second Quizzes:

1a.) b - profit all the way was the Virginia Company's goal

1b.) a - no one company owned all of Maryland, so there cannot be said to have been the same profit motive that the Virginia Company had. Having said that, individual planters in Maryland certainly did want to make money but there was not a company managing the colony to do so.

2.) d - the Spanish allowed some free blacks in St. Augustine, and Georgia initially banned slavery

3.) d - agriculture is the key to understanding the southern colonies

I. New France

As we have noted already, the English were not the only Europeans interested in American colonies. While we have already briefly noted the French efforts in North America, it is worth taking a few moments to explore **New France** in a bit more detail. In 1534, French explorer Jacques Cartier sailed up the St. Lawrence River looking for a Northwest Passage to East Asia (which he did not find). This episode got France interested in planting a colony, but took quite a while for New France to be established. By the 1580s, French trading companies had been set up, and ships were contracted to bring animal furs (mostly beaver) from North America back to France for use in garment and other textile manufacturing. Much of what transpired between the natives and their European visitors around that time in New France is not known for lack of historical records.

The fur traders moved about New France, either following herds, trading with different groups of Indians, or both, meaning that fixed French settlements with large numbers of French people living there would not come quickly. Early French attempts at establishing permanent settlements were failures. (Recall the 1560s, when Fort Caroline in Florida was destroyed by the Spanish; see Chapter One.) At this time, the French were involved heavily in the Caribbean and in their own internal affairs; thus it was only in the early 1600s that the French did succeed in their North American colonization project. Samuel de Champlain set up a trading post at Quebec City, an easily-defendable spot on the mouth of the St. Lawrence River. In 1642, the French founded Montreal, at the place in the river where ships could not travel any further upstream. And yet, the population of New France grew painfully slowly.

Despite the relatively small numbers of French colonists, the colony was an important source of revenue thanks to the fur trade. The basis of the economy was the fur trade, with beaver, otter, mink, and lynx pelts all in high demand back in Europe. The majority of French immigrants to New France were men—fur trappers, traders, and soldiers, who because there were so few French women, married Indians, who had children called **métis**. (Spanish soldiers and other [male] colonists also intermarried with Indian women, and their mixed-race children were called mestizos.) The French had some farming and had also set up forts, villages, and camps. But the growing price of gifts, transportation, and competition from the English, took a toll on the French.

The French approach to dealing with Indians sets them apart in some ways from the Spanish and English colonial projects. While it is true that French Jesuit (a Catholic order) missionaries, called the “Black Robes” after the costume they wore, did try to convert the Indians, the French were in a position where they needed the Indians’ assistance and willing participation in trade. That is, the French needed Indians for allies, friends, trade, sexual partners, for survival. Thus they (the French) could neither dictate to Indians nor ignore them. Indians were at the center of the action. The French were responsible for uniting the scattered tribes of the vast region. They (the French) were peacemakers, encouraging the Iroquois to be neutral in conflicts.

The French and the Indians had to rely on each other. They created a common world and had to appeal to the interests and culture of each other and to compromise. They learned to resolve conflicts so each side would be satisfied. When they didn’t, the middle ground broke down. Each time the French used force, they found out that only mediation, reconciliation, and gifts would work. Sometimes, there were elaborately scripted solutions—rather than an eye for an eye, when a few Indians massacred settlers in Detroit, they “escaped.” When an Indian killed a Frenchman, the Indians offered to help the French in a war against a rival group of Indians. Of course, this approach

by the French – more-or-less partnering with the Indians – could be more congenial than the English or Spanish approach to the Indians, since the French were not trying to clear Indians off of land for their (French) use to grow crops (like the English), nor where the French trying to exploit the labor of Indians to run their plantations (like the Spanish).

By 1750s, New France had expanded, but only to about 50,000, whereas, the British population numbered over one million people. Yet the French presence in North America would have important later consequences for the Revolutionary Era.

60-second Quiz #1: How did New France's approach to dealing with Indians differ from the English and the Spanish? Why? Which of the following is NOT true?

- a. The Spanish wanted to exploit the Indians for labor and/or convert them to Catholicism
- b. The French wanted to trade with the Indians
- c. The French wanted to clear the Indians off their lands to make way for French agricultural settlement
- d. The English wanted to clear the Indians off their lands to make way for English agricultural settlement

II. The New England Colonies

As you may have discerned by now, we are essentially filling in the political map of colonial North America, as way of setting the stage for the American Revolution. So now as we turn back to the English colonies, let us begin with a few notes on the New England colonies about which there really is not much to say:

A. Connecticut

Connecticut was settled by Puritans from Massachusetts (see below) in the 1630s, and was actually two colonies: New Haven and Connecticut; New Haven was an extreme Puritan colony, with really strict, religiously-informed laws; in 1664, these two minor colonies decided to merge and thus formed what we consider today to be the area of the state of Connecticut.

Connecticut saw the first serious armed conflict between indigenous people and settlers in New England; the powerful **Pequot** tribe. Hostilities between the tribes of Southern New England escalated into war; the Indians raided and destroyed a settlement, killing thirty. In 1637, settlers and their Indian allies burned a Pequot village and massacred nearly 300 men, women and children. An estimated thirty or forty Pequots escaped. The ones who were captured were brought to Boston and sold into slavery in Bermuda. In the following weeks, the whites hunted down and killed the remaining warriors. The War ended with just a few surviving Pequots. (Today, the Pequots own and operate Foxwoods Casino.) The Pequot War opened up Connecticut to settlement, and was the first officially-recognized Indian War (the Jamestown Massacre was not considered a war).

A. New Hampshire

New Hampshire was a similar case; it was also established in the 1630s as a fishing colony; it kept going back and forth from being part of Massachusetts or not, depending on the King and the situation in England. Finally in 1741, New Hampshire permanently broke free of Massachusetts.

B. Maine

Maine was founded in the 1620s as a fishing colony; there was some fishing and farming there and little else; it was one of the poorest colonies, and was actually considered part of Massachusetts. Now we can move on to the big show: the Pilgrims and the Puritans.

C. Pilgrims and Puritans: Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay colonies

Way back in 1533, English King Henry VIII broke with the Roman Catholic Church and established the Church of England (the Anglican Church). You may have learned this story in HIST 1121; Henry wanted to divorce his wife and marry another but this event brought the Protestant Reformation to England. By the early 1600s, the issue of the king's wives had retreated and English Christians were much more incensed over questions of worship, Biblical interpretation, church structure and governance, and even the relationship between the church and the state. While England was mostly Protestant (i.e. not Catholic), there was a small number of Catholics, as well as a small number of English Protestants who were displeased with the performance of the new Anglican Church.

1. The Plymouth Colony

Some people broke completely with the Church of England—these included the Quakers and the **Pilgrims**. The Pilgrims (sometimes called Separatists) formed in about 1590, left England, and settled in Holland in 1608, where there was religious freedom. But two things happened: 1) they became upset that their children were beginning to speak Dutch and adopt Dutch culture, and 2) The Netherlands was about to go to war with Spain, and if Spain conquered the Netherlands, these Puritans would be taken over by Catholics, and would be persecuted.

The Pilgrims and a group of private investors secured a land grant from the English Crown, and 102 people, half Pilgrims, half men seeking money, sailed to the New World and arrived in Plymouth, Massachusetts, in 1620.

Realizing they were too far north of their intended destination, and therefore out of the jurisdiction of English law, males signed the **Mayflower Compact** (the ship on which they had just sailed was named the *Mayflower*), the first constitution for a government in the United States. The Pilgrims arrived too late in the year to plant crops, and within 4 months, half of them had died.

Two friendly Native Americans, Squanto and Samoset (also known as Massasoit), helped the Pilgrims. Squanto taught them how to grow corn, and the following November, they celebrated the first Thanksgiving. Over the next dozen years, several more large groups of settlers arrived in the region, settling Salem, Massachusetts and Dorchester, Massachusetts. In 1690, Plymouth colony became part of the (much larger) Massachusetts Bay Colony.

2. The Massachusetts Bay Colony

Another group of English Protestants who did not like the Anglican Church were the **Puritans**, named so because they desired to “purify” the Anglican Church. They weren’t as strongly opposed to the Anglican Church as the Separatists, and they hoped to influence it to change. The Puritans felt that church services were too formal, and they objected to the stained glass windows and décor, and to bishops and archbishops and the hierarchy of the church (which still looked very much like the Catholic Church of old). The Puritans believed that each church should be independently governed.

They also believed that, in order to join a Puritan Church, one had to stand up and relate an emotional conversion experience. This proved that you were a “**visible saint**” – someone whom God had predestined to receive his saving grace upon their death and be admitted to Heaven for eternity.

Broadly speaking, Puritanism was a form of Calvinism and, broadly speaking, most Americans in the present-day who identify as Christians belong to one or another Protestant sect that is related to Calvinism. (Catholics have long been, and still are, a minority in the U.S.; the other major branch of Protestantism is Lutheranism, which never gained a majority here; there are also Eastern Orthodox Christians and non-Christian religious groups but Calvinist-derived Christianity is most common.)

Of these Puritans, there were Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, and other groups. Presbyterianism emerged in Scotland. They believed bishops should be replaced and that churches should be organized into Presbyteries, and then into smaller groups called synods. They believed any one with a decent reputation should be admitted into church membership. Presbyterians share a common set of beliefs called the Westminster Confession of Faith. Congregationalists believed that each church should be independent, and that there should be no higher authority to govern each church. They required a dramatic conversion experience. Most Puritans that came to Massachusetts Bay were Congregationalists, which because of their independent nature, posed a problem. Baptists emerged in the 1600s; Baptists believed that once a person had been saved, only then could they be baptized. In other words, only adults could be baptized; to Presbyterians, children of members should be baptized as infants. What you should notice is that these English colonists did *not* all share one point of view or opinion on how their Christian faith should be organized and practiced.

Anyway, in 1629, a group of Puritans led by **John Winthrop** left England to provide an example of a godly society that might serve as a guide for England to copy. In the period 1630-1642, 25,000 Puritans came to Massachusetts; this was called the Great Migration (there were 1,000 who came in 1630 alone). Settling in the area of modern-day Boston, these Puritans established a religious state, the **Massachusetts Bay Colony**, with Boston as the capital. Church and state were one and the same in Massachusetts Bay. There was a secular governor and a two-house legislature, yet all citizens had to attend the established Puritan Church, and pay taxes. Only those who were full church members could vote or participate in government, and each village had a meetinghouse, or steeple, that was the center of town life. Remember, these people were Congregationalists, and thought that the independence of their churches was being sacrificed to this utopian experiment.

In many ways, Massachusetts Bay settlers lived in communities that were unlike what we have seen or will see in any of the other English colonies. For starters, religion was everywhere (see above). Secondly, Massachusetts colonists had a much greater sense of themselves existing in a shared community. They lived close to each other and shared farmlands. They established a series of beliefs called “The Puritan Way,” and sought to be all on the same page, believing the same things. As a result, they established Harvard College in 1636, the first American college, to train ministers. Thirdly, the types of people who migrated from England to Massachusetts were not the same as those who traveled to Virginia or Georgia. Massachusetts settlers were middle class, and middle aged, and traveled in family groups, mother and father, several children, sometimes entire communities. Fourthly, Massachusetts settlers had very high behavioral expectations for themselves. They did not allow anyone to take unfair advantage of anyone else in business or personal life. They expected moral behavior and honest business deals. They were also highly literate.

Daily life in Massachusetts was also heavily informed and affected by Puritans’ religious beliefs. Family values were vital to Puritanism—fathers were in charge and unlike the Quakers, women were subordinate. If the father failed to keep his children in order, public officials could step

in. Public officials similar to police officers made house to house visits to check up on families. Homelessness was forbidden, and people usually took in elderly relatives, orphans, or single people.

Puritans lived the longest and healthiest lives of anywhere in the colonies. Puritan men typically married about age 25. On average, women married about 20 years old, and over ninety percent had children. On average, women could expect to have six or more children until about age forty. One in 30 births resulted in the death of the mother, and, so therefore about one in five women died in childbirth. Men and women remarried soon after being widowed, as family life was extremely important. Massachusetts Bay had the highest natural population increase of anywhere in the colonies.

The stability and growth of the population fostered the growth of the colony itself. Over time, small towns fanned out from Boston. As European diseases killed the Native Americans off, and through phony land deals, Europeans accumulated vast tracts of land that they used for basic farming and cattle raising. The economy was not as prosperous as the South would be, and for the most part, the economy rested on fishing and whaling, and some lumber and livestock. It should be noted that the Puritans did force Native Americans to stop practicing their religions and force them into Praying Towns where they were indoctrinated in English religion and culture. The best examples of these were Natick, Martha's Vineyard, Cape Cod, and Nantucket.

Though Puritans came to establish a unified, godly community, within a short period of time, people with different views emerged:

Roger Williams began to doubt the validity of the conversion experience. He argued for a complete separation of church and state. He opposed mandatory church attendance and taxes (which were used to support the official church), and believed that the title "Goodman" should be used only for the saved. He criticized the King and refused an oath of loyalty. Basically he was anti-English and anti-authority. Williams was banned from the colony in 1635. He went briefly to Plymouth colony, and joined the Pilgrims, but he offended them because he thought they were too kind to the Church of England. Williams eventually purchased land from the Narragansett Indians and founded **Rhode Island**.

Anne Hutchinson, an outspoken mother of eleven, became another critic of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. She held prayer meetings in her home where she taught both men and women. She challenged the ministers' authority and their teachings. Most significantly, she believed that a person was saved by God's grace (predestination), and good works could do nothing to help a person be saved (which is what the ministers were teaching). By challenging the ministers' authority, this threatened the leaders' ability to keep the colony unified. Plus, she was a woman, and women were not supposed to speak out against men or to preach to men. After a public hearing in which she announced that she received direct revelations from God, Anne Hutchinson was banished from the colony to Rhode Island. Dozens of her followers joined her. She later went to Long Island (New Netherlands) and was massacred by Indians.

So, early on the Puritans in Massachusetts Bay faced religious division, but there were other problems. By 1660, it was clear that the "city on a hill" mission was a failure. By mid-century, fewer people were becoming church members. Remember, in order to become a Church member, you had to get up and relate your conversion experience.

Fewer people did this; maybe it was embarrassing, or maybe they did not have conversion

experiences because there were many other things on their mind besides God. Unless something was done, church members would die out and Puritan rule in Massachusetts Bay would end. In 1662, the Puritans allowed the children of non-members to be baptized; this is called the **Half-Way Covenant**.

Over time, with less land available because of partible inheritance, communities broke apart and families split. Younger children went west to create new communities. Originally, Puritans believed in sacrificing for the good of the community, hence the idea of the barn-raising, etc., but as they became more prosperous merchants, especially in the seaport towns, they became more materialistic, and gave up on many of the ideas of the Puritan Way. The Church simply could not oversee, discipline and control a larger more scattered population. The influence of religion decreased, and the clergy began to preach fire and brimstone sermons, warning people that they were materialistic and self-centered.

There was widespread conflict with Indians; in fact all of New England faced the most destructive war on American soil in the colonial era: **King Philip's War**. This seemed to be further proof of God's disfavor and of the failure of the Puritan "errand into the wilderness." The great Wampanoag Indian Metacomet, also known by the English name Philip, waged a fierce and bitter struggle against the settlers of New England in 1675-1676. He nearly succeeded in driving the English out of New England in a war that inflicted greater casualties in proportion to the population than any other war in American history.

The basic conflict with the Indians in Massachusetts was the same as nearly everywhere else in the English colonies: whites invaded Indians' land and established permanent settlements. Later, after a period of trade and friendly relations, the Indians realized that they were being swindled out of their lands, and when they resisted, they met Europeans' superior forces. Metacomet (sometimes simply called "Metacom")/Philip was the second son of Massasoit/Somoset, the sachem of the Wampanoag who had befriended the pilgrims at Plymouth in 1620, and he (Metacomet) grew up to see the relationship between Indians and whites continue to decline.

As the years went by, the Wampanoag felt more pressure from the English. In 1661, Massasoit died, and Metacomet/Philip and his brother became the sachems. Metacomet/Philip's brother soon died, which left Philip in charge; he was only in his early 20s. As whites kept encroaching on Indians' land, there were several conflicts between the Indians and the whites over pigs (English settlers' livestock would basically roam free through the forests and thereby find and eat crops planted by the Indians).

New Englanders expressed a sort of paranoia that Metacomet/Philip was planning a widespread conspiracy, a widespread war. He wasn't.

Yet in 1671, they forced Metacomet/Philip to sign a treaty of friendship and tried to make his men give up their guns, but of course the Indians wouldn't. They also forced him to sign a treaty subjugating Indians to the colony of Plymouth's laws. Metacomet/Philip badmouthed the colonial authorities. When a white spy was found murdered, whites quickly captured three Indians on poor evidence, and Metacomet/Philip was implicated in the murder of the white. After a few raids and skirmishes, an all-out war broke out, fought throughout New England. The conflict spread.

Metacomet/Philip led a war party of only about 300 Indians, yet seemed to be everywhere at once. The English tried to capture him. The Nipmucs and the Narragansetts joined in. But the Niantics, Pequots, and Mohegans, three Connecticut tribes, signed on with the English as scouts, guides and warriors, and other smaller tribes did the same or remained neutral, hoping that they

might have something to gain.

Indians hadn't planned for war, they ran out of food and supplies, and they became demoralized. Metacomet/Philip went to New York to try to convince the Mohawk Indians to join in, but they refused. In 1676 after a rough winter, many Indians surrendered, but King Metacomet/Philip refused. Metacomet/Philip's wife and nine-year old son were captured and sold into slavery in the West Indies.

Finally, in an ironic, almost cruel coincidence, Metacomet/Philip was killed by a "white" Indian, an Indian who had become a white, and to make an example out of him, the English hacked up his body and placed the head on a stake in Plymouth where it stayed for 25 years. In the war, 3,000 Indians and 6,000 whites died, 50 English towns were completely destroyed, several hundred Indians were sold into slavery in the West Indies, and the Wampanoag and Narragansett Indians—pretty much all the Indians south of Boston yet near the coast, were wiped out.

Hundreds of white men, women and children were also taken captive and held for ransom; the best example of this is Mary Rowlandson, a minister's wife who was kidnapped and held hostage for eleven weeks, during which time she traveled all around New England with the Indians. She later wrote a harrowing account of her experiences, which became a religious text, an inspirational story of a woman's faith and courage and of God's saving mercy.

In addition to conflict with the Indians, social and economic change also brought tensions to Massachusetts Life; in 1692, Salem Village was divided between wealthy people who embraced commerce and less-well-to-do farmers who were more old-fashioned. They accused anyone who did not fit their traditional standards of witchcraft, and the result was the Salem Witch Trials. Outspoken women, tavern keepers, etc., anyone associated with social change, was accused. 100 men and women were arrested and 19 were executed.

60-second Quiz 2: What role did religion and the question of religious freedom play in the New England colonies? Which of the following is TRUE?

All people living in Massachusetts Bay Colony had the freedom to practice whatever religion they preferred.

All English people living in Massachusetts Bay Colony had the freedom to practice whatever religion they preferred.

All English people, who were Puritans, living in Massachusetts Bay Colony had the freedom to practice whatever religion they preferred.

All English people who, were Puritans, and who did not question the Puritan Church leaders, living in Massachusetts Bay Colony had the freedom to practice whatever religion they preferred.

A couple of final notes on New England, both of which will be important later:

In 1684, King Charles II seized control of all New England colonies, New York and New Jersey. The Colonists had refused to allow Anglicans (those who belonged to the "regular" Church of England, which was headed by the King of England) freedom to practice their religion (which involved obedience to the King), and had refused to obey England's trade restrictions. Charles II replaced the governments with the Dominion of New England, with a dictator-like governor, Sir Edmund Andros. With the glorious Revolution in 1688, when William and Mary took the throne, the Dominion of New England ended.

Slavery was never a factor in New England; only the rich had slaves and used them as servants; and there was some antislavery rumbling in New England. In 1690, there were only 1,000 slaves in New England, about 1% of the total population, and in 1720, that number had risen, but only to 3% of the population.

III. The Middle Colonies: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware

Now we can turn to the area “in the middle” – between the northern colonies and the southern colonies (from Chapter One). We refer to this area as “the middle colonies.”

A. New York.

New York began as **New Netherlands**, a Dutch colony (see the Introduction), and like New France, New Netherlands remained small and largely confined to a river valley and some small settlements. The Dutch West India Company established an outpost called Fort Orange on the site of present-day Albany, New York in 1614. In 1624, they founded a city on Manhattan Island called New Amsterdam. As we'll see, it later became New York City. Like the French, the Dutch sought beaver belts and they competed with the French in the region, meaning that (again, like the French), the Dutch aimed primarily at trade rather than settling large numbers of Europeans in North America. In time, the Dutch took over New Sweden, a settlement of Swedes and Finns in part of Southern New Jersey and Delaware, and their capital, Fort Christina, (today Wilmington, DE). There were corrupt dictator-like governors, and was no elected assembly. Few migrants arrived; in 1664, there were only 9,000 people in New Netherlands.

In the 1660s, English King Charles II awarded his supporters with colonial land. It was at this time that six of the thirteen colonies were established (NY, NJ, PA/DE, NC, and SC). James II, the Duke of York, King Charles II's brother, organized an invasion to conquer New Netherlands for the English but New Netherlands surrendered without a fight and England took New York, Long Island, NJ, and Delaware, from the Dutch. James renamed it New York.

Obviously, New York already had non-English people living there, but it was diverse beyond the Dutch settlers from the beginning. Puritan New Englanders lived on Long Island. Dutch, Germans, and French-speaking Belgians were scattered across the territory, and there were even Italians! In addition, the Dutch had a large number of African slaves—perhaps 1/5 of New York City was African, one of the highest percentages of Africans in any colonial area in 1664. James 15 gradually phased out Dutch forms of local government. He did not take away people's land, though, and he kept the legal system the way it was. Each town could decide what its official church was: Dutch Reformed, Congregational, or Church of England. The population grew slowly until 1720, because it had a poor governor.

B. New Jersey

After they conquered New Netherlands, Charles II split New Jersey into two and gave the two halves to two friends: George Carteret and Lord John Berkeley. New Jersey offered large land grants, freedom of religion, representative assembly, in exchange for quit rents, annual taxes on the land. New Jersey attracted mainly settlers from elsewhere, not from England—Puritan New Englanders, Barbadians, and Dutch New Yorkers. The economy rested on farming, and the population grew rapidly. Within 20 years, in the 1670s, Carteret and Berkeley sold to separate groups of private investors, who were Quakers. The non-Quakers were furious and formed their own communities. New Jersey became a Quaker-controlled colony, a close ally of Pennsylvania, but more diverse. It also became the first refuge in the colonies for small numbers of Quakers, but was not as well-organized and not as well-publicized as Pennsylvania would become.

C. Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania was an oddity—Pennsylvania was founded as a religious safe-haven for Quakers. We've mentioned them several times so we should pause and explain who the Quakers are:

In approximately 1650, a young weaver named George Fox broke from the Puritan Church and established a new religion, known as the **Society of Friends, or The Quakers**. The name Society of Friends comes from John: 15.15 where Jesus told his followers, "I have called you Friends, for all that I have heard from my Father, I have made known to you."

The name "Quaker" was something of an insult hurled by those who opposed or the Friends, because these Friends were so moved by their faith that they would often shake and otherwise appear to be overcome with the holy spirit (or something like that). However, The Society of Friends came to use this name (Quakers) to refer to themselves, because they liked knowing that people thought they serious about practicing their faith.

Quakers' beliefs are interesting and maybe to us a little strange: they glorified "plainness" and simplicity. They did not have ministers; all of the academic degrees and learning in the world, they believed, could not make a person a minister; it is their relationship with Christ and their ability to share their faith with others that makes one a minister. They believed that every person was possessed with an inner spirit, the "Light of Christ." They refused to bow and show signs of deference to their superiors, and they hated titles that suggested that anyone was any better than anyone else. Most people were on a first name basis, no matter how rich or poor the two people were. They often times would sit in silent prayer before starting a religious service. They believed in full equality for women, and women played an active role in their religious meetings. Many Quakers were city merchants. As an interesting aside, they believed in charging a fair price for a product, and so a shopkeeper set a price and that was it—no haggling.

Because their views differed so much from the Church of England, Quakers faced severe persecution, and by 1680, 10,000 Quakers had been imprisoned, 243 had died in jail from torture or mistreatment. Quaker missionaries also met fierce persecution in the colonies; they started arriving in the 1650s; in Boston, for example, four Quakers got hanged in the public square. At about this time, 1681, the King granted a massive tract of land to a family friend, **William Penn**, a prominent leader of the Quakers. Penn's father had been a supporter of the royal family. William Penn and the family held it under a proprietorship until the Revolution. Was this a favor to a family friend, or was the king trying to get rid of the Quakers? It might have been a little bit of both.

Penn offered land to all, toleration of all religions (though only Christians could vote), guaranteed the same rights as Englishmen, set up a representative assembly, and advertised Pennsylvania in foreign countries. Pennsylvania had a massive migration, on the scale of Massachusetts Bay, and attracted large groups of Welsh, German, Dutch, and French immigrants as well as people from other colonies.

He also welcomed Anabaptists— similar to the Baptists, these were Pacifist-believing people like the Amish and the Mennonites. It attracted an especially large number of indentured servants, especially from Ireland and England, until the 1750s. In 1682, Penn purchased Delaware, which had a population of 1,000, mainly Swedes and Finns leftover from New Sweden. Delaware became a territory, sort of, of Pennsylvania, and maintained some political freedom; it had its own assembly, for instance. With rapid migration and friendly policies, Pennsylvania's population grew rapidly. Philadelphia, which means the city of brotherly love, soon rivaled Boston in size and wealth.

Penn was a Pacifist, meaning he didn't believe in war, and as a result, Pennsylvania had good relationship with the Indians. Penn learned to speak the Delaware Indians' language. He purchased land from the Delaware for a fair price. Penn forbade the sale of alcohol to Indians. The Delaware happened to be really friendly, so that made things easier. Gradually, Indians migrated westward across Pennsylvania. Yet in the late-colonial and revolutionary period, they would clash with the new arrivals—the Scots-Irish and Germans who didn't share the values of William Penn.

60-Second Quiz #3: What characteristics united the northern colonies? How were they similar to and different from the southern colonies?

Which one is TRUE?

- A. Slavery only existed in the southern colonies.
- B. English settlers and Indians only fought in the northern colonies
- C. Religion was a greater concern in more northern colonies than in most southern colonies
- D. Trade was the most important economic activity in both northern and southern colonies.

KEY for 60-second Quizzes:

- 1.) c – there were no large agricultural settlements created by the French in New France
- 2.) d – Anne Hutchinson and Roger Williams prove that freedom to practice the religion of one's choosing in Massachusetts extended only to those who were Puritans and who did not question the church leadership. This is important because modern-day arguments invoking "freedom of religion" as a historic American tradition usually do not recognize the sharp limitations on religious practice among the Puritans.
- 3.) c – religion was not absent from the south but it was less important in explaining the existence of the southern colonies. Trade was more important in the north, economically speaking; agriculture in the south. Indians fought with colonists in both places and slavery was present in both places.

I. African Slavery in the Colonial Period

A. The business of slavery

For the first 75 years, (until about 1700), slaves brought into the North American colonies had been transported from the Caribbean. By 1700, that changed, and slaves began to arrive directly from Africa. This was largely a result of the demand for slave in the colonies having dramatically increased for a number of reasons. First, colonial life, especially in the Chesapeake region, had stabilized and fewer people were dying of disease; purchasing slaves in the 1600s meant that planters in Virginia (for example) ran the risk of their slaves dying quickly and having to replace their “investment.” Secondly, after Bacon’s Rebellion (see Chapter Two), wealthy gentry in Virginia (especially) were increasingly wary of hosting large populations of poor former indentured servants-turned-small farmers, since these poorer farmers were often hostile to their wealthier (and more successful) neighbors, and since these poorer men had shown they would resort to violence to promote their interests. Since indentured servants were now thought to be too risky, and slavery deemed to be less risky (for different reasons), it became therefore more profitable for slave-traders to bring them to the North American colonies directly.

Over the course of the 17th century through the 19th century, the African-Atlantic Slave Trade brought approximately 10 million slaves to the New World. You may be surprised to learn that, of these, only about 600,000-700,000 came to the United States, and mainly to three areas and a few cities: (1) the Chesapeake region, (2) South Carolina (the colonies’ largest importer of slaves), and (3) Savannah (which became a major destination only in the late-colonial period). New York and Philadelphia were also slave destination, as urban slavery was fairly common in the Northern Colonies, even if rural agricultural slavery was not. (The vast majority of slaves were sent to the Caribbean and South America.) During the colonial period, about 500,000 slaves arrived in the US. Although Congress ended the slave trade in 1808 (and many of the Northern states stopped it during the Revolution), the practice of holding slaves continued but with the population of enslaved people reproducing itself within the U.S., instead of being replenished with new captives from Africa.

60-second Quiz #1: Why did the numbers of African slaves transported to the North American colonies increase in the 18th century? Which of the following reasons are correct?

- a. White indentured servants were becoming rebellious once they were freed.
- b. Indian indentured servants were becoming rebellious once they were freed
- c. Life expectancy in the Chesapeake region increased.
- d. All of the above
- e. (a) and (b) only
- f. (a) and (c) only

Who were the slaves and where did they come from? English slave-traders brought 85% of all slaves arriving in the mainland colonies, yet the English never developed long-term links with specific African regions for their slaves; instead, the English traders purchased their captives from all along the African Coast. This meant that about ¼ of all colonies received enslaved people from Congo-Angola. Later, more slaves came to English colonies through Angolan ports along the African coast. About ¼ of all slaves came from Southeastern Nigeria; these included the Ibo and Ibibio groups. About 15 percent came from the Senegambia region; these included the Mandinka, Fulba, Serer, Wolof, Bambara, and Jola. About 15 percent came from the Gold Coast—these were the Ashanti and Fanti. About 15% came from Sierra Leone or the Ivory Coast, including the Vai, Mende, Kpelle, and Kru; a sizeable portion of South Carolina slaves came from Sierra Leone, and brought with them their knowledge of making baskets out of reeds.

Why is this important?

For several reasons: First, these enslaved people were PEOPLE and not objects; although they were treated as personal property (**chattel**), which could be bought, sold, leased, and inherited, these individuals were human beings with their own lives, wants, and needs, who were captured (sometimes by African slavers initially) and had their freedom and their futures stolen from them. Secondly, these people were from different places, different communities, and did not necessarily have a natural affinity for other people enslaved next to them. They may not have even been able to communicate, because Africans spoke several hundred languages in Africa and represented diverse cultures and ways of life. The vast majority lived in small villages, relied mainly on farming and ranching, and had a strong sense of community (from which they were permanently separated).

There were two major ways in which slave traders acquired slaves in Africa, the “**boat trade**” (mainly used by the English and French) and the “fort trade.” Once they were put on the boat, slaves were not packed in quite like sardines as the pictures showed, but they had about half the space of a convict sent to Australia, or of a poor white indentured servant coming to Philadelphia. Still, conditions were horrible, as you have probably heard. In a giant room beneath the ship with 4-5 foot ceilings, they had to contend with foul air, heat, smells. They ate only twice a day, morning and evening out of communal tubs, and had a pint of water with each meal. There was on average during the colonial period, a sixteen percent mortality rate on board the ship (this includes the rare shipwrecks, pirate attacks and possibility of epidemic outbreaks). If slave traders were paid according to profits, they took better care to keep their deaths to a minimum. If paid in advance, they cared even less about the captives’ well-being. Ship revolts were occasional, and happened about once every five years or so.

After about a thirty or 40 day journey, from say, Sierra Leone to Charleston, slaves were quarantined in the harbor and had to remain for a week or two to make sure that there were no epidemics on board the ship with them. During this time another 5% died. So, in total, about 20% of all slaves died on the boat before they reached land in America.

There were two ways in which slaves were then sold: “boat sale” and the “regular sale.” The Boat sale was more typical in Chesapeake; here a plantation owner would coordinate the sale through a slave trader, the ship would arrive as advertised, and planters would show up to meet it and would carry out their transactions on board the ship. The **regular sale** typically took place further south, in ports such as Charleston (but also Georgetown and Beaufort), which received ¼ of all colonial slaves, and Savannah but also in New York and Philadelphia. In the regular sale, slaves were cleaned up and brought to established slave markets on land, where people would contract with merchants.

B. African American culture

Africans and African-Americans who were enslaved were deprived of the power to determine many of their life choices, from where they wanted to live, to what they wanted to do, to with whom they wanted to associate, and certainly they were deprived of the right to own the proceeds of their labor. And yet, African Americans still demonstrated their very humanity and exercised what little agency they possessed over their lives by creating their own unique culture, mixing together their various languages, customs and traditions, assimilating white religious beliefs, and combining it all together. They were enthusiastic in their religious services, expressing emotions, laughing, dancing, and shouting. Their funerals were loud, with music, singing dancing, laughing and drinking. It is true that they did not have the power to universally separate themselves from white English culture but the extent to which they retained their African ways of life depended upon their isolation from whites,

meaning slaves who were forced to work under more immediate supervision of whites would have less autonomy but slaves who were sent to work in more remote locations could exercise a little bit more freedom to choose their words, their music, their religious practices, even as they could not choose to be completely free people.

At the same time, we do know that the idea of freedom was inescapable and the desire for freedom irrepressible, even if only a small fraction of slaves attempted to revolt or run away. On occasion, there were slave revolts, as we talked about before.

In September 9, 1739, the **Stono Revolt** drastically hurt African Americans in Charleston for ever after. 20 blacks broke into a store, stole guns and gunpowder, killed the shopkeepers, and headed south, intending to go to Florida. They killed whites on their way, and tried to get slaves to join them. By mid-day, there were 50-60 slaves. They crossed paths with Lieutenant Governor William Bull, who happened to be riding in the area on horseback, and he notified the authorities. Within a week the planters had attacked, dispersed, and gradually apprehended many of the people involved in the revolt. Perhaps 20-30 escaped to Florida. After that, whites tended to lump all blacks together as hostile, increased slave patrols, harshened laws restricting Africans' freedoms, and increased the severity of punishments. Still, slaves could resist in other ways, such as poisoning, using perhaps their knowledge of plants from Africa. One slave, Caesar, actually became a local celebrity for his expertise in *curing* poisoning victims, and his folk remedies for poisoning, food poisoning, and various intestinal disorders, were published in the *South Carolina Gazette* and in Charleston Almanacs in the 1750s.

Africans contributed other aspects of their own culture, too: In South Carolina and Georgia, they reconstructed African-style dwellings. Their music and dance actually influenced Virginia, whose dance parties normally included a harpsichord player and a bunch of stuffy rich (white) people dancing organized waltzes; instead, Africans animated, lively, and sometimes spontaneous dances became part of Virginia culture. Africans also brought the tambourine, xylophone, and guitars made out of gourds. Africans also contributed several western African words to the English language such as: okay, nitty-gritty, voodoo, banana, banjo, and tote (as in tote bag or to carry something).

In their spare time, most Africans in Charleston liked to gather to dance, to race boats, to drink and play dice, and to make fun of whites. Once again, their freedoms to hold parties, for instance, were severely restricted in the 1740s everywhere following the Stono Revolt and the New York slave conspiracy.

60-second Quiz #2: What evidence is there of enslaved peoples' resistance to the demands of the slave system? Which of the following is NOT correct?

- a. Enslaved African Americans created their own culture by mixing elements of African religious practice with white European religious practice
- b. Enslaved African Americans built their own African-style dwellings to live in
- c. Enslaved African Americans sometimes openly revolted and sometimes subtly poisoned their masters
- d. Enslaved African Americans adopted white Europeans' musical styles and preferences, and wrote music to suite the colonists' needs

II. Women in Colonial America

While African-American slaves and Indians were, as we have seen, subject to control, abuse, violence, and generally unequal treatment from white English colonists, the white English women living in the colonies were also did not enjoy status equal to their male peers. Thus we can say that,

generally speaking, women's lives varied depending upon location and relative social status, however all women were subordinate to men, and all women's lives revolved around private life, in the domestic circle.

A. Women's experiences

Mary Beth Norton, a Cornell professor and leading expert on early American women's history has divided women's experiences into roughly four categories:

1. Female African-Americans on the plantation, were usually assigned a job by the master that they kept for a number of years: cooks, seamstresses, housekeepers, field laborers, or poultry and livestock attendants. Housekeepers tended to have their daughters work with them and learn the ropes. On the plantations, slave midwives delivered African and European children, and were usually expected to drop everything else to do so. Slave women had some entrepreneurial initiative; though they worked six days a week, they tended gardens on Sundays and raised chickens; they could also sell these at markets to whites. Free black women in the cities tended to work primarily as housekeepers and nannies.

2. Poor and middling white farm women spent most of their lives cooking, washing, and ironing. They milked cows and took care of animals. Their lives revolved around daily routines and also seasonal patterns: for example, in the spring they'd plant the garden, in the summer, they'd harvest the bee hives, in the fall would be time to make apple cider and do canning, in the winter when the hog-killing took place, they'd make candles and soap and do the knitting and sewing necessary. Because their homes had dirt floors and it was a never-ending task, most women did not clean or sweep. It was simply too difficult.

3. White urban women were involved mainly in food preparation, gardening, etc., but they had a higher standard of cleanliness to live up to. Typically, they'd do their work in the morning and then in the afternoon, would socialize with friends or read. They had typical daily and seasonal rhythms, though they went to the market daily to procure the food for the evening's meal. City daughters had it especially good. Since their mother did most of the work, and perhaps had a slave or free servant or two, they learned music, sewing, read and sang, and hoped for a rich husband to continue to provide them with a life of leisure.

4. White plantation women had even fewer household chores, however, they had much more supervisory duties and required good management skills. They supervised slaves in the household. They read and played piano, did needlework and wrote letters to family and friends in their spare time or after dinner. They ate meals with their husband, but other than this and in the early evenings, had little time together. Once the food was available and in storage, they were also meal planners.

Demeaned and devalued by men, women found their work burdensome and difficult.

Domesticity was women's only role, it was seen. It was supposed to be fulfilling, but as we can tell from what many women wrote down, it was not.

B. Sexuality / Homosexuality

In his article, "Deficient Husbands: Manhood, Sexual Incapacity, and Male Marital Sexuality in Seventeenth-Century New England," Thomas A. Foster argues that sexual pleasure played an important role in marriage, and on seventeenth century views on male sexuality. Incapacity had serious repercussions for manhood, because it could prevent men from fully performing their role as

head of household, husband, and father. Many advice manuals, a New Haven law, and many individuals recognized and valued the importance sexual pleasure, while downplaying the role of sex purely for the purposes of procreation; male incapacity became a serious hindrance to female pleasure. Although seventeenth-century New Englanders held strong beliefs about the importance of reproduction, they believed that sexual relations between husbands and wives were separable from this imperative and important in their own right.

Attitudes towards homosexuality in the colonies are difficult to know, and so are the ways in which people reacted to it. Not all New Englanders, however, shared a horror of it. Ministers and magistrates saw homosexual acts as driven by sexual orientation and they were unequivocally hostile towards those who committed it. They saw it as a sin, like any other sin, a bodily impulse. But the community was surprisingly tolerant of it. For example, Stephen Gorton, a Baptist minister in Connecticut in the 1750s, was accused of making advances to other men, the community required him to take a leave of absence to reform his ways and allowed him to return to the church. Ebenezer Knight, a preacher in 1730s in Marblehead, MA, was suspended from his church, and a few years later publicly asked for forgiveness and was reaccepted.

There was a gay subculture, with men called “**mollies**”—they dressed and acted effeminately, and gathered in taverns, parks, and public places; this represented a shift to a homosexual identity. However, this was not the case in the countryside or in America.

60-second Quiz #3: What were some of the more nuanced gradations of gender and sexuality in colonial North America? Which statement is most correct?

- a. Domesticity was the overarching ideal African-American (enslaved) women were expected to pursue, but not white European women
- b. Domesticity was the overarching ideal white European women were expected to pursue, but not African-American (enslaved) women
- c. Domesticity was the overarching ideal wealthy white European women were expected to pursue, but not middling- and poor white European women, and not African-American (enslaved) women
- d. Domesticity was the overarching ideal all women were expected to pursue, no matter their race, class, or free/unfree status

III. The Great Awakening

Now that we have surveyed two of the larger examples of structural inequality in the colonies – the third example would be the experience of Indians – we need to turn back to religion. Up to this point, we’ve really seen religion play an important role in the northern colonies but less so in the southern colonies. This dichotomy was made less strict by the arrival of the Great Awakening, an event which saw religious revival threaten to shake the pillars of English society, both inside and outside the churches.

The **Great Awakening** was an intercolonial revival that occurred in the 1730s. Started by Presbyterians Gilbert and John Tennent of New Jersey, the movement crossed denominational and geographical lines, and had far-reaching implications for the culture of colonial America. In part, it was a response to the failure of the Puritan experiment. It was also in part a reaction to the Enlightenment, that intellectual movement among scientists and philosophers in Europe to apply reason and logic to nearly all aspects of human experience; in this case, the **Enlightenment** had led

the Anglican Church to produce sermons and teachings that were viewed by congregations as cold, rational, serious, and mental, instead of personal, exhilarating, or emotional.

Writing to friends in New England, the New Jersey preachers encouraged revivals in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Soon, **Johnathan Edwards**, a Congregational minister, led the charge. Edwards believed that God was acting throughout the colonies, perhaps throughout the world. He preached that, at any moment, our hold on life could break and we'd be plunged into fires of eternal damnation, and so therefore, *now* was the time to repent and to devote one's life to Christ.

In the late-1730s, **George Whitefield**, a young Anglican minister in England began questioning the Anglican Church. Influenced, perhaps, by Edwards and by changes in England that patterned the changes in the colonies, he developed a preaching style in contrast to the established church. He traveled around England and Wales, seeking out the poor and drawing large groups. Sometimes, thousands of people flocked to hear him in streets, fields and parks. He elicited an outpouring of emotions.

Short, skinny, and cross-eyed, Whitefield had an amazing voice and a dramatic presence. He had a loud, booming voice, and it is said one conversion occurred 3 miles from where he was preaching. An observer once noted that he could pronounce the word "Mesopotamia" in such a way that it could melt an audience. He would always say it at least once in sermon, no matter the topic. He was also a skilled marketer, advertising his speaking engagements effectively and well in advance. By 1739, news of his exploits in London had reached the colonies, and Whitefield crossed the Atlantic to tour the colonies, to raise funds for an orphanage in Georgia, and to bring his style of preaching to the colonies and join Jonathan Edwards in attempting to spread the revival throughout English North America.

Whitefield traveled from Georgia to Maine, and became perhaps the first celebrity seen and heard by a variety of colonists. At first, many of the colonists were skeptical, like Benjamin Franklin. Franklin noted in his autobiography the following experience:

I had in my pockets a handful of copper money, three or four silver dollars, and my five pieces of gold. As he proceeded, I began to soften, and concluded to give the coppers. Another stroke of his oratory made me so ashamed of that, and determined me to give the silver, and as he finished so admirable, I emptied my pocket wholly in to the Collector's dish, gold and all.

Besides witnessing the Great Awakening, Benjamin Franklin is also an example of how religious message (and later political messages, too) could travel across the colonies. Franklin was then the owner of a printing press in Philadelphia, produced many of the 80,000 copies of Whitefield's letters and sermons produced in the colonies. Whitefield had tremendous influence in the Congregational, Presbyterian, and Dutch Reformed churches of New England and New York, and some influence in South Carolina. He was less effective in Virginia, which was soundly Anglican. Revivalism came to Virginia in 1743 and from then on proceeded under the leadership of Presbyterian Samuel Davies, who trained many missionaries to the southern Indians. In the South, the Great Awakening was more of a frontier phenomenon than was the case in the Middle Colonies or New England.

In addition to drawing unprecedented crowds and making a sensational impression, Whitefield stirred controversy by blaming Anglican ministers of being boring and not reaching the people. His

theological beliefs also offended people, Charleston's Anglican ministers, for example, tried to have him jailed or fined for preaching to crowds there in 1740, but ultimately Whitefield stole the show at a public hearing. Josiah Smith at the Independent (Congregational) Church on Meeting Street took him in, and Whitefield also befriended several families in Charleston and helped them set up a school for African slaves; after the Charleston fire, they broke from the Anglican Church and set up a new church in McPhersonville. Thereafter, a number of new churches were established in sparsely settled areas from Georgetown to Beaufort, and indeed from York, Maine to Savannah, Georgia.

Whitefield spurred local revivals in the colonies, as people broke from the Anglican Church, and as Congregationalists, Presbyterians, and other groups divided too. The Baptists, who believed in baptizing adults, through full-immersion, and practiced the laying of hands and foot-washing, gained a huge following. By 1760, there were four Baptist Churches in South Carolina, with several more to follow. By the late-colonial period, the number of Baptist churches had more than quintupled in Virginia.

So what's important here is that the revival brought a change in religious beliefs for *all* denominations, because of this competition over souls. The revivalists became known as the **New Lights**, because they believed in revivalism, in emotional sermons and conversion experiences. They were younger ministers, university educated, from less wealthy backgrounds; they had traveled a bit, they were from small towns, they were younger, and they had large families. They themselves had had dramatic conversion experiences. The **Old Lights**, those that resisted the revival, tended to be a little older, a little better established, from heavily populated areas. Unlike the New Lights, they were the sons of clergy, preached in the same places they had been born or not far from it.

The Revival had a number of long-term consequences and effects, not all of which pertain to religious practice:

1. Popular enthusiasm for sampling an array of traveling preachers of remarkable social and theological diversity; basically revivalists realized they had more in common theologically than they had apart, and so traveling Presbyterian ministers, for example, visited Baptist churches, and people went to different religious services from time to time. In essence, Whitefield reduced to Christianity to its lowest common denominator--those sinners who love Jesus will go to heaven. Denominational distinctions were down played.
2. It extended Christianity to African slaves—it was accepted by revival churches, for example, Hugh and Johnathan Bryan established one such school just outside of Charleston.
3. It extended Christianity to Native Americans; one Native American named Samson Occom, a Mohegan Indian, became a minister and founded Dartmouth College in the late-1760s. In the South, the Presbyterians trained ministers to evangelize to the Cherokee. This mission impulse fell apart in 1759 with the Cherokee War, however.
4. It led to the founding of new colleges and universities to train ministers and missionaries; from 1746-1769 alone, the following colleges were founded for religious reasons: Columbia, Brown, Washington and Lee University (then by a different name), Rutgers, Hampden-Sydney.
5. Regular church attendance increased from 67% to 85%.
6. Changing of attitudes—people were now more enthusiastic about religion, more assured of salvation, more hopeful of heaven. These changes are exemplified by gravestone art.

60-second Quiz #4: What were some of the wider social effects of the Great Awakening?

- a. Christians in different denominations (e.g. Congregationalists, Anglicans, Baptists, etc...) felt more separated from each other as a result of the Great Awakening, and were even less enthusiastic about their religious faith than before
- b. Old Light preachers split away from the existing churches and founded new churches to preach the revival message, but they avoided preaching to Indians
- c. New Light preachers remained in the existing churches and to preach the revival message, but they avoided preaching to slaves
- d. New Light preachers split away from the existing churches and founded new churches to preach the revival message, including preaching to Indians and slaves

KEY for 60-second Quizzes:

- 1.) f – Indians were sometimes enslaved but almost never entered into indenture contracts
- 2.) d – African-American music actually influenced whites, not the other way around
- 3.) d – domesticity for all women
- 4.) d – the inclusion of Indians and slaves was one of the new changes in American Christianity, as practiced by the English

I. Imperial and colonial contexts

France and Britain had fought a series of wars in the 1700s, mainly in Europe. The first was the War of the League of Augsburg (1688-1697), a conflict between France and the Holy Roman Empire (a conglomeration of Austria and several hundred other, smaller, German-speaking principalities in central Europe at this time) on one hand and between France and various Protestant states on the other. France was essentially trying to seize territory and exert its influence but was forced to accept peace in the Treaty of Ryswick in 1697. In the second of these conflicts, the War of the Spanish Succession (1702-1713), the French and their allies were fighting to maintain control over the Spanish throne. (The French king's grandson had been named heir but a number of other states were alarmed that one royal house might control too much territory.) Neither of these two wars are, in themselves, crucial to our story of early American history, except insofar as the wars spilled over from Europe into the Americas.

Already rivals in Europe, the enmity between France and Britain only increased in North America. During the War of Spanish Succession, the French had surrendered Acadia to the British in the Treaty of Utrecht, and the British renamed the colony Nova Scotia (it became a British colony). The Acadian settlers stayed, and few Britons ever came to colonize the land, leaving 6,000 French-speaking farmers there. The French retained control of the Northern part of the island, where they had a large fortified seaport called **Louisbourg**; from here the French controlled the St. Lawrence River that stretched into the interior of Canada, to Quebec and Montreal (which remained part of New France).

The third conflict, the War of Jenkins Ear (1739-1748), began when tensions between Spain and British sailors and smugglers escalated. Robert Jenkins, a British captain, appeared before Parliament holding his ear, which he claimed had been sliced off by the Spanish. Parliament launched a war against Spanish shipping, and the Spanish defeated the British at St. Augustine and Cartagena, attacked Georgia (the British held them off). The French entered the war late in the game, and the conflict took place in both North America and in Europe. The British captured Louisbourg, but as a result of the treaty, returned it. The war ended in a stalemate. The peace treaty was unpopular in Britain. Wounded by the criticism, the British colonial authorities resolved to pay closer attention to North America in the next war and to keep any gains there.

Two things then happened, proving that the peace of 1748 would be short-lived:

First, with the latest war over with, French authorities in North America began to establish a string of forts in the Ohio Country west of the Allegheny Mountains. Their intent was to keep fur-trapping and trading activities in the hands of French citizens and to deny the area to land-hungry American colonists.

Second, in the 1740s a group of Virginians received from the Crown a massive land grant for lands in the Ohio valley. They established the **Ohio Company** for the purpose of investing in the western lands and opening them up to trade and settlement.

In 1753, Virginia lieutenant governor Robert Dinwiddie, himself a member of the Ohio Company, dispatched **George Washington** (also a member of the Ohio Company) into the disputed territory. The intent was to deliver a letter of protest to the French officials. The French refused to

vacate. The following year, Governor Dinwiddie sought, but failed, to secure assistance from the other colonies in a proposed effort to expel the French. He again turned to Washington, then 22 years old, who led his men westward into the disputed area. On May 28, Washington's forces surprised a group of French and Indians, inflicted heavy casualties, and took a number of captives. The colonial forces then hastily constructed Fort Necessity, not far from the French Fort Duquesne. On July 3, the French forces struck back, defeating Washington and his men at the Battle of Great Meadows, and took over Fort Necessity. The **French and Indian War** (1756-1763) had begun. Washington was forced to surrender on July 4 and returned with his men to Virginia.

The French commander treated his opponents leniently in the hope of avoiding a broader conflict. Nevertheless, the opening shots of the French and Indian War had been fired. Washington's loss only made the Britain more resolved to assert its claims in the Ohio Country.

While Washington was engaging the French in western Pennsylvania, colonial delegates from seven of the British colonies gathered in Albany in an effort to prepare for the coming war. Discussions focused on two primary issues:

(1) The Iroquois: Often referred to as the Six Nations, the Iroquois had traditionally maintained stronger relationships with the French than the British, but by the 1740s the British were actively engaged in trade with many tribes in the Ohio Valley. Native leaders were not anxious to commit themselves to siding with one power or the other, preferring to wait and see if they could ally with the winning side. Nevertheless, the Albany officials were successful with winning a tepid commitment from the Iroquois in return for substantial bribes of supplies and weapons.

(2) **The Albany Plan of Union**: Benjamin Franklin and Massachusetts governor Thomas Hutchinson drafted a proposal for colonial unity in the face of the coming war with France. The plan called for the creation of new layers of government, including a president-general who would be appointed by the Crown and exercise broad powers over relationships with the natives, making war and governing the frontier areas until new colonies were created. A grand council was also proposed whose members would be appointed by the existing colonial assemblies and whose representation would be determined by the amount of financial contribution (taxes) paid to the organization.

The plan for a federated colonial government never got off the ground. It was approved by the delegates at Albany, but not a single colonial assembly ratified it. It was doubtful, even if approved by the assemblies that royal officials would have approved of this consolidation of power in America. Instead, the Board of Trade in London proposed the creation of a colonial council composed of one representative from each colony. That body would be responsible for raising **militia** forces (i.e. local farmers, merchants, and workers who took up arms but who did not fight very well) and apportioning the cost among the membership. This idea elicited little enthusiasm in America, where the colonists preferred to have **British regulars** (i.e. professional soldiers) fight their battles with money raised on the other side of the Atlantic. (The Albany Plan of Union set an example that would later be followed by such gatherings as the continental congresses.)

The early period of the war saw localized action in North America and began with Washington's loss at Fort Necessity. Neither side committed much in the way of troop strength or resources to the effort. Most of the action was confined to attempts to capture the opponent's fortified positions on the frontier.

60-second Quiz #1: What were some of the imperial and colonial conflicts that existed before the French and Indian War? Which of the following is NOT one of these conflicts:
a. British and French rivalry for power and influence in Europe

- b. British and French competition for power and influence in North America
- c. Willingness of the English colonies to unite together to face the French threat
- d. Unwillingness of the English colonies to unite together to face the French threat

II. Major highlights

What follows are some of the major highlights during this period:

In 1755, two British regiments led by General Edward Braddock were ambushed and murdered when they tried to attack Fort Duquesne, yet the British scored a major victory in Nova Scotia, and as a result, drove out the French residents, the Acadiens. A large number of them relocated to Louisiana, and became the **Cajuns**.

Formal war was declared between Britain and France in 1756, and a small colonial conflict was transformed into a world war. Spain also entered the conflict, fighting both the British and the French. Effecting a reversal of past alliances, Austria sided with France and Britain with Prussia. Thus, there was fighting in Europe, too, and in all the colonies all around the world that all the countries involved possessed. (Of course, we'll be concerned with what happened in North America.) The picture was further complicated by the allegiances of the area's natives. As a rule, most of the tribes tended to favor the French who enjoyed a reputation for conducting business more fairly than the British. Further, the French trappers and traders did not threaten to inundate the region with settlers, unlike the British colonists. The French had cultivated a network of Indian allies on the Middle Ground, and had a long string of small forts and trading posts that stretched around the Great Lakes and down the Ohio and Mississippi River Valleys. The Indians faced a greater threat from settler invasion and environmental transformation from the more numerous and certainly more aggressive English than from the far fewer and much more generous French.

In North America the string of British failures continued, especially in New York. The French defeated the British at Fort Oswego in 1756, and Louis Joseph, the Marquis of Montcalm, arrived as the new French commander and successfully pushed southward from Lake Champlain to Lake George. In August 1757, Fort William Henry fell, leaving Albany susceptible to French invasion. (This is the battle depicted in the movie [*The Last of the Mohicans*](#). It was actually filmed in [Chimney Rock Park](#) in North Carolina.)

By 1757, the French fielded a North American army of slightly more than 10,000 men, about equally divided between regulars and Canadian militia; the Indian allies were undependable by this point. The British, on the other hand, had 20,000 regulars and an equal number of militiamen. The overall population of British North America was about 10 times that of New France, and the French were impaired by longer and more exposed lines of supply.

Lake George was wilderness. It was the void between two encroaching European frontiers. Just a few miles north of the lake, stood Fort Carillon, the French fortress, designed to guard the area north from any English advance into Canada. Several miles south and east of the lake stood Fort Edward, on the Hudson, the northern terminus of the English foray into this forested area. Between the two stood the 26 mile long Lake George.

Named Lac Du St. Sacrement by the French, the place was renamed Lake George by William Johnson in 1755, shortly before he had defeated a French force there in the Battle of Lake George, to leave no doubt as to English sovereignty in the area. A road, constructed to link Fort Edward to the lake, now needed protection. In addition, a fort at this site could prove to be a launching and

resupplying point for assaults against the French outposts and beyond. Thus was born **Fort William Henry**, designed and situated by Captain William Eyre along with Johnson.

On June 7, 1756 General Daniel Webb arrived to assume command of the fort and lead the upcoming planned offensive. At both ends of the lake, French and English garrisons were increased, entrenchments built, and preparations undergone. Over the course of the next year, a series of raids, counter-raids, and scouting missions occurred leading to some casualties and gathered intelligence.

It soon became apparent that Fort William Henry was becoming a thorn in the side of New France. General Marquis de Montcalm, in command at Fort Carillon, decided to invest and reduce the log structure at the south end of the Lake. Departing from his post on Lake Champlain in late-July, 1757, the French under Montcalm assembled 3,081 regulars, 2,946 Canadian militia, and 1,806 Indian warriors.

1806 warriors from 33 tribes accompanied Montcalm. The central antagonists were NOT Hurons, as portrayed in the movie, but rather Ottawa, Chippewa, Potawatomie, and Menominee Indians from the Pais d'en haut (the Great Lakes Region). There were also Abenaki, Iroquois, and Nipissing from the Canadian mission villages.

By contrast, the garrison at Fort William Henry, under the able leadership of Lt. Colonel George Monro - once General Webb decided to turn tail and survey matters from Fort Edward - had a total, as the siege began, of 2372 men. Only a maximum of 500 could man the fort. The remainder settled into an entrenched camp just east of the fort. No preparations were undertaken to resist French attempts to make landings on the shore. The English merely waited. Expecting the attack to come from the west - the east side being swampy and fortified by the camp - Monro had the heaviest of the artillery pieces along the west wall. And so it was to be...

Montcalm chose the northwest bastion to bear the brunt of the artillery barrage he planned. Arriving during the night of August 2-3, 1757, he immediately set to work building a road and then a series of entrenchments to inch ever-closer to the fort walls. Meanwhile, Indian and militia marksman positioned themselves between the entrenched camp and Fort Edward, straddling the road, and harassed the beleaguered British.

As the days went on, the French artillery moved closer, the British casualties mounted, and hope of reinforcement continued to dwindle. Couriers were routinely dispatched between the British forts, often times being intercepted by the French or their Indian allies. One such message, from Webb, encouraged surrender, as at the time, he felt he could not aid Monro. On August 7, Montcalm ordered his aid-de-camp, Captain Bougainville, forward under a flag of truce to make this intercepted letter known to the garrison. By the next morning, the French trenches were a mere 250 yards outside the fort wall. Within the fort, ammunition was low, spirits were lower. There was little hope.

And so, just after dawn on the 9th of August, following a conference of the fort's officers, a flag of truce was visible flying over Fort William Henry. Montcalm offered generous terms; even for the typically gentlemanly terms of the day: the entire garrison would be allowed to march off in military parade, colors flying, to Fort Edward. A cannon would even be allowed to accompany the procession. In return, the English would not bear arms against France for the next 18 months. No ammunition would be granted, and the sick and wounded would be returned when well. One British officer would remain as hostage, until the French escort attached to the retreating column, returned safely from Fort Edward. In European terms, all was well. The paid French soldiers had earned their victory. Once burned, there would no longer be a British post on the shores of Lake George. The British, though defeated, had retained their honor. The siege of Fort William Henry was over.

Many of the Indians accompanying Montcalm had canoed a thousand miles on French promises of scalps, prisoners, and weapons, promises that were repeated by Montcalm. However, with the generous terms of surrender, British and colonial soldiers were released with their arms and personal possessions in exchange for agreeing not to fight the French and Indians for 18 months. With the victorious French claiming the fort, cannon and supplies for the Canadian government, the Indians were left with very little but anger and disappointment.

Indians entered the camp at dawn, August 10—they took blacks and Indians, horses, kettles, personal possessions of white officers. They killed and scalped the severely wounded, because under the peace agreement, the French would have to nurse these back to health.

The next event did not begin with a firefight as portrayed in the film. 1600 Indians, with guns but hardly any ammo, attacked 2,300 disarmed parolees. The numbers are unclear, but anywhere from 70-180 were killed. The movie misrepresents Indian actions. Magua was not motivated by revenge, and Munro and all the other British officers survived the attack.

Indians took perhaps a few hundred prisoners; a few hundred more fled into the woods, many wandered around for weeks, and others made their way south to fort William Henry.

The Indians held the prisoners ransom for goods and 30 bottles of brandy.

After the massacre, the French troops brought the British soldiers and the survivors to fort Edward and burned Fort William Henry to the ground.

By 1758, things started to turn around for the British, when King George II appointed William Pitt to lead the war effort. Pitt controlled the war effort almost single-handedly:

Pitts paid Frederick the Great of Prussia to do the fighting for Britain in Europe. He then instructed the royal navy to set up a blockade against the French, which cut off French supplies and enabled British supplies to get through to the colonies. Pitt further publicly criticized the French and won support in both Britain and the colonies for the war effort. Finally, Pitt appointed dynamic young military commanders, particularly Jeffery Amherst and James Wolfe.

So the British concentrated on North America, and invested even more money and effort into winning.

In 1758, the British scored major victories; with the British victory at Louisbourg, they now controlled the St. Lawrence River and set up a blockade. British victories continued in 1759; Jeffrey Amherst won at the Battle of Fort Ticonderoga, and most especially, the fate of French Canada was sealed by the British victory in Quebec City, a battle in which both Wolfe and Montcalm died. The British strategy reached its conclusion in 1760, when they successfully completed their attack from the Great Lakes east, from New York north and from the Atlantic Provinces of Canada southeast; the British scored a major victory and seized Montreal in 1760. With this, for all practical purposes the French had been defeated, because their major forts and cities had been taken in the west, in New York, the St. Lawrence valley, and in the Atlantic Provinces of present-day Canada.

With superior numbers (1.5 million residents, a much larger army, superior sailors, warships and cannon, the British also spent 10 times as much money as the French, who only had 75,000 residents, and whose army and navy concentrated elsewhere in the world. The British also scored

naval victories against the French, and against the Spanish, who jumped into the war near its end hoping to prey on the British.

60-Second Quiz #2: How did the British go from losing the war to winning the war? Which of the following statements it most true?

- a. The British relied on superior numbers of Indian allies during the war than France did
- b. The French won no major military victories during the war
- c. The British relied on more extensive military support from Spain during the war than did France
- d. The British decided to invest more money, more troops, and more resources into the war than did France

III. Deteriorating relations with the Indians

Meanwhile, in 1759-1760, conflict with the Indians continued on the frontier for some time, most especially, a struggle with the Cherokee, allies of the French, in the South Carolina frontier. Late in the war, with the French facing defeat, South Carolina settlers invaded Cherokee lands and poached their deer.

About 100 Cherokee accompanied a British expedition that was intended to attack the French-allied Shawnee but the campaign was abandoned when their provisions were lost while attempting to cross a swollen river. The Cherokee began home on foot in starving condition, angered at the contempt and neglect they experienced from the British. They "confiscated" some free-roaming horses belonging to Virginia colonists, feeling fully justified considering their service to the ungrateful colonists. The colonists, however, attacked the Cherokee, killing over twenty of them. The Cherokee dead were mutilated and scalped and the scalps redeemed for bounty as provided by Virginia law.

The chiefs of the Nation attempted to negotiate restitution with the colonists but the young warriors were so incensed that they began raiding border settlements. The colonists declared war, cut-off all trade, and demanded that numerous chiefs be surrendered for execution. Thirty-two prominent Cherokee, including the famous war chief Oconostota, went to Fort Prince George, in South Carolina, to attempt to negotiate peace but the British took the whole party prisoner. Chief Attacullakulla, the Little Carpenter, was able to negotiate the release of Oconostota and two others while the remaining twenty-nine chiefs remained captive.

Angered at the tactics of the British, Oconostota laid siege to Fort Prince George. The commander of the fort was called out to speak to Oconostota but when he came out he was shot and killed. The garrison of the fort immediately killed their twenty-nine captives. With war now in full swing, Oconostota's warriors begin raiding the Carolina settlements while other Cherokees laid siege to Fort Loudoun in what is now eastern Tennessee. A force of 1,600 Colonials drove Cherokees back and destroyed numerous towns. The Cherokee, however, massed a large force and in June of 1760 forced the colonists to retire leaving Fort Loudoun under siege.

Fort Loudoun surrendered to Oconostota in August on the condition that they would be allowed safe passage with sufficient arms and ammunition for the march home but delivering all other weapons and ammunition to the Cherokee. When they occupied the fort, the Cherokee discovered that powder, balls (i.e., bullets), and cannon had been buried or thrown in the river. Angered at the former garrison's deception, the Cherokees attacked the soldiers the next morning killing 29 in the first volley and taking the remainder prisoner until they were later ransomed by the colony.

The colonists demanded revenge and, despite attempts for peace by Attacullakulla, sent an 2,600 man force in 1761 which destroyed 15 Cherokee towns and "pushed the frontier seventy miles

farther to the west" though incurring heavy losses in the process. Attacullakulla was able to negotiate a treaty with the South Carolina colony in September of 1761.

In November of the same year, a force of Virginians who had descended as far as present-day Kingsport, TN were met by a delegation of Cherokees and a treaty was signed. In addition, Lt. Henry Timberlake volunteered to return with the Cherokee and lived with them for several months. Timberlake later took a delegation of chiefs to England but, since the trip was not authorized by the government, they were practically ignored and returned disgusted.

Because Virginia had placed a bounty on Shawnee Indians, South Carolinians killed Cherokee because Cherokee and Shawnee looked alike. Cherokee warriors took revenge by killing 30 settlers. South Carolina demanded that the Cherokee surrender the subjects. The chiefs proposed to compensate for each death with a French scalp or prisoner, but South Carolina's governor rejected this. South Carolina wanted Cherokee submission, not French scalps. 22 Cherokee chiefs traveled to Charleston to meet with the colonial government, but were seized and executed.

The Cherokee were tough foes for South Carolina. They numbered 12,000, perhaps double the population of Charleston, and in 40 villages throughout North and South Carolina were fairly dispersed. They ravaged the South Carolina frontier in 1760, captured the British Fort Loudon, and posed a threat to British and South Carolina troops.

In 1761, the British and the colonies invaded and destroyed 15 Cherokee towns. The British blockade of New Orleans cut off the French supply to the Indians and the Creek Indians remained neutral. Without French troops to help either, the Cherokee struggled. Finally in 1761, the Cherokee fell and ceded vast tracts of land to the colonists.

After the fall of Montreal, and by 1760, with only the Cherokee War still taking place, and the French not participating in this, peace negotiations between Britain and France began. At this time, though, King George II died, and new King George III took over. He fired William Pitt, who he thought had become too powerful and popular.

Negotiations continued, as did fighting in the Caribbean between the British, French and Spanish.

Finally in February 1763, the major European powers met and signed the Treaty of Paris. As part of the treaty, France gave to Britain all of Canada and all North American claims east of the Mississippi River. France ceded the Louisiana Territory to Spain (Napoleon would get it back). Britain gave France back its major sugar islands, Guadeloupe and Martinique, but gave up a few minor ones.

Spain also gave up Florida to Britain, yet took back control of Cuba, which had temporarily fallen to the British.

60-second Quiz #3: How were British relations with the Indians affected by the war? Which effect is NOT true?

- a. The British traded peacefully with the Indian, and this induced them (the Indians) to fight against the French secured British victory
- b. The British relied on Indians to remaining exclusively neutral in the war and this neutrality was decisive in securing British victory
- c. The British exclusively tried to secure alliances with Indians to advance their (the British) military interests

d. The British sought alliances with some Indians, neutrality with others, and war against still others, all to advance their (the British) military interests

IV. End of the war, consequences of the war

So Britain emerged as the major winner. But not everything was rosy.

The Indian tribes of the Ohio Valley, stung by the defeat of their French allies, and seeing the British now in control of their homelands, were outraged, because they knew their lives would change for the worst.

English dominance in North America meant the construction of new forts and the movement of new settlers into traditional Indian lands. The earlier French presence had been slight and the relationship often harmonious.

British traders lacked the reputation for fairness in dealing with the Indians that had been the hallmark of the French. The natives had become dependent on European firearms, ammunition and other manufactured goods, and were now forced to deal with untrustworthy English partners. British arrogance was well-known among the Indians. The French in many instances had married native women and been adopted by the tribes. Few British followed that example and many expressed utter contempt for the natives' cultures and worth as human beings.

Tensions were further heightened when, in early 1763, Sir Jeffrey Amherst, the new North American governor-general, announced that he would discontinue the practice of presenting annual gifts to the tribes, an event long honored by the French. The Indians were insulted by this snub, but also were angry to be denied the expected tools, blankets, guns and liquor.

A native visionary called the **Neolin** the Prophet seized on this anger and preached for a return to traditional ways and for the rejection of contact with the British. He encouraged Indians to resist colonial culture, to reject alcohol, and to stop giving up their lands. Neolin's teachings influenced many Indian tribes who had been allies with the French, including **Pontiac**, an Ottawa chieftain.

Inspired by Neolin and Pontiac, Indians launched a widespread rebellion against the British, capturing forts in the Great Lakes region and the Ohio Valley, raiding settlements in PA, MD, and VA, and killed or captured 2,000 whites. They hoped to incite the French to jump back into the conflict, but they failed to capture the major British posts of Detroit, Niagara, or Pittsburgh. Though eight British forts fell to the Indians in late 1763, the British in the ensuing year simply escalated their attacks against the Indians throughout the Ohio Valley and the Great Lakes regions, and began to win.

The British turned the tide, because the Indians did not have any central organization. Contrary to popular belief, Pontiac was NOT the central commander of the movement. Rather, he was one figure in it, and the British pinned the blame on him.

The rebellion sparked several unrelated atrocities; in Pennsylvania, for instance, a group of Scotch-Irish vigilantes called the **Paxton Boys** attacked a settlement of peaceful Christian Indians in Lancaster, taking out their anger about the government's inability to protect land-grabbing settlers on the frontier on peaceful Indians who for years had coexisted peacefully with the Penn family's example. Sifting through the ashes of the community they had destroyed, they found the treaty of friendship papers that the Indians had signed with William Penn in 1701.

What were the effects of the French and Indian War and of Pontiac's Rebellion?

(1) Knowing they could not defend the western borders, George III of Britain issued the **Proclamation Line of 1763** forbidding Western settlement beyond the Appalachian Mountains. Designed to preserve peace and to protect whites, the Proclamation Line angered colonists who claimed land to the west. It also angered the colonies themselves, because they saw it as limits on their land rights and their growth and expansion. The Proclamation Line did not only prohibit future settlement—it also demanded that people already settled west of the line leave.

(2) Another major legacy of the war was debt. During the war, Britain's national debt had more than doubled to 132 million pounds, mainly because of William Pitt's leadership. It needed to be paid off. With English taxes already at all-time highs, they turned to the colonies for revenue. After all, most of the fighting had occurred in the colonies; it only seemed fair that the colonies should pay for it.

(3) Third, furthermore, following the war, Britain kept 10,000 troops in colonial America to keep peace between colonists, Native Americans, and the French, mainly on the frontier. Who better to pay for these troops than the people who would most benefit from their presence, the colonists themselves?

(4) Fourth, the war led American settlers and British administrators to conclude that Indians and whites could not coexist peacefully, and that extermination was the only option.

(5) Fifth, during the War, with an increased presence in the colonies, the British realized that the colonists had ignored anti-smuggling acts, most especially, they had ignored the **1733 Molasses Act** that forbade them to import French molasses to make rum. The British could not believe that even during the war, the colonists were trading with the enemy and disrespecting British laws.

(6) Sixth, the war had cultural consequences for the future of British and American relationship; I've identified four:

a. It had united the colonists in a shared experience and hardship and had strengthened the bonds, the news, and the similarities, between the colonies.

b. It spread resentment—colonists felt that they were always second-fiddle militarily in the eyes of the English; the English treated them as inferiors.

c. Finally, it exposed the cruelty of the English military.

d. Neither side liked what it saw in the other. To the English the Americans were arrogant amateurs; to the Americans the English were brutal bullies, ungrateful for Americans' skills and efforts.

So by 1764, the war was over, the Indian rebellion had been put down, but Indians were more hated than ever. The British and their colonies were victorious, but the colonists and the British were divided and resentful, rather than joyful and united. The British were also broke.

Thus would begin a chain of events that led to the War of American Independence...we'll pick it up there next time.

60-second Quiz #4: What were some of the major effects of the French and Indian War? Which result is NOT true?

a. Continued tension (and war) with Indians, due to pressure by the English to seize more Indian land

- b. Increased debts for the English government and, therefore, increased pressure from England onto the colonies to pay higher taxes to finance the debt
- c. Lingering presence of British troops ("regulars") in the colonies to keep the peace
- d. Immediate calls for the colonies' independence from Great Britain

Key for quizzes:

- 1: c.
- 2: d.
- 3: d.
- 4: d.

I. The End of Salutary Neglect

As we have seen, for most of the 18th century, the British Government was busy with European affairs and had more-or-less left the American colonies alone. This period of time is sometimes referred to as “salutary neglect,” meaning that the colonial governments could more-or-less operate as they pleased, with very little interference from London. This had changed rather suddenly with the French and Indian War, as the British Government took all necessary steps to defend its claims to land and power in North America. By 1764, the war was over, the Indian rebellion had been put down, but Indians were more hated than ever. The British and their colonies were victorious, but the colonists and the British were divided and resentful, rather than joyful and united. The British were also broke. The British had already dictated the Proclamation Line of 1763. What would they do next? What would the ungrateful colonists do next? The victories ushered in a chain of events for twelve years, and eventually led to war between Britain and the colonies.

With Britain in debt, and having to pay the costs of having troops in the colonies, Britain needed money. Americans individually paid low taxes to their colonial governments, and paid little in import taxes for goods that they imported. Plus, British officials realized that Americans had been avoiding the Molasses Act of 1733 for thirty years.

The **Molasses Act of 1733** had placed a six pence tax on every gallon of Molasses that the Americans imported from the French or Dutch islands in the Caribbean, thus making it cheaper to import molasses from the British islands. However, the colonists had various complaints about it, because they had to pay a 2 pence tax on British molasses, too. Instead, they just secretly brought in molasses from the French islands and did not pay any taxes on it at all. (They used molasses for making rum, which was then sold from New England. The Act taxed the import of sugar and rum, too.)

In 1764, Parliament came up with what it thought was a solution: The **Sugar Act of 1764**. The Sugar Act lowered the tax on foreign molasses, yet it also cracked down on smugglers. It was an attempt to raise more revenue. In addition, any one caught trying to break the law would be tried by British-judges, not a colonial jury. So the deck was stacked against any colonists who were trying to smuggle.

The British also passed the **Currency Act of 1764**, prohibiting colonies from printing their own paper money (to make things more uniform). This meant that the colonies had to use hard currency (i.e. gold and silver), or banknotes from Great Britain, for any and all business transactions. This was a big deal because the colonies were so remote from Great Britain that hard currency was usually scarce, so it would be hard for merchants to do business.

In May, at a town meeting in Boston, James Otis raised the issue of taxation without representation and urged a united response to the recent acts imposed by England. In July, Otis published "The Rights of the British Colonies Asserted and Proved." In August, Boston merchants began a boycott of British luxury goods.

The British passed the **Quartering Act of 1765**; this required colonists to provide accommodations (i.e. rooms in houses) for British troops stationed in America; this would save the crown money. (Contrary to popular belief, colonists were not themselves forced out of their houses. Rather they were required to allow soldiers to use vacant rooms and houses; this did deprive landlords of the opportunity to rent out real estate.)

Finally, in March, 1765, Parliament passed the **Stamp Act of 1765** (it was to go in effect November 1). All legal documents, customs papers, newspapers, almanacs, diplomas, playing cards, and dice were to have a special stamp on them, proving that Americans paid a tax on them. The colonists quickly united in opposition. They believed that no people should be taxed without their consent, as they had been with the Sugar Act and the Stamp Act. Also, to be deprived of the right to trial by a jury of their peers angered them. Influenced also by the Country Ideology (a history of government opponents in England who warned that the government was corrupt and out to get you), colonists suspected that Parliament was out to get them, to take away their liberties, to treat them as inferiors, to have their way with them.

It is worth pausing a moment to explain the British government's side of the story. Parliament at this time was filled with individual representatives (called MPs – Members of Parliament) who in theory represented a particular borough but also represented the entire British Empire. That is, British citizens eligible to vote (only men; and only men who possessed a minimum amount of property that qualified them to vote) elected their MPs from individual boroughs but the boroughs themselves were not designed to contain equal numbers of citizens in them. So more populous boroughs did not necessarily have more MPs. Furthermore, Parliament operated on a theory called “**virtual representation**,” which meant that MPs always voted to make the best decisions that were in the best interest of the entire British Empire. So, even though the American colonies did not get to vote for MPs who were then sent to represent them in London, Parliament believed that virtual representation meant that the American colonies' best interests would be served by the MPs in London, no matter what.

The colonists did not buy this explanation and, throughout 1765, they protested the Stamp Act. This tax affected everyone. During the spring and summer, colonial legislatures passed resolutions (usually called “resolves”), claiming that Parliament had no right to tax them. They pointed out (rightly) that, even though every single acre of England was represented in Parliament, not one single acre of American ground was represented in Parliament. They also pointed out (again, correctly) that Americans had no way to advise members of Parliament, they could not replace members by voting them out of office, and instead had to appear as humble petitioners begging for favors. Therefore, argued the colonies, Americans were not represented in the same manner as Englishmen. That is, the colonies rejected the theory of virtual representation.

60-second Quiz #1: What were some of the ways Parliament acted to end the period of “salutary neglect,” following the French and Indian War? All of the following are examples of ending “salutary neglect” after the French and Indian war EXCEPT which one?

- a. Parliament passed the Molasses Act of 1733
- b. Parliament passed the Sugar Act of 1764
- c. Parliament passed the Currency Act of 1764
- d. Parliament passed the Stamp Act of 1765

II. Colonial Defiance

In July, the **Sons of Liberty** – a group of middle class artisans, brewers, craftsmen — organized in Boston in opposition to the Stamp Act. Inviting poorer whites to join them, including dock workers, apprentices, and servants, the Sons rioted, burnt effigies of Stamp distributors, intimidated British officials, and in Boston, looted and vandalized the home of lieutenant governor Thomas Hutchinson of Massachusetts. They burnt his house to the ground and destroyed all his belongings. There were organized riots in several cities, including Newport, Baltimore, and Charleston.

The resolves passed by different colonial legislatures were printed in the newspapers, and the way they were printed gave the public the impression that the Virginia House of Burgesses had been much bolder than they had actually been in denouncing the Stamp Act, and their supposed example stirred up other assemblies to emulate and sometimes surpass the original. Rhode Island adopted the resolutions as they were printed in the *Newport Mercury*, making additions and modifications. That is, Rhode Island openly endorsed resistance to the Crown! Other colonies followed suit, passing resolutions defining their rights. Most of these denied the authority of Parliament to extend the jurisdiction of admiralty courts; all of them denied its authority to tax the colonies. These resolutions as they were printed in the *Mercury* and the *Gazette* eventually led to the Stamp Act Congress. In October, 1765, delegates from nine of the colonies met in New York City. This is called the **Stamp Act Congress**. They wrote a petition to King George and the Parliament requesting that the Stamp Act and all the previous acts be repealed.

On November 1, the day the Stamp Act went into effect, people simply refused to comply. Most cities boycotted British goods, and people tried to keep the stamp distributors from doing their jobs. The Sons of Liberty tried to keep the agents from selling stamps in Boston by enlisting the help of the lower classes, and by sending a mob to hang an effigy representing Andrew Oliver (the stamp distributor for Boston) on a tree. They then burned down Andrew Oliver's wharf-front building, and beheaded the effigy, stomped on it, and burned it in a bonfire. They broke into Oliver's home and burned it. Everyone agreed that it was the most violent riot the town had ever seen. They had obtained the resignation of the Stamp Distributor, and had made it clear what would happen to anyone who dared to take Oliver's place. They also staged a public resignation for Oliver. In addition, the mob destroyed the homes of Mr. Story and Benjamin Hallowell, the Comptroller of Customs.

Intimidating political officials came easily for Bostonians -- the mob had already savagely destroyed lieutenant-governor Hutchinson's home (see above). The mob also hung effigies of George Grenville (British Prime Minister at this time) and John Huske (another official) and placed a copper plaque around the trunk of the liberty tree. They cut down the images and held a procession, carried the images to a gallows, and hung them, and cut them to pieces. There was another similar demonstration later that week. The colonists also managed to secure the opening of the courts and ports, and used the newspapers to publish letters and inflammatory material.

In 1766, Parliament repealed the Stamp Act, yet the same day passed the confusing **Declaratory Act**. It stated that Parliament had the power to make laws for the colonies "in all cases whatsoever." This resembled a 1719 law that the British had used to subjugate the Irish, and colonists saw a definite resemblance.

The Stamp Act had lasting consequences, even though it was repealed. It convinced colonists that the British were out to deprive them of their rights. To the British, the unruly colonists had to be put in their place. It brought young, more radical leaders into power in the colonies, unwilling to compromise. It showed that the colonies could work together, and it got their guard up.

After a shuffling of prime ministers for various reasons, Charles Townshend came into office, absolutely determined to raise money from the colonies. In 1767, he urged Parliament, and they complied, to levy a new set of taxes on the colonists: The **Townshend Duties**, which placed taxes on lead, paint, paper, glass, and tea, that the Americans imported from Britain. The Act also created a new Board of Customs Commissioners, headquartered in Boston. Its first duties were to enlarge the number of subordinate officers, increase the number of boats patrolling the coast and expand its intelligence gathering operations to catch smugglers and corrupt officials. Finally, Townshend rearranged and strengthened the colonial vice admiralty courts. There were to be three new courts at

Boston, Philadelphia and Charleston. Only vice admiralty courts (with their lack of juries) could try violations, under the new Townshend plan.

In October, Bostonians decided to reinstate a boycott of English luxury items. Led by a well-connected and well-liked brewery owner from Massachusetts, who was also a colonial congressman (Samuel Adams), Massachusetts sent letters to other colonial assemblies calling for them to boycott British goods. By July, 1769, Charleston had joined the non-importation ranks; at the end of the year all the colonies except New Hampshire were in compliance.

After repeated threats from Boston, scattered incidents of violence, and the citizens' absolute refusal to comply, British customs officials seized a ship belonging to John Hancock, the *Liberty*, and a smuggling ship. Customs officials, scared for their lives, requested troops to help bring Boston to order. Colonial authorities could see that in order to have an effective customs service, a civilian peacekeeping force was necessary.

Later in September, English warships sailed into Boston Harbor, with 4,000 troops sent to keep order and to stay until further notice. Boston's 15,000 unruly residents assaulted, intimidated, harassed, and heckled the troops. They hated the British troops. The situation in Boston gradually deteriorated.

On March 5, 1770, a mob gathered and cornered a group of 15 British soldiers on guard duty near the customs house. In the confusion of the scene, British soldiers apparently accidentally fired their muskets into the crowd, killing five and injuring six. After the incident, the captain of the British soldiers, Thomas Preston, was arrested along with eight of his men and charged with murder. The colonists dubbed this the **Boston Massacre**, and silversmith and printer Paul Revere created a propaganda image reinforcing the belief that the colonists were innocent bystanders, innocent victims of British aggression. The Pelham-Revere depiction shows Preston raising his sword in a gesture of defiance and command. Preston did not command a halt but neither did he order a volley. In truth, he hadn't wanted them to fire. The soldiers had reloaded. Preston was actually enraged. The soldiers may have fired mistakenly.

The British repealed the Townshend Acts and all of the previous taxes and laws they had made in the 1760s, EXCEPT for the tax on tea.

In the trial for the British arrested in the Boston Massacre, John Adams (future member of the Continental Congress, and future President of the United States) served as the defense attorney. This was not because Adams sympathized with the soldiers, but because he believed that the accused should be proven guilty in a court of law, not jailed or executed without trial and evidence. Amazingly, Adams was able to successfully defend his clients, despite the angry juror pool (and despite the danger to his own reputation). Only two of the soldiers were found guilty of manslaughter and were branded and set free; all others were acquitted. Troops left Boston, and everything seemed calm.

However, in 1772, tensions flared again. In June, a British customs schooner, an anti-smuggling enforcement vessel, the *Gaspee*, shipwrecked off the coast of Providence, Rhode Island. Colonists then rowed out to the schooner, pulled the British crew members off of it, and burned the ship. The English Crown responded by sending a committee to investigate and by offering a giant award for the capture of those involved. England's response angered the colonists.

Samuel Adams, outraged at this latest incident, created a **Committee of Correspondence** to communicate with other towns and colonies, and within the next year, other colonies followed. Now the colonies were talking to each other, sharing information, and organizing.

In the middle of 1773, the British decided to try once more to set a tax on the colonists, but to the colonists, the British were just trying to pull a fast one on them, with the **Tea Act of 1773**. It allowed the East India Company to sell tea directly to the colonies, bypassing the merchants. It would make tea cheaper for the colonists, yet it was seen as a deliberate trick to make them pay a tax. Despite their protests, the ships set sail for the major cities in the colonies, and arrived at the harbors. In Charleston, the ship went to the British Fort Johnson, on an island in the harbor and was protected, but never unloaded. It ended up turning around and going back. In New York, the ship carrying the tea returned back to England. Philadelphians prevented the ship from docking, and eventually it returned to England.

In Boston, royal governor Thomas Hutchinson demanded that the colonists pay the taxes on the tea, or else. (This would require the unloading and sale of the tea.) On December 16, 1773, almost a month later, Boston residents spilled out of the Old South Meeting House, in a rally held by Samuel Adams. Later, 50 (white) men disguised themselves as Mohawk Indians, boarded the ships, and dumped all 342 chests of tea, about 90,000 pounds' worth, into Boston Harbor. The event was subsequently referred to as the **Boston Tea Party**.

By the beginning of the New Year, there was hardly an American who did not know of the Bostonians' destruction of the tea. With the news from Charleston, New York, and Philadelphia, it showed that colonists were uniting, and that the cause was continental. Colonists were overjoyed. At last the Americans had struck back with a bold blow at tyranny.

60-Second Quiz #2: What were some of the ways American colonists expressed their defiance in the face of new, more punitive laws enacted by the British Government? All of the following are examples of colonists expressing their defiance EXCEPT which one?

- a. Colonists formed the Sons of Liberty to intimidate British officials to pressure Parliament to repeal the Stamp Act
- b. Colonists formed the Stamp Act Congress to lobby the King to repeal the Stamp Act
- c. Colonists fired on British soldiers in the Boston Massacre to pressure Parliament to repeal the Stamp Act
- d. Colonists dumped tea into Boston Harbor in the Boston Tea Party to pressure Parliament to repeal the Stamp Act

III. The Empire Strikes Back

Parliament responded to this act of defiance with the Coercive Acts, called the **Intolerable Acts** by colonists. Great Britain accepted the act out of exasperation, convinced that Americans would agree that Boston had crossed the line, and because Britons unilaterally called for reprisals. Commerce and customhouse officers were no longer safe. Lord North (Prime Minister at this time) wanted Boston to serve as an example, because the Bostonians had set a bad example. Many could not condone the Bostonians' action or the destruction of property. The Tea Party was seen as a challenge to Great Britain's authority. North convinced Britons that there was no other alternative and the Act passed. In part, these acts directly punished Boston:

1. The Boston Port Bill closed Boston Harbor until King George III saw fit or until the colonists paid for the tea and the tax.

2. The Massachusetts Government Act shut down the colonial government, and put all government matters into the hands of the Crown. It made jury selection at the hands of crown officials, it allowed the royal governor to appoint his own judges; it limited towns to one meeting a year.

But in addition, other parts of the Coercive Acts seemed a sinister plot against the liberties of all colonists everywhere:

3. The Impartial Administration of Justice Act permitted the governor to send home to England for trial all government officers accused of crimes committed in the execution of their official duties. This was supposed to free them from the fear of being tried by American juries if they performed their duties overzealously...but it seemed like it would lead to quite a few acquittals. What American would go to England to testify against the official?

4. The Quartering Act required cities and towns to provide accommodations for British soldiers; if they did not, British officers could seize barns and unoccupied buildings.

5. The Quebec Act organized the government of Canada, but claimed a huge chunk of territory for Canada (that the colonists did not agree with), it made Canada a royal government, with no colonial assembly, and it allowed Catholicism. This just made no sense to the colonists. It seemed that Britain was trying to spite them.

There was some Parliamentary opposition to these measures, which was outspoken, but not enough to prevent the passage of this legislation, known collectively as The Coercive Acts. Colonists began calling for an intercolonial response to overcome the Coercive Acts and to unite against the British.

In September and October 1774, the **First Continental Congress** met in Philadelphia with 56 delegates from all colonies except Georgia. The conservatives made only one major effort to prevent the adoption of the radical measures. It came in the form of Joseph Galloways' Plan of Union. Galloway rejected the patriots' contention that Parliament had no authority over the internal affairs of the colonies. He did admit that it was unjust for Americans to be taxed by a body in which they had no representatives and that it was impractical for colonists to sit in Parliament. So, Galloway suggested a Grand Council in America, in which all the colonies would be represented. This Council, together with a president-general appointed by the King, would govern the American colonies. It would enjoy a similar veto power over bills of that body that affected the American colonies. Galloway's plan had the potential to restore harmony within the Empire and establish a permanent federation between the colonies and the mother country. But his Grand Council idea was inferior to Parliament and dependent on Parliament, and stood no chance of being adopted by the Congress. Contributions from the conservatives were thereafter brushed aside.

The delegates signed the **Continental Association**, which committed the colonies to the policy of commercial retaliation against Britain, and establishing procedures for its enforcement throughout America.

The delegates had accepted a series of resolutions called the Declaration of Colonial Rights and Grievances. With it, the patriots stated the rights to which they thought the colonists were entitled. Among them was a clause that asserted the colonists' right to self-government in matters of taxation and internal law. The resolution did grant that by consent not by right, Parliament might

regulate the commerce of the Empire to the advantage of the mother country, provided no attempt at raising a revenue were made. The Declaration also ruled that all existing acts of Parliament, including of course the Townshend tax on tea, that taxed the colonists, were infringements on American rights. Finally, the delegates called for the repeal of the Coercive Act, the Quebec Act, and several other laws deemed unconstitutional. The patriots had made their demands; all that remained was to rally the public behind them.

Congress vowed not to obey the Coercive Acts and on October 20, the Congress adopted the Continental Association in which delegates agreed to boycott English imports, to not send anything to Britain, and to stop dealing with British slave traders. Over the next several months, the colonies communicated with each other. In Virginia, Patrick Henry delivered a speech against British rule, declaring, "Give me liberty, or give me death!"

Parliament passed the New England Restraining Act on March 30, demanding that New England colonies trade exclusively with England and also banned fishing in the North Atlantic. In April 1775, Parliament ordered Massachusetts' Royal Governor Thomas Gage is ordered to enforce the Coercive Acts and suppress "open rebellion" among the colonists by all necessary force. On April 18, he sent several hundred British troops, on foot, to march from Boston to the Massachusetts town of Concord, where the colonists had a weapons stockpile. The British troops were to seize the weapons in the stockpile, disarming the Americans and preventing a future attack, and to return.

Paul Revere, a Boston Silversmith, and two others learned of the British plan, the night before, and in the middle of the night, rode through the countryside, notifying the towns on the way to Concord. When the British soldiers reached Lexington, on their way to the weapons stockpile in Concord, Captain Jonas Parker and 75 armed **Minutemen**, members of the local militia, were there to meet them. The Minutemen were greatly outnumbered. Words were exchanged on either side. Suddenly a shot went off, and the British soldiers fired, killing 8 Minutemen and injuring ten others. The Americans fired back, killing several British; the British rushed through with their bayonets drawn and continued on their way to Concord.

While the British soldiers continued on their way to Concord, the men and women of Concord were busy moving the arms and ammunition to new hiding places in surrounding towns. When the soldiers arrived they were only able to destroy part of the supplies. As the British soldiers headed back to Boston, they were attacked by the Minutemen. All along the route, Minutemen, local farmers and townspeople continued the attack against the British. By the time the soldiers reached Boston, 73 British soldiers were dead and 174 more were wounded. In the days fighting, 49 patriots were killed, and 39 more were wounded. This was the first official battle in the war, often called the **Shot Heard 'Round the World**. Within a week, colonial volunteers from all over New England assembled and headed for Boston. They established camps around the city.

In May, 1775, the Continental Congress met for a second time in Philadelphia, and the Congress placed the colonies in a state of defense. It unanimously elected **George Washington**, of Virginia, to serve as the general and commander in chief of a new Continental Army.

The first major fight between British and American troops occurred about a month later, in June 1775 at Boston in the **Battle of Bunker Hill**. American troops dug in along the high ground of Breed's Hill (the actual location) and were attacked by a frontal assault of over 2000 British soldiers who stormed up the hill. The Americans were ordered not to fire until they can see "the whites of their eyes." As the British got within 15 paces, the Americans let loose a deadly volley of rifle fire and halted the British advance. The British then regrouped and attacked 30 minutes later with the same

result. A third attack, however, succeeded as the Americans ran out of ammunition and were left only with bayonets and stones to defend themselves. The British succeeded in taking the hill, but had lost half their force, suffering over a thousand casualties, with the Americans losing about 400, including important colonial leader, General Joseph Warren.

Even at this point, some colonists, and some delegates to the Continental Congress, hoped for a peaceful solution. Led by Pennsylvania's John Dickinson, the Continental Congress adopted the **Olive Branch Petition**, a petition written directly to the King. It expressed the hope for a reconciliation and professed loyalty to the Crown. However, about the same time it arrived, King George III learned of the Battles at Bunker Hill and at Lexington and Concord, of the formation of the Continental Army and of George Washington being appointed general. Receiving obviously mixed messages, George III refused to acknowledge the petition, and declared the colonies in a state of open rebellion.

For the next six or eight months, the end of 1775 to beginning of 1776, colonists discussed and debated the idea of getting into a full-flung war with the British. Some still expressed doubt. Americans were not by any means united, but after the blood shed, could they look back? Wouldn't there be great sacrifices during wartime? Did they want to break the bonds with the mother country?

Thomas Paine's pamphlet, **Common Sense**, a fifty page document criticizing the British, pointing out the problems with a system of monarchy, and making a personal attack on King George, proved the answer. "We have it in our power to begin the world anew...American shall make a stand, not for herself alone, but for the world," Paine stated. *Common Sense* swayed public opinion against the British and for the war, and was printed, circulated and read throughout the colonies.

60-second Quiz #3: What were some of the key developments that pushed colonies from mere defiance to open rebellion? All of the following events took place after the Boston Tea Party EXCEPT which one?

- a. Boston Massacre
- b. Shot Heard 'Round the World
- c. Battle of Bunker Hill
- d. Publication of *Common Sense*

Key for 60-second quiz questions:

- 1. a. The Molasses Act of 1733 was BEFORE the end of the French and Indian War (1763)
- 2. c. It was British soldiers who fired on the colonists in the Boston Massacre
- 3. a. The Boston Massacre was in 1770; the Boston Tea Party was 1773

I. The War for Independence

A. Formally at War, Formally Independent

With the publication of *Common Sense*, America jumped into the war with renewed energy. American forces scored a major victory at Dorchester Heights, near Boston Harbor. The British then evacuated Boston, sailed for Canada, and made plans for a massive invasion of New York City. As the British regrouped and planned their assault on New York, General Washington and his army went to New York to prepare for the British invasion. A massive British war fleet arrives in New York Harbor consisting of 30 battleships with 1200 cannon, 30,000 soldiers, 10,000 sailors, and 300 supply ships, under the command of **General William Howe** and his brother Admiral Lord Richard Howe.

As the British invaded New York, the Continental Congress moved to officially declare independence. On June 7, Richard Henry Lee, a Virginia delegate to the Congress, presented a formal resolution calling for America to declare its independence from Britain. Congress postponed its decision on this until July until delegates could get information from their colonies on how they should proceed and because some of the delegates were absent at the time. On June 11, Congress appointed a committee to draft a declaration of independence. The committee members included Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, John Adams, Roger Livingston, and Roger Sherman. The committee chose Jefferson to prepare the first draft of the declaration, which he completed in one day. Just seventeen days later, June 28, Jefferson's **Declaration of Independence** was ready and was presented to the Congress, with changes made by Adams and Franklin. On July 2, twelve of thirteen colonial delegations (New York abstained) voted in support of Lee's resolution for independence. On July 4, the Congress formally endorsed Jefferson's Declaration, with copies to be sent to all of the colonies. The actual signing of the document occurred on August 2, as most of the 55 members of Congress placed their names on the parchment copy.

The summer and fall of 1776 were difficult for Washington's forces. As the Americans had expected, General Howe led 15,000 British soldiers against Washington's badly outnumbered army in the **Battle of Long Island**. Washington's men suffered a severe defeat and scattered as they retreated to Brooklyn Heights. Washington's men continued to engage the British, however, in the New York City area, by avoiding large-scale battles with the British through a series of retreats. That September, **Lord Richard Howe**, the British Naval Commander, held a peace conference with American representatives. He offered them an opportunity to surrender, but the Americans refused. The fighting continued in the New York City area; in September, British troops captured a spy from Connecticut, Captain Nathan Hale. Executed without a trial, his last words, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," inspired the war effort.

Yet as the fighting expands northward and westward from New York City, the Americans continued to lose—on Lake Champlain, at White Plains, at Fort Washington on Manhattan, at Fort Lee in New Jersey—in two battles alone, Washington's army suffered 3,000 casualties. General Washington abandoned the New York area and moved his forces westward to the New Jersey/Pennsylvania border.

It had been a trying time. Among Washington's troops was Thomas Paine, author of *Common Sense*, who now wrote a new pamphlet, ***The American Crisis***. In this new pamphlet, Paine severely

criticized the “**sunshine patriots**” who supported the war and independence only as long as they were easy, and who abandoned their new country when things got difficult. Here is a quote from Paine:

...These are the times that try men's souls: The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country: but he that stands it NOW deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like Hell, is not easily conquered. Yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph.

On Christmas night, Washington took 2,400 of his men and recrossed the Delaware River in small boats, navigating through chunks of ice, and silently slipping back into New Jersey. The men then raided the town of **Trenton**, where British and German mercenaries had been partying. Colonel Rolle, the commander of the British and German forces in Trenton, apparently had advance notice that Washington was coming. Absolutely drunk, he refused to see the messenger, and when handed the note, stuffed it in his pocket and never read it. When the Americans assaulted Trenton, killing Rolle, the sealed note was found inside his pocket. The victory proved a much needed morale-booster to the Americans, a victory which they followed up with another huge win at Princeton, New Jersey.

B. American Success, European Support

In 1777, America got the much-needed break that propelled the French into the war on their side and proved a turning point: **Saratoga**. British General John Burgoyne, moving south from Lake Champlain, planned to march twenty-three miles through dense forests of upstate New York, to the source of the Hudson River. He would attack southward and General Howe (also British) would attack northward, thus seizing the entire Hudson River and virtually taking all of New York from American control. This would cut off supply lines to all the surrounding towns. Yet for Burgoyne, the trip was difficult. It took almost a month to travel, with 8,000 men and 2,000 camp followers—mainly servants and women. Though Gen. Burgoyne's troops stunned the Americans with the capture of Fort Ticonderoga on Lake Champlain, after blasting its way through the forests of New York, suffering disease, exhaustion, and running out of supplies, Burgoyne's army reached the Hudson in a much-weakened condition, and had to wait for Howe to catch up. Burgoyne decided to send several hundred Hessians to Bennington, Vermont, to steal some horses. The Americans were waiting for them.

It had been a terrible summer for Burgoyne and things only got worse; General Howe decided NOT to attack northward, decided not to link up with Burgoyne, but instead figured Burgoyne could handle things himself. Howe went to Philadelphia instead. As Howe was capturing Philadelphia, the Americans defeated the British at Saratoga, as Gen. Horatio Gates and Gen. Benedict Arnold defeat Gen. Burgoyne, inflicting 600 British casualties. American losses are only 150. This victory at Saratoga convinced the French that the Americans were for real, and Louis XIV finally agreed to see Benjamin Franklin and Silas Deane, America's ambassadors. Shortly thereafter, France would formally enter into a military alliance with the Americans, sending them much-needed weapons and troops.

That winter, as Washington's forces camped at **Valley Forge**, Pennsylvania, for a bitterly cold few months, Baron von Steuben of Prussia arrives at Valley Forge to join the Continental Army. He then begins much needed training and drilling of Washington's troops, now suffering from poor morale resulting from cold, hunger, disease, low supplies and desertions over the long, harsh winter. At

about the same time, across the Atlantic Ocean, American and French representatives signed two treaties in February 1778: a Treaty of Amity and Commerce and a Treaty of Alliance. France now officially recognized the United States and began to supply Washington's army. Both countries pledged to fight until independence was won. Neither country would sign a truce with Britain without the other's consent. With the entry of the French in the war, French troops sailed to Newport, Rhode Island to await future orders from France.

In 1778-1779, the fighting reached a virtual stalemate; Americans recaptured Philadelphia but the British took Savannah, Georgia. After a severe winter, Gen. Washington faces a serious threat of mutiny at his winter camp in Morristown, New Jersey. Two Continental regiments conduct an armed march through the camp and demand immediate payment of salary (overdue by 5 months) and full rations. Troops from Pennsylvania put down the rebellion. Two leaders of the protest are then hanged. **Benedict Arnold**, an American general, and the hero of the Battle of Saratoga, turns against the Americans and defects to the British, becoming a brigadier general.

C. Civil War in the South, End of the War

British General **Charles Lord Cornwallis** and the British increasingly turned their attention to the South. Under the command of Henry Clinton the British crushed and captured Charleston, South Carolina. Gen. Nathaniel Greene, Washington's most able and trusted General, is named as the new commander of the Southern Army, replacing Gen. Horatio Gates. Greene then begins a strategy of rallying popular support and wearing down the British by leading Gen. Cornwallis on a six month chase through the back woods of South Carolina into North Carolina into Virginia then back into North Carolina. The British, low on supplies, are forced to steal from any Americans they encounter, thus enraging them.

In 1780-1781 the fighting focused on the South, where, especially in South Carolina, Americans loyal to Britain (**Loyalists**) fought American patriot troops, the British engaged patriot troops, and the British sometimes mistakenly attacked the homes of loyalists. In Virginia, British troops raided the home of Thomas Jefferson, but he escaped.

In August, 1781, after several months of chasing Gen. Greene's army without much success, Gen. Cornwallis and his 10,000 tired soldiers arrive to seek rest at the small port of **Yorktown**, Virginia, on the Chesapeake Bay. He then establishes a base to communicate by sea with Gen. Clinton's forces in New York. Gen. Washington abruptly changes plans and abandons the attack on New York in favor of Yorktown after receiving a letter from French Admiral **Count de Grasse** indicating his entire 29-ship French fleet with 3000 soldiers is now heading for the Chesapeake Bay near Cornwallis. Gen. Washington then coordinates with French Gen. Rochambeau to rush their best troops south to Virginia to destroy the British position in Yorktown. Count de Grasse's French fleet arrives off Yorktown, Virginia. De Grasse then lands troops near Yorktown, linking with French General Lafayette's American troops, to cut Cornwallis off from any retreat by land. The troops of Washington and Rochambeau arrive at Philadelphia.

Off Yorktown, a major naval battle between the French fleet of de Grasse and the outnumbered British fleet of Adm. Thomas Graves results in a victory for de Grasse. The British fleet retreats to New York for reinforcements, leaving the French fleet in control of the Chesapeake. The French fleet establishes a blockade, cutting Cornwallis off from any retreat by sea. French naval reinforcements then arrive from Newport.

In late-September, 1781 Gen. Washington, with a combined Allied army of 17,000 men, begins the siege of Yorktown. French cannons bombard Gen. Cornwallis and his 9000 men day and night while the Allied lines slowly advance and encircle them. British supplies run dangerously low. As Yorktown is about to be taken, the British send out a flag of truce. Gen. Washington and Gen. Cornwallis then work out *terms of surrender*. As their band plays the tune, "[The World Turned Upside Down](#)," the British army marches out in formation and surrenders at Yorktown. Hopes for a British victory in the war are dashed. Loyalists began leaving America, heading north to Canada. The British withdrew from North Carolina, and the British Parliament votes to negotiate peace with the United States. The British continued to evacuate their forces from America, and left Savannah and Charleston in late-1782.

As representatives hashed out the details to the Peace Treaty, an anonymous letter circulated among Washington's senior officers encamped at Newburgh, New York. The letter urged the officers to defy the authority of the new United States for failing to honor past promises (pay) to the Continental Army. The next day, Washington promised to hold a meeting to hear the officers' complaints, but instead, the press reports that Washington has sympathized with the officers. Washington gathered his officers and talked them out of a rebellion, thus preserving the American democracy.

Congress then declared an official end to the war, though angry and unpaid veterans threatened to protest. In September, 1783, the **Treaty of Paris** was signed by the United States and Great Britain. In November, George Washington delivered his farewell address and the last American troops were discharged. Washington appeared before congress and resigned his commission, an unheard of event. This action by Washington showed that he was not power-hungry and that he had no intentions of becoming the dictator or military ruler of the new United States.

And yet, in 1784, with the war over, America faced several problems. Before we look at those, however, let's stop to explore the lives of women and of African Americans during the Revolutionary era.

60-Second Quiz #1. What are some reasons we might consider the American victory unexpected? Which of the following statements about the war is LEAST true?

- a. French military assistance was crucial to winning the war
- b. American opinion on independence or loyalty to Britain was divided
- c. American armies almost always defeated their British foes
- d. American soldiers were often poorly equipped, poorly trained, poorly fed, and underpaid

II. African Americans in the Revolutionary Era

The war brought challenges and decisions, and in many cases, opportunities, for African American slaves. I'd like to focus on their experiences in Virginia, South Carolina, and the North, specifically during the war, and then to look at African American life as a whole, after the Revolution to see how it had changed.

A. African Americans in Revolutionary Virginia and the Chesapeake

In Virginia, in the earliest stages of the war, by July 1775, the British Navy was both encouraging and helping slaves to run away. **Governor Lord Dunmore**, the royal governor of Virginia, issued a proclamation on November 7, 1775 that encouraged all able-bodied blacks to join him, and immediately as many as 800 slaves joined Dunmore's army in the early stages of the war.

Dunmore's order was less a general emancipation than an offer of freedom to the able-bodied and able to fight. Dunmore was no champion of emancipation.

Though Dunmore fled from Virginia in 1777, by that time, the British had a presence in Virginia and British raids liberated slaves and stirred up blacks. Slaves fled to Gen. Howe's army, and in the area in-between Virginia Beach, Newport News, Norfolk, etc., British forces disturbed the plantation economy and plundered plantations of tobacco, animals and slaves. More than 30,000 Virginian slaves left their plantations by choice or by force; many white families along the route of Gen. Cornwallis' troops removed their slaves and livestock to safety; others did not. Cornwallis had over 4,000 slaves with him. Slave society was disrupted and there was a labor shortage.

Virginia authorities, crippled by the loss of slave labor and fearing an uprising, imposed controls to minimize the possibilities for mass escapes and even individual defections. Citizen patrols, surveillance on creeks and rivers, a series of laws, and the Virginia Convention pardoned all fugitives who returned within ten days and approved death or deportation for captured slaves. Swift exemplary punishment, in the form of forced labor and fear, was used to intimidate other slaves from defecting. The *Virginia Gazette* published warnings to dissuade slaves from escaping. It is probable that owners read the papers to their slaves.

On the other hand, the British were racist toward Africans and African-Americans, too. Though they had a lot to gain, they seldom used blacks in combat. If they did use blacks, they did so at sea and on barges. How could the British woo slaves belonging to American rebels without attracting those belonging to loyalists? How could they induce fear in whites without permanently alienating them? How could they inspire enough black resistance without inciting rebellion against the slave system entirely?

British policy failed. Instead of calling slaves to arms, the British army summoned them to serve. Most blacks held a servile role, as servants and brute laborers, to build dams, clear trash, and to do other jobs that Europeans wouldn't want. They dug outhouses, buried garbage, and did other straining work. Further, the British army pushed blacks to exert themselves more than usual. Disease, hunger, cruel and inhumane treatment—this was common. Perhaps 500 of Dunmore's African American members died in seen weeks on Gwynne's Island. Smallpox hit blacks hard, and Cornwallis had little concern for suffering blacks, especially because he was only concerned with the health of the white British army soldiers.

British armies in VA and NC (especially under Cornwallis) took runaway slaves (meaning they took the slaves from their American masters, to accompany and serve the British Army). Yet the British Army freed slaves (meaning they did *not* have to serve the British Army) only if they became too expensive to support or supply. The British still believed they needed the labor of slaves and gave them all sorts of promises as to their freedom or their lives after the war. These promises often never materialized, at least not until the end of the war, after the majority of blacks became servants, overworked, underfed, suffering from disease and hoping for a better life.

Dunmore actually disarmed blacks unfit for service, forcing many blacks to return to their owners. Cornwallis allowed whites to search for their slaves in his camp, but only the slaves belonging to Loyalists and passive citizens were given back; those belonging to active patriots remained in British camps. In some instances, British authorities abandoned blacks or turned them out at Yorktown.

Most Virginia slaves stayed on their plantations, but thousands—an estimated 30,000, ran away, expecting a better life. That this happened showed that in Virginia and throughout the Revolutionary War South, resistance to slavery was high. Besides the act of running away, we can also see black resistance to white rule and mistreatment in the realm of religion. In the Chesapeake, only by the late-century did a separate church movement begin. Richard Allen, a slave in Delaware who purchased his freedom in 1777 founded the Bethel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Philadelphia, fed up of the discrimination he faced at his own church.

B. The African American experience in the South

South Carolina and Georgia prohibited the enlistment of blacks in the militia and freed few slaves because they feared a conspiracy. In 1775, a free black harbor pilot in Charleston named “Jerry” or “Jeremiah” was accused on questionable evidence of collecting guns and urging other blacks to start a rebellion. He was quickly hanged and burned. As a result, by 1790, there were less than 2,000 free blacks in Charleston.

In South Carolina, many slaves fled during the war, but planters also stepped up discipline and resorted to brutal and extreme violence, fearing a slave revolt. Some planters relocated their slaves, some sold them West, and some separated men from women. Runaways led raids from Sullivan’s Island (held by the British) against low country plantations early in the war. Unique to South Carolina, slaves often fled in massive groups. Thousands went off on their own hoping to meet up with British troops. Some set up independent communities, others headed west and lived among the Indians. Many fled to Savannah or Charleston where they passed themselves off as free. But urban life for these was dangerous; malaria and smallpox claimed the lives of many slaves. Yet they could easily find jobs—no one questioned or asked them about their origins.

As in Virginia, South Carolina slaves worked for the British military, and often served as entertainers to the British. They worked in British camps as servants, wood choppers, took care of animals, and did cooking and cleaning. It was a difficult life, but many had the hopes of a better life after the war to keep them going.

Some, a minority, had the opportunity to fight. Yet the British were caught between the need to mobilize labor and the fear of alienating land owners who were still loyal to the Crown. There was really no consistent policy among the British. Some harbored slaves, others sent them back, others published lists so loyalists could reclaim them, and some slaves suspected of being runaways, perhaps about 5,000 were simply redistributed, or re-enslaved, to the loyalists. Some planters sold their slaves others transported them elsewhere. Some joined bandit gangs. Many refused to leave their plantations because they didn’t want to deal with uncertainty or re-enslavement, or didn’t want to leave their families. For many, it was a difficult decision—did they want to leave their families, or extended families for freedom in Canada? Their homes, plantations, and gardens destroyed during the war, slaves who remained on the plantations often did so until they found themselves staying on the best crop land in North America.

During the war, the slave population decreased in South Carolina from 100,000 to 75,000, meaning 25,000 were lost, escaped, died, or went with the British. In fact, 10,000-12,000 alone left Charleston when the British evacuated. Some were sold to the West Indies, a minority went to England, others went to the loyalists or with the loyalists wherever they went, and others went free.

7,000 Georgia slaves escaped to the British, and others made it to the Spanish or Indians, but for those who remained slave patrols discouraged running away, and with their masters away, they

found life on the plantations less intrusive. At the war's end, the British evacuated Charleston and Savannah, taking with them 12,000 slaves whom they resold into slavery in the West Indies.

After the war, during the early years of the Republic, slavery in the South actually grew in size and strength, protected by the Constitution. Slavery then expanded into the cotton south in the early-1800s. Cotton expanded inland after 1790, and SC and GA slavery increased rapidly as a result. At the same time, (when the Revolution was over), Americans quickly pushed out Indians and opened westward lands. Men brought slaves with them in the 1780s-90s to Kentucky, Tennessee, and the Carolina upcountry, and once Spain ceded Mississippi and Alabama, plantations opened there, too. The international slave trade reopened after the war in the South, and from 1788-1808, rapid (forced) immigration brought 100,000 Africans into South Carolina and Georgia. Congress ended the trade January 1, 1808.

When colonists began discussing the position of slavery in their new and democratic society, racism increased with arguments that blacks were biologically inferior. Northern and Southern delegates to the Constitutional Convention in 1789 were split; South Carolina and Georgia would not sign the Constitution if slavery were limited. In the final draft, delegates let the slave trade remain until 1808. They also included the **3/5 clause**, meaning that states where slavery remained legal (mostly in the south) could count these populations of unfree people at 3/5 the rate of their free (white) populations, for the purposes of determining Congressional representation in the House of Representatives; this also applied for the Electoral College to select the President. Finally, the Constitution included the **fugitive slave clause**, whereby slaves who escaped from a state where slavery was legal, into a state where slavery was not legal, would still be considered a slave and had to be returned to their masters. As a sign of how divisive the issue of slavery was, there was no mention of the actual word, "slavery," in the Constitution – they just use euphemisms like "person held to service or labor."

In the 1790s, free blacks suffered also. Almost all of the northern and middle colonies-turned-states passed laws to eliminate slavery, leaving black populations there free (see below). There were also smaller numbers of free blacks in the southern states. As they became successful in freedom, this challenged racist views that they would never be able to thrive on their own. Several states passed discriminatory laws – special taxes, denial of army membership, denial of voting rights or the right to bear arms. So just because slavery ended in some areas does not mean racism ended with it. By 1800, racial segregation was firmly established, and African Americans were forced to deal with separate, inferior accommodations in churches, restaurants, taverns, schools, cemeteries.

C. The African American Experience in the Revolutionary-era North

In the North, the Revolution made it possible for some blacks to gain their freedom and put an end to slavery north of Maryland and Delaware. Vermont became the first state to abolish slavery when it freed its sixteen slaves in 1776. Yet the American Revolution was full of contradictions for African Americans. The clearest contradiction involved slavery and the ideology of the founding fathers used for breaking with England. A third of the signers of the Declaration were slave owners. Jefferson owned 200 slaves and observed that ending it would have brought political, social, and economic ruin to the slave-owners.

Men and women who were no longer slaves found themselves segregated and ostracized by the rest of society, especially in their churches. America became more racist. If all men were created equal, whites interpreted it as saying that all white men were created equal, and to most whites, all persons of color were less than whites, subhuman.

Before 1770, free blacks made up only 5% of the colonial African American population, and nearly all were in the North. Methodist and Baptist revivals in the 1770s and 1780s caused some guilt-ridden masters to free their slaves or let them buy their freedom. A few owners **manumitted** (freed) slaves on the condition that they enlist in colonial militia units and some of these northern blacks participated at Lexington and Concord and at Bunker Hill. In 1781, several states granted freedom to slaves willing to serve a three year term and would even compensate their masters.

Many Northern slaves ended their bondage by siding with the British. They carried messages, prepared food, and served as sanitation workers. In 1783, when the British evacuated New York, they took 3,000 slaves with them. Boston King, for example, had served with Cornwallis, then joined a British naval vessel as a crewman, eventually made his way to New York City, and was one of the three thousand that the British took from New York to Nova Scotia.

The Massachusetts Supreme Court declared slavery unconstitutional in 1783 with *Commonwealth vs. Jennison*. Many states passed gradual abolition laws in the 1780s – New York held out, but the numbers declined. In New England, PA, NY, and NJ, slavery was essentially over by the early-1820s.

Black Society developed differently, but it was possible to see a distinct African American lifestyle emerging.

- Most were employed as wage laborers; most stayed close to home at least for a few years.
- Most could feel a difference—they felt like new people.
- Many changed their names, and rather than nicknames, they adopted Biblical first names or English first and last names.
- Many moved to Northern Coast cities for job opportunities. (From 1780-1800, the white population of Philly doubled while the black population increased 6-fold.)
- There were more women than men; they worked as domestic servants.
- Most men worked in the maritime industry, at shipyards and as dockworkers.
- In the cities, a distinct African American culture emerged. There were community churches, clubs, and schools.
- Many African Americans in the cities took in single boarders to help make ends meet.

60-second Quiz #2. How should we evaluate the African-American experience of the American Revolution? Which of the following statements is MOST true?

- a. Slavery ended everywhere in the United States at the end of the Revolutionary War
- b. Free Blacks at the end of the Revolutionary War enjoyed equal treatment under the law and equal participation in American society with whites
- c. The British had a uniform policy of freeing any and all slaves they encountered during the Revolutionary War
- d. White Americans' racism toward African-Americans remained after the war, whether directed at slaves or free blacks

III. Women in the Revolution

Historian Linda DePaw's *Women in Combat: The Revolutionary War Experience* gives us a similarly insightful take on how white women experienced the American Revolution. Like African-

American men and women, white women did not gain as many benefits as white men (though white women were undeniably accorded more rights than African-American men and women). Here we see another point of tension between the stated goals of the American Revolution and its actual effects.

With their men away, new opportunities and responsibilities opened for women: to make crucial decisions and to run their husbands' affairs. In the absence of their husbands, women assumed the responsibility for running the family finances and businesses. Yet when their husbands returned, the men expected things to revert back to how they had been, and the men felt they knew it all.

At home during the revolution, women faced the uncertainties of wartime—the threats of invasion and disease. Further, in New York and Philadelphia, women were forced to house British officers in their homes. Many loyalist women were forced to flee their homes or even the country, by their husbands.

As Historian Sylvia Frey has written, we do know that women participated in the Continental Army as **“women of the army,”** enlisted as regular troops, or served irregularly in local militia units or committees of safety, often in female units. Women were involved in war, and have been taken for granted or misrepresented in history.

Women of the army often served as cooks, nurses or laundresses, and while this was difficult work, it was often an opportunity to be with one's husband. This sort of task might be reserved for middle aged women. Women were also essential to the war effort not only in a domestic way but as support units attached to the medical corps and the artillery. Historians have overlooked the role of female nurses in the Army. Also, **“Molly Pitcher”** never existed. As the myth goes, Molly Pitcher was a woman who carried water to the soldiers to drink, weaving her way through the battlefield at the Battle of Princeton. In fact, women carried water to gun crews not for drink but for use in swabbing the cannons. (After a round was fired, the gun barrel had to be swabbed to extinguish any remaining sparks, or else the powder charge loaded for the next round could explode prematurely.) Possibly, women could have stepped in to assist the artillery crews if a man became disabled. Nurses and water carriers found themselves in danger.

Some women served as regular troops—as regularly enlisted soldiers – in men's' clothing. This does not mean they were lesbians or cross-dressers; instead, like Massachusetts' Deborah Sampson, they passed themselves off as men in order to contribute to the war. In fact, not all women tried to conceal their sex. If a woman made a good soldier, no one questioned her presence.

Women also saw combat as members of local militia units or committees of safety. We do know that women were active in small units, emergency militia, for example. A shortage of manpower necessitated women in combat. Prudence Wright's Guard, for instance, guarded the bridge in Pepperell, Mass. with pitchforks and muskets and even detained a British messenger. Such women's activities were common in the day-to-day experience of the war. Other evidence of small units organized and commanded by women can be found throughout the colonies.

Women were most active in military actions on the frontier, where warfare raged against Native Americans, especially in the South after 1780. Mrs. John Merrill of KY single handedly warded off an Indian invasion of her cabin with an axe. Women used a variety of weapons to defend themselves. There are many examples of women fighting off and wounding attackers. Apparently, hand-to-hand

combat was not seen as unfeminine but became a necessary skill. Some women became heroines such as the Indian scout Mad Ann Bailey. Women served at stockades and forts as either women of the army or as members of militia units. As one witness said, women commonly risked their lives for the sake of the military. Thus, women contributed to the war effort in a crucial way.

60-second Quiz #3. How should we characterize white women's participation in the American Revolution? Which of the following is MOST true?

- a. White women only remained in the domestic sphere, unable to run their husband's businesses or perform military service
- b. White women were uniformly welcomed into the public sphere, able to run businesses and serve in the army, even after the war's conclusion
- c. White women enjoyed a temporary acceptance into the public sphere to run businesses and serve in the army during the crisis of the war
- d. White women were relegated to only serving as nurses and supervisors of servants

Key for 60-second quizzes:

1. c. American armies regularly lost battles against their British foes; Washington's ability to make the war drag out (despite losing battles) was important because, if they had wanted to commit more troops and resources to the war, the British could easily have won. But they decided it was too expensive and not worth it.
2. d. Slavery generally ended in the northern states but not the southern ones. Free Blacks at the end of the Revolutionary War faced legal and social discrimination. The British had no uniform policy on slaves – sometimes they freed them, sometimes they promised freedom in exchange for military or domestic service, sometimes they sent slaves back to their masters.
3. c. White women contributed to the war in many ways, sometimes as soldiers, sometimes serving the army by providing ancillary labor; they assumed much of their husbands' work when the husbands were away fighting; but this period of gender equality (or semi-equality) did not last long past the end of the war.

I. The Articles of Confederation: Dysfunctional Government?

During the Revolutionary War and during the rest of the 1780s, the United States of America had been governed by the **Articles of Confederation**. This was a written constitution (but not “*the* United States Constitution” – see below) that provided the ground rules how the government of this new country would operate (namely, via single, central legislature) but was very weak. The central government had no authority to tax, no authority to regulate trade and commerce, had no president, and no court system. It required a two-thirds majority to pass a law, and only lasted from 1781-1787. The Articles are oftentimes forgotten in public discussions and invocations of American history but, among historians, they are usually interpreted as having done little to help, and much to hinder, the growth of the United States.

Having said that, the Articles of Confederation were not a total failure. The Articles did succeed in overseeing westward expansion. (This is, again, usually pointed to as their only success.) With the Land Ordinance of 1785, the Articles provided for a system to survey land and divide it into townships that were six square miles, and then divide that into sections that were 1 square mile, or 640 acres. Essentially, this was a process for building new territories and later new states. Some of the thirteen colonies did not have western boundaries in their colonial charters, so there was some negotiation of where the old colonies (now states) should end and new ones could begin. Of course, enlarging the size of the country (all the way to the Mississippi River, at this point) would only be beneficial if Americans moved west and settled the land. So the land that was surveyed and cut up into parcels was sold at a cost of \$1 an acre. Thus, westward lands were opened up to speculators, who could buy up lots of land cheaply ((because the speculators had lots of cash on hand), and sell it at a mark-up to poor but land-hungry settlers (who would often have to borrow money to pay for their purchases)).

This system for marking land, selling it, and encouraging growth eventually called for the expansion of governance systems to enforce law and order in these new lands. Here we see the most important contribution made by the Articles to American history -- the **Northwest Ordinance of 1787**. The Northwest Territory would be eventually divided up into six states: Minnesota, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. (Remember, the Mississippi River was the western border of the US at this time.) The Northwest Ordinance said that there would be three stages to get these new lands to statehood:

1. The Territory would divide into smaller regions that would be unorganized regions run by the U.S. government
2. The regions would have a territorial government, with an appointed governor, but would have their own legislature
3. Once they had a population of 60,000 people, the regions could write their own constitutions, and could become states.

It should be noted that slavery was prohibited in all the Northwest Territories. Thomas Jefferson was largely responsible for the Northwest Ordinance. He also wanted a Southwest Ordinance, but this never happened. It was much later—1820s—that the Deep South was settled. Jefferson (author of the Declaration of Independence and later the third US President) had a vision for the USA that was a nation full of small farmers, who were citizens actively making decisions about government at the local level.

However, the Articles of Confederation had several shortcomings:

1. International relations were a problem for the new nation under the articles, since there was not really one voice who could speak for the United States and conduct diplomacy. Instead, each state more-or-less operated as its own sovereign entity.

2. With a lack of stronger authority for the national government (that would be granted to the federal government under the eventual Constitution), as well as a leader to serve as the head of state (which would also come under the eventual Constitution), the Americans were having a hard time getting the Europeans to recognize the country as legitimate.

3. The British troops remained on frontier forts near the Great Lakes and refused to leave.

4. The United States (i.e. the national government) needed to negotiate trade treaties, but lacked the authority to do so.

5. The British were complaining that Americans hadn't returned confiscated Loyalist property.

6. The Spanish owned Louisiana and controlled the Mississippi River. In 1784 they closed the port to US citizens for a short time. America would need access to the river as it settled westward, to ship farm goods down the river.

7. There was not enough power to maintain a national army and to conduct diplomacy. The army had been disbanded and thus there had to be some way to protect the settlers in the west and to deal with national security.

These were challenges that we might call "international relations" in the present-day but what is important to understand, is that the original US government (under the Articles of Confederation) could not deal with these challenges, either because it did not have the authority to do so, or because it did not have the authority to take the steps necessary to do so.

In addition, there were also domestic problems that needed to be resolved:

1. The states were treating each other as if they were separate nations, and were each negotiating trade agreements with one another.

2. In 1785, Virginia and Maryland got together at Mount Vernon to discuss these trade-related issues, solved their differences, and agreed to meet the following year. James Madison suggested another meeting this time with all colonies to discuss trade issues in general, and in 1786, at the **Annapolis Convention** only 5 colonies met, and 4 others came late. Nothing got done at the Annapolis Convention, because it was more informal. Alexander Hamilton, a delegate from New York, proposed a convention in Philadelphia the next year, 1787, to discuss amending the Articles of Confederation.

3. In the Mid-1780s, a depression hit. Each state had a different solution for dealing with the economic crisis. Most printed their own money, which made for an inconsistent financial system. Many people were in debt. Massachusetts was unsympathetic to debtors, kept taxes high, and foreclosed on people who could not pay their taxes and threw them in jail. People in the Massachusetts countryside responded and began closing the courts. Led by farmer Daniel Shays, a crew of as many as 12-1500 marched on the state supreme court. The rebellion showed many people that the government under the Articles was broken and that the Country was headed for economic ruin and anarchy. After **Shays Rebellion**, Congress decided to call a convention to discuss the Articles as Hamilton had proposed, however, all the people involved just wanted to revise the articles, not write a Constitution.

60-Second Quiz #1: What were some of the shortcomings of the Articles of Confederation? Which of the following was NOT a shortcoming of the Articles?

- a. The US government could not impose any taxes
- b. The US government did not have a single head of state to represent its interests internationally
- c. The US government did not have a mechanism for expanding the country and creating new states
- d. Any changes to the laws enforced by the US government required a 2/3 vote from the legislature to approve them (making them unlikely to be approved).

II. The U.S. Constitution: Correcting the Errors?

At this point, it seemed clear that the confederation had failed; it was not unified, there had been power struggles, conflicts between the states, taxation and commerce issues, money issues, foreign debts and foreign affairs, Indian problems, disputes over borders. The delegates feared that if they failed in their task, evil would result. Liberty was at stake. Anarchy and chaos and civil disruptions and foreign intrusions could result. Further disruptions like Shay's Rebellion could strike at any time. The country must be united. Delegates to this convention shared these goals, but their visions for the future of the country differed, and during the summer of 1787 in Philadelphia, they hammered out a new Constitution.

The delegates consisted of wealthy merchants, planters, generals, governors, and especially lawyers, most from old families in America. Most were Anglicans, Presbyterians and Congregationalists. Of the fifty-five delegates from twelve states that attended (Rhode Island did not attend), more than half had attended college, and 10 of those 28 had gone to Princeton. The youngest delegate was 26, the oldest, Benjamin Franklin, was 81. The majority were in their forties and fifties, and had served in the war. There were eight that had signed the Declaration of Independence. Of the delegates, the single-most influential person at the convention was the diminutive **James Madison**, five-foot nothing, one hundred and nothing, he became the father of the Constitution. He had read over 200 books in the past year about governments—basically history and political science books, and he was really the leading figure in the Constitution. He also kept detailed records, which helps us to understand what happened and how the debate proceeded.

That summer, the delegates had a difficult task—they had to balance the need for a powerful central government against the need for states' rights. They ended up scrapping the articles of Confederation and writing a new Constitution. It was nothing short of a political miracle; the delegates created a constitution in which they compromised personal, local, and state interests for the good of the nation. As the delegates decided how to set up the legislature, executive (presidency), and court system of the new country, there were several compromises that the delegates reached:

1. The Legislature. Their first discussions were over representation—the legislature. After their experience with the British Parliament, and their long controversy with Britain over the powers of Parliament, the delegates regarded the legislature as the most important branch of government; only if they resolved the knotty problems of representation in the new Congress could they assure success. Had they failed to reach agreement on this matter, the Convention probably would have broken up in disarray.

There were two plans: In late-May Edmund Randolph of Virginia proposed the **Virginia plan**. In mid-June after a few weeks of debate, William Paterson proposed the **New Jersey plan**. Both valued a system that enabled the legislature to levy taxes, regulate commerce, protect property, and enforce the laws, but each plan was a little different: The Virginia plan reflected the interests of the

larger stronger states, to dominate the smaller states, and to create a federal republic with effective powers. The New Jersey plan was really an assembly of states, not a government of the people. The New Jersey plan would give the smaller states more influence in the legislature; it would protect them commercially, and would be a looser government.

The Virginia Plan had a 2-branch legislature based on representation of the people at large. One branch would consist of members with 3 year terms, the other would have members over 30 years of age, chosen by the state legislatures, and holding a 7 year term. The New Jersey plan had one single legislature, rather than both a Senate and House of Reps.

The Virginia plan depended on proportional rep—the House of Representatives that it proposed would be based on the state's population—thus Virginia might have ten representatives, but Delaware might have only two. The New Jersey plan was based on equality of the states—for example, all states would have two delegates, regardless of their population.

Ultimately, the delegates discussed different options, including one vote for each state in the second branch. To solve the conflict, the delegates appointed a committee. The **Great Compromise**, first suggested by Benjamin Franklin, resolved the differences between the large states' and the small states. Connecticut's delegates, picking up Franklin's lead, proposed what is today called the Connecticut Compromise, or the Sherman Plan (named after delegate Roger Sherman).

They proposed that Congress consist of two houses: a Senate and House of Representatives, that the House be elected on the basis of proportional representation and would have the power to initiate bills and laws for collecting revenues and operating the budget, and the Senate would be elected on the basis of equal representation and would only accept or reject the bills proposed by the House of Representatives. The upper house (Senate) to be composed of nominees selected by state assemblies for six year terms; the lower house (House of Representatives) to be elected every two years by popular vote.

As a result of the Great Compromise, everybody gained something. The large states were happy because they got more members in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives was the only house of Congress that could write bills to create taxes. The small states were happy because they got equal representation in the Senate. In other aspects, the two houses of Congress were equal. The result was that the large states would have slightly more influence over the creation of laws on taxation and how money would be spent. Bills passed by the House could always be checked, or rejected, by the Senate where the small states had equal representation.

2. The Executive Branch. The issue of an executive, or president, was also tossed around. The Virginia plan provided for a single executive with a fixed, seven year term. They would be voted by the majority popular vote. In the Virginia Plan, the executive could be removed by impeachment and conviction. The New Jersey Plan was a little different. It provided for a plurality as head of government, or basically a governing committee of co-presidents to share the power. The executives could only be removed by the states.

Ultimately the delegates agreed that the Executive Branch would be headed by a chief executive (President) elected every four years by presidential electors from the states. The President is granted sweeping powers including: veto power over Congress which can be overridden by a two-thirds vote in each house; commander in chief of the armies; power to make treaties with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Senate; power to appoint judges, diplomats and other officers with

the consent of the Senate; power to recommend legislation and responsibility for execution of the laws. The President is required to report each year to the legislative branch on the state of the nation. The legislative branch has the power to remove the President from office. The House can impeach the President for treason, bribery or other high crimes and misdemeanors with actual removal from office occurring by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

3. Judicial Branch. Both groups agreed on the necessity of a Supreme Court and a court system. Both basically agreed on the judicial system but the Virginia Plan called for the Supreme Court judges to be appointed by the Senate and the New Jersey Plan called for them to be appointed by the executive. Finally the delegates decided that the judicial branch would consist of a Supreme Court, and that the new Congress would somehow figure out how to set up the lesser courts. The Supreme Court justices would be appointed by the president but approved by the Senate. Finally, the court had the implied power to review laws that allegedly conflicted with the Constitution.

4. The issue of slavery—how to count the slaves for taxation and representation. The southern states wanted to have slaves because it was crucial to their economies, but did not want to be taxed fully because of them. The northern states worried that slaves were not considered citizens. Some were concerned that the northern states, numbering 8 would outweigh the southern states, with slaves, numbering 5. They worried that to count the slaves as a full person when determining representation, as the southern states proposed, would give the southern states more representatives in the House. They thought this would give the South an unfair advantage in votes taken in the House of Representatives. Madison even suggested one branch be based on all inhabitants, the other on free inhabitants. After much debate, finally the two sides reached a compromise. The slaves would count as 3/5 of a person for representation to the House of Representatives. The southern states would be allowed to keep slaves, yet would only be taxed based on 3/5 of that number. This agreement was called the **Three-Fifths Compromise**. Southern delegates agreed that Congress had the right to end the slave trade in 1808, which it did. (*Note the slave TRADE, which is the importation of new slaves, NOT the existence of slavery.*)

On September 17, 1787, after about three months of discussions, a draft of the Constitution was finally ready. Delegates had agreed on the following:

1. By late September, the proposed Constitution was made public.
2. Congress voted to send the Constitution to the state legislatures.
3. When nine of the thirteen approved, a two-thirds majority, then it would become official.

60-second Quiz #2. What were some of the main points of disagreement over the U.S. Constitution? Which of the following compromises is CORRECTLY explained?

- a. The Virginia Plan called for a legislature in one chamber, with equal representation for all the states, giving smaller states an advantage in the Congress
- b. The New Jersey Plan called for a legislature in two chambers, with representation for the states based on their populations, giving larger states an advantage in the Congress
- c. The New Jersey Plan called for the populations of slaves held in southern states to be counted as 3/5 of a free person, limiting the ability of southern states to wield their slave populations as a source of power in the Congress or the Electoral College
- d. The Virginia Plan called for the executive branch to be headed by a President, who could be impeached and convicted if necessary to remove them from office

III. The Disunited States of America?

A storm of controversy soon arose as most people had only expected a revision of the Articles of Confederation, not a new central government with similarities to the British system that they had

just overthrown. Many Americans opposed the Constitution, right off the bat, there were skeptics. There were also many of the delegates who believed in the Constitution. So two groups developed: federalists and anti-federalists.

Federalists supported the Constitution, and those who didn't were the **Anti-federalists**. The anti-federalists believed that the delegates had gone too far, and should have just revised the Articles in a less drastic way. They believed that the national government had become too strong, and that the Senate would be ruled by rich people—like the English House of Lords. They were furious that there was no Bill of Rights.

James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, and John Jay, three people at the Constitutional Convention, and three Federalists, wrote a series of 85 Newspapers articles in New York published under false names and reprinted throughout the colonies. These articles are collectively called the **Federalist Papers**. They dealt with the articles of the constitution and defended the Constitution against the Anti-federalists' arguments.

As Congress began to draft a **Bill of Rights** (a listing of certain rights and liberties that individual citizens possessed, and which could not be suspended or stripped away by the new national government), the states continued to ratify the constitution and by early 1789, the government began to operate, with a presidential election in February, and the arrival of the House of Representatives and Senators in March in New York, which was chosen as the new national capital.

George Washington learned of his election in mid-April and made his way to New York City, greeted as a hero all along the way.

The new nation had officially begun its business.

60-second Quiz #3. What were some of the reactions Americans felt towards the new Constitution? Which statement is NOT correct?

- a. Federalists opposed the new Constitution, believing it to give the new US government too much power
- b. Anti-federalists opposed the new Constitution, believing it to give the new US government too much new power
- c. The Federalist Papers were authored by James Madison, John Jay, and Alexander Hamilton
- d. Congress wrote a Bill of Rights to assuage those who had doubts about the Constitution, to list out certain rights that could not be taken away by the new US government.

KEY for 60-second quizzes:

1. c. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 (which set out the rules for creating new states) is usually identified as one of the only things the Articles did well.
2. d. The Virginia Plan called for a legislature in two chambers, with representation for the states based on their populations, giving larger states (like Virginia) an advantage in the Congress. The New Jersey Plan called for a legislature in one chamber with equal representation for all the states, giving smaller states (like New Jersey) an advantage in the Congress. The Three-Fifths Compromise called for the populations of slaves held in southern states to be counted as 3/5 of a free person, limiting the ability of southern states to wield their slave populations as a source of power in the Congress or the Electoral College
3. a. Federalists supported the new Constitution

I. Washington's First Term: Building the United States Government

A. Diversity or Uniformity?

In the wake of winning his country's independence and then overseeing the formation of its government, George Washington thought he had done enough. He desperately wanted to live out his final years in privacy at Mount Vernon, but Americans wanted no one else to lead them. America's first presidential campaign was more an effort of Americans to convince Washington to take the job. Washington didn't have to convince anyone that he was the ideal person for the job; in fact the American public almost assumed that Washington would be president. Washington was reluctant, and expressed to a friend that he felt like a dead man walking.

In 1789, America was a diverse country. With the recent addition of Vermont, there were fourteen states. The population numbered 4 million, and about 750,000 slaves (or 20% of the population), lived mainly in the South. The majority of Americans were farmers, white or black. Only six percent of all Americans lived in cities; there were twenty-four cities with populations greater than 2,500. By the end of the decade, 500,000 people, principally from Virginia and North Carolina, had moved inland, west of the Appalachian Mountains, where they confronted 100,000 Native Americans who had lived there for hundreds of years. Indeed, in the rural farm areas of the Atlantic seaboard, a third of the households moved elsewhere during this time period, and in the cities, closer to 50 percent of the population relocated.

French visitor Hector St. John Crèvecoeur observed that Americans had a few things in common: they treasured their freedom, had no extremes of rich and poor, had no distinctions between people based on hereditary status, and the majority of white men were farmers or self-employed craftsmen. However, he also chronicled the diversity of the country: he saw three distinct regions and temperaments: Those who lived near the sea, those who lived in the middle settlements, and those on the frontier. Those who lived by the sea were the most enterprising, gregarious, and restless; those who lived in the middle settlements were the hard-working farmers and the frontiersmen were lazy, drunken, brutal, and lawless. He also noticed regional diversity in terms of North, mid-Atlantic, and South.

In the opinion of Crèvecoeur, the Yankees (those who lived in the North) appeared cold, stingy, serious, cheap, vulgar, and plain, they talked too fast and with an obnoxious accent. Among these Northerners there were English descendants of the Puritans, French, and Jewish immigrants. In the mid-Atlantic, there was tremendous diversity; from Native Americans that remained in upstate New York, to an equal percentage of Dutch, Scottish, Blacks, and German, French, Scandinavians and Jews, there were a variety of religions practiced, from Dutch Reformed to Anglicanism, to Judaism to Lutheranism and Quakerism. The general impression of the South was the image of the gentry, of giant slave plantations, yet upon a closer glimpse the South was just as diverse as the mid-Atlantic. There were Scotch-Irish frontiersmen, South Carolina low country gentry, Yankee immigrants, and giant populations of slaves.

There was also a noticeable difference, a difference that became important during the debates of Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson: there was an obvious division and even tension, between country dwellers and city dwellers, between merchants and farmers, and between small businesses or farms and big businesses or plantations. The new government, then, would have the tremendous challenge of governing this diverse group of people. This is the America that George Washington would have to preside over. Washington could not refuse, and he could not afford to fail, for if he failed, it would make his entire life's work a meaningless failure.

Once everyone arrived in Washington, Congress began its work in April, and began to count the votes of the Electoral College. Washington won easily, and at the time, since the Founding Fathers had not expected any political parties or anything like the ideological division easily observed today, the runner-up in the presidential election, John Adams, became the vice-president. Washington began his leisurely trip to the temporary capital of America, New York City. His presidential inauguration was held near New York's Wall Street in late April 1789. A tremendous crowd showed up to see the man now known as "the Father of His Country." Borrowing a custom from English monarchs, who by tradition address Parliament when its sessions open, Washington gave a brief speech. It was the first inaugural address and the first of many contributions that Washington would make to the office of the presidency. But this would be no monarch; the new leader wore a plain brown suit. Washington realized that his actions would set the tone for future presidencies: "I walk on untrodden ground," Washington wrote soon afterward. "There is scarcely any part of my conduct which may not hereafter be drawn into precedent."

Several things got accomplished in 1789: organizing government, filling jobs, settling debts and finances, passing the Bill of Rights, creating the judiciary, and the creation of the **Cabinet**. Washington knew that he himself could not run the country without advice and help, so he went to Congress and got permission to create a Cabinet, similar to what had existed under the Articles of Confederation. To head up the State Department, Washington chose Thomas Jefferson, who had been the ambassador to France. To chair the Treasury Department, Washington chose his former aide, the young Alexander Hamilton. To direct the War Department, Henry Knox became the nominee; he had been the head of the army. Washington also created two offices: that of the Attorney General and post office. The Attorney General was John Randolph of Virginia, the author of the Virginia Plan. Samuel Osgood of Massachusetts became the postmaster general.

With these new government departments and agencies created, Washington had a number of jobs to fill; people were stopping by to visit him at his residence in New York, were coming by just to meet him or to have their children see him—Washington had to set visitation boundaries and he had to use a set of guidelines for how to fill all the government jobs (about 1,000), that were created in all the different departments of the government. He accomplished this task by selecting people who were supporters of the Constitution, who could provide some recommendation from someone else. He allowed upper level government employees to choose who they wanted and trusted to work for them. Finally, if any Senator recommended or disapproved of a candidate from the senator's state, he got the final say.

B. Setting up the Country

Money was the most critical problem that Congress had to deal with—the national government was bankrupt. Congress agreed to pass a **tariff**, a tax on imported goods, and taxed the weight of goods brought in on ships with the Revenue Act of 1789. This was a step in the right direction, though the government was in debt to its citizens and needed some way to convince investors that their money would be paid back. (More on this below.) At the same time, federal employees had to be paid. Congress set George Washington's salary at \$25,000, which was more than he expected, however, Washington's expenses were quite high--\$2,000 a month for liquor alone because there were frequent parties at the presidential mansion. Interestingly, the question of how much to pay the President of the United States reveals a larger question facing the leaders of this young, new country: how to understand the Office of the President – was he a king? Was he a Prime Minister? The office of "president" was not common at this time, and the Founding Fathers has in many ways modeled the entire US Constitution on that of the ancient Roman Republic (where the executive was a "consul" but

later functioned as an emperor). Congress spent 3 ½ weeks discussing how to address the President (meaning what the proper title should be). There were all sorts of suggestions, from “his excellency,” and ultimately the Congress decided that “Mr. President” was appropriate.

Congress had other work to do as well, most notably completing a **Bill of Rights** to amend to the Constitution during the summer of 1789. Virginia’s George Mason, a planter and neighbor of Washington in Northern Virginia, was a congressman from Virginia, and had drafted a Bill of Rights for the state of Virginia; he and James Madison narrowed down 80 proposals they had received from the states to ten, and in September, 1789, Congress approved the Bill of Rights, 10 Amendments to the Constitution. The Bill of Rights had been ratified by the following June. The first amendment dealt with freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly, and petition; the next two guaranteed the right to keep and bear arms (expecting that men would be citizen-soldiers), the third limited the quartering of troops in private homes, the next five dealt with judicial procedures: the fourth amendment prohibited “unreasonable searches and seizures,” the fifth and sixth established the rights of the accused, such as “due process,” and the right to not say something that would incriminate oneself. The seventh outlined the right to a jury trial, the eighth forbade “cruel and unusual punishments,” the ninth and tenth amendments reserved all things not specified to the states.

Congress was not done. They also needed to create the judiciary branch of the federal government. (The Constitution outlined how the executive and legislative branches would operate but only said that the Congress should also create a court system, without spelling out how to do it.) The system that Congress would set up would change significantly in the future but we should still take a look at the origins. Senator Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut and William Paterson, of New Jersey and author of the New Jersey Plan, worked to strike a balance between state and federal courts. Until 1789, there was no federal legal system. The Judiciary Act of 1789 changed that; it created the Supreme Court and lower courts. The **Supreme Court** had six justices, there were two levels of federal court, a circuit court with three districts, and sixteen district courts. The Supreme Court was limited in the new cases brought before it; cases had to start elsewhere and work their way up to the Supreme Court. (The Supreme Court is commonly referred to today by political junkies and policy wonks as the “SCOTUS,” *Supreme Court Of The United States*.) To give states a bit more power, Congress said the Supreme Court judges would travel to serve as additional circuit court judges. Each state also had a district court. John Jay of New York became the first chief justice of the SCOTUS; John Rutledge of South Carolina, James Iredell of NC, John Blair of VA, James Wilson of PA, and William Cushing of Massachusetts made up the remaining justices. The Supreme Court handled very few cases early on of any lasting significance.

C. Signs of Trouble

On September 29, Congress adjourned and everyone went home until the following January. Washington visited New England. Yet the House instructed Treasury Department head Alexander Hamilton to survey the public debts and come up with a plan for paying them off. Hamilton’s proposal, and the controversy that it ignited, attracted the bulk of Congress’ attention in 1790 and 1791. When Congress re-adjourned in 1790, Hamilton issued his **First Report on Public Credit**. He wanted the government to deal honestly with people that it owed money, and to pay off debts, which would encourage people to borrow again. The government owed money to individual citizens who had loaned it money during the war, it owed money to foreign countries, and some also argued that it should reimburse the states for many of the expenses related to the war. Hamilton proposed that:

- a) The Federal Government would pay of all the federal debts owed in full

- b) The Federal Government would pay without discrimination to whoever currently owns the debt (sometimes it had passed hands)
- c) Federal Government would assume state debts because their debts were war-related (to pay for the national defense).

Because Hamilton was a **Federalist** and wanted the government to be strong, he thought that if the government assumed the states' debts, it would make the central government stronger and would gain people's allegiance the central government. Under Hamilton's plan, though, the states would have to help the federal government pay a portion of the debts to private citizens.

James Madison countered with a different proposal. He explained that it was more complicated, because most of the debt had been in the North—most of the state debt had been in the North. Many of the Southern states had tried to pay off their debts already, so Hamilton's plan would help the North more than it would the South. We should pause to note that, in the dispute over Hamilton's plan, we see the signs of significant differences emerging with the ranks of the Founding Fathers. Hamilton and many others close to Washington believed that the Federal Government should be large, powerful, and take on many tasks to promote the economic growth of the new country. Many of these people were northerners (but not all), and many envisioned the United States as a center of international trade and commerce (a position that probably meant the northern states would be more economically, and therefore politically, important). These people came to be known as Federalists. Opposed to the Federalists were the faction eventually known as the Republicans, later **Democratic-Republicans** (and even later, Democrats). This second group centered around James Madison and Thomas Jefferson, both of Virginia, and they had a vision for the United States that called for a nation of small, independent farmers. In this vision, the Federal Government was much more limited in size and activity, and state governments wielded more power (because they were closer and more responsive to the will of the voters). So with Madison and Hamilton, and their supporters disagreeing on both the question of the debt, but also the question of how this new Federal Government would work, Congress was deadlocked.

Hamilton sought out Thomas Jefferson, to work out a deal. Hamilton promised to move the national capital to Philadelphia for ten years, then to a site on the Potomac River, in Northern Virginia. Virginia would thus get a major port city, and locating the future national capital (Washington, D.C.) would benefit Virginia, since Virginia would have the national government in its backyard. In exchange, the Virginia senators agreed to support Hamilton's plan on the debt. Congress approved a 20-year charter for the first Bank of the United States; the bank would hold government deposits and issue banknotes that would be received in payment of debts owed the federal government. The Government paid off the debt with bonds, and a small number of northern investors benefited. The government established credit, by showing itself to be trustworthy, and many northerners invested again in the government.

In 1791, Hamilton presented to Congress his *Report on Manufactures*, which outlined plans for the development of industry and manufacturing in the United States. Hamilton argued that a nation could never be truly independent if it relied on European nations for manufactured goods. He proposed several ideas that Congress adopted; for example, Congress agreed to Hamilton's proposal of a limited tariff to encourage American manufacturing and also to a steep tax on whiskey. It would be a valuable source of revenue, taking on New England and New York rum distillers. Most involved in the distilling business were Scotch-Irish frontiersmen who had a lack of respect for the new national government and Hamilton agreed that these westerners should be made to feel the lash, as well as the benefits, of government. (This tax on whiskey will be important later.) By now, the midpoint of

Washington's first term, cooperation had deteriorated and Washington's administration had split into the two rival factions noted above, and much of the President's energies were spent in mediating their differences.

PAUSE for 60-second Quiz #1: How did the unanimity of Washington's election in 1788 break down into antagonism between two political factions? WHICH of the following issues helps to explain this break down?

- a. Federalists and Democratic-Republicans disagreed on whether to pass the Bill of Rights
- b. Federalists and Democratic-Republicans disagreed on whether Washington should be President-for-Life
- c. Federalists and Democratic-Republicans disagreed on the nature of the Federal Government, with Federalists like Jefferson supporting a large, powerful Federal Government while Democratic-Republicans like Hamilton supporting a weak Federal Government and more power for states
- d. Federalists and Democratic-Republicans disagreed on the nature of the Federal Government, with Federalists like Hamilton supporting a large, powerful Federal Government while Democratic-Republicans like Jefferson supporting a weak Federal Government and more power for states

II. Washington's Second Term: Working Out the Kinks?

The story of Washington's second term was one of even greater challenges. Washington wanted to retire. He was sixty, his hearing and eyesight were deteriorating, and he longed for the tranquility of Mount Vernon. But he slowly realized that there were crucial problems to be resolved, and at his advisors' request, Washington ran again for president and easily won. John Adams was again voted Vice-President. However, Thomas Jefferson, tired of his conflict with Hamilton, resigned his position as Secretary of State.

A. Domestic Disputes

One of the taxes created as a result of Alexander Hamilton's programs was a steep tax on whiskey. Whiskey production had increased dramatically in the 1790s, and the high taxes enraged many western citizens, especially in Western Pennsylvania. Whiskey was often used as **barter**—a medium of exchange with which to trade. That is, if a farmer had little or no gold or silver, and no credit at the bank, they might trade barrels of whiskey for seed or tools or other goods they needed to purchase. Thus this high tax on whiskey, which had to be paid with money or else the farmer went to jail, meant that the farmer lost what little money he had. It seemed that with the tax, the federal government was trying to reduce him to the status of a European peasant.

These small-time farmers believed instead in a land tax. The taxing of western land would force land investors to sell that land at reasonable rates to small farmers, enabling them (the farmers) to move west into new areas of the country and set up farms cheaply. (This was important as some areas of farmland in the old colonial regions was becoming depleted of nutrients in the soil, and so farmers needed new lands to continue farming.) This new tax on whiskey made it seem like the Federal Government was favoring the land owners (by not taxing land holdings) and investors, over small farmers and consumers (by taxing the product they consumed). Plus, tax officers were searching homes and forcing people to make oaths to the federal government. There were numerous people being prosecuted, but to make matters worse, the Philadelphia federal court would hear the cases. With a small farm, a distillery, and little else, how could that small farmer possibly get all the way to Philadelphia to be in court, while simultaneously being absent from his farm during farming season, have to pay a lawyer, and get witnesses there if he hoped to win the case? It seemed like a deliberate and contrived government conspiracy. To make matters even worse, these frontier

farmers were already upset with the Washington administration because Hamilton's economic plans seemed to represent the needs of the manufacturing and industrial east, and did not take into account the needs of the western farmers.

Resistance to the whiskey tax boiled over in western Pennsylvania with attacks on tax collectors and the formation of several well-armed resistance movements. These participants in the **Whiskey Rebellion** were convinced that the rising commercial and industrial class was allied with the federal government to crush out the small entrepreneur and cut off the farmers' only source of income. Plus, with a denser population than in Kentucky and western Virginia, there was more government interference in Pennsylvania, and it was more difficult to evade the law. Finally, there were more people involved in distilling whiskey there, and thus more people affected.

Washington was alarmed by the Whiskey Rebellion, viewing it as a threat to the nation's existence. In an extraordinary move, designed to demonstrate the federal government's preeminence and power, the President ordered militia from several other states into Pennsylvania to keep order. He then personally led an army of 13,000 men to Western Pennsylvania to show the federal government's strength and seriousness. The insurrection collapsed quickly with little violence, and the resistance movements disbanded. Twenty prisoners were captured and paraded to Philadelphia, where crowds insulted them. Stuck in jail for six weeks, most prisoners were found not guilty for lack of evidence. Only two men were found guilty; Washington pardoned them. Resistance disappeared, and moonshiners evaded the law. People became convinced that the Democratic Societies had put the rebels up to it, and the Federalists remained strong.

Rural farmers were not the only ones causing the U.S. Government problems. In the early-1790s, the Miami Confederacy of Indians, located in Ohio, refused to sell their territory to America and defeated two American military expeditions, killing over 600 American soldiers and militia. In response, Washington sent an army commanded by "Mad Anthony" Wayne, a Revolutionary War veteran, to launch a new expedition against a coalition of tribes led by Miami Chief Little Turtle. Wayne spent months training his troops to fight using forest warfare in the style of the Indians before marching boldly into the region. After constructing a chain of forts, Wayne and his troops crushed the Indians in the Battle of Fallen Timbers (near present-day Toledo) in the summer of 1794. Defeated, the Miami and their six allies—the Shawnee, Ottawa, Chippewa, Iroquois, Sauk, and Fox, ceded large portions of Indian lands to the United States in the **Treaty of Greenville** (1795).

B. Foreign Policy Challenges

In 1789, the **French Revolution** began, but by 1793, the Revolution had turned more radical, and the King and Queen of France, and many of its nobility, had been executed. The French republic outlawed Christianity. In 1793, Revolutionary France and England went to war. Americans were deeply divided over whether the United States should continue its alliance with France (from the time of the American Revolution) or support Great Britain (whom many in the U.S. were not sure they completely trusted). This choice was made more difficult because, in some ways, the French Revolution could be seen as emerging out of concerns similar to the American Revolution: high taxes, unpopular king with too much power, inability for regular citizens to have a voice in the political system (although there were also many differences from the American example, too), yet the direction taken by the French Revolution was much more radical by 1793 than anything seen in the United States to that point.

Hamilton and his allies, the Federalists, viewed the French Revolution as anarchy, as out of control. They believed that the United States should renounce the 1778 Treaty of Alliance with France and should side with Great Britain. But the British were inciting Native Americans to attack American settlers along the frontier of the new country. American anger in response to these attacks served to reinforce sentiments for aiding France in any conflict with Great Britain. Jefferson and his supporters favored a continued alliance with France.

In 1793, the situation became more complicated when in April, Edmund Genet, known as "Citizen" Genet, a representative of the French government, arrived in Charleston, South Carolina to recruit Americans for expeditions against British and Spanish colonies in the western hemisphere, to gain support for the French by distributing pamphlets, and to spread pro-French ideas. Washington did not want to get the United States involved in any foreign conflict; the nation was too young, too weak, too economically unstable, to fight another war with a major European power. Washington issued a proclamation of American neutrality in the conflict, declaring that the U.S. would follow "a conduct friendly and impartial toward the belligerent powers," and prohibiting "aiding or abetting hostilities." When Genet allowed a French-sponsored warship to sail out of Philadelphia against direct presidential orders, Washington demanded that France recall Genet. Ultimately, when the government in France changed, Citizen Genet could not return, yet his ideas, which often overlapped with the ideas of the Jeffersonians, led to the creation of dozens of **Democratic-Republican Societies** in the 1790s. These societies criticized Washington and Hamilton, and spread opposition views against the Washington administration.

America continued to trade with both France and Great Britain, even though France and Britain were at war with each other. Thus France and Great Britain both refused to respect the rights of (neutral) American ships in their respective waters, seizing American ships for supporting the other side. Even worse, British naval ships seized American ships and cargoes and kidnapped American sailors and forced them to serve in the British Navy! (This action was called **impressment**.)

In mid-1793, Britain announced that it would seize any ships trading with the French, including those flying the American flag. In protest, widespread civil disorder erupted in several American cities. By the following year, tensions with Britain were so high that Washington had to stop all American shipments overseas. Six large warships were commissioned; among them was the USS *Constitution*, the legendary "Old Ironsides." An envoy was sent to England to attempt reconciliation, but the British were now building a fortress in Ohio while increasing insurgent activities elsewhere in America. The President's strong inclination in response to British provocations was to seek a diplomatic solution. Washington sent John Jay to England, but Jay negotiated a very unpopular treaty (the **Jay Treaty of 1795**). For the US, Britain agreed to evacuate the Northwest by 1796, though Fallen Timbers already happened. The British East Indies (basically the Caribbean) would open to Americans; this trade brought millions in profits over the next few years. Britain got in return restrictions preventing Americans from carrying certain commodities to Europe, even if they were imported from French or Spanish colonies, or if they were produced in the US. Both sides benefitted in that war was averted and each nation placed the other in terms of tariffs, on a most-favored nation status. The Treaty did not settle boundaries, pre-Revolutionary debts or compensation for maritime seizures. It said nothing about the kidnapping of American sailors. These issues would be resolved by committees. The Treaty did not mention of confiscated slaves during the Revolution and thus angered Southerners. Though the treaty insured neutrality, it protected the Hamiltonian system, and many of the Federalists in the North were content.

Jay's Treaty continued to have negative consequences for the remainder of the Washington administration. France declared the U.S. to be in violation of American-French treaties signed during the Revolution, and by 1796, the French were harassing American ships and threatening the U.S. with punitive sanctions. Diplomacy did little to solve the problem, and in later years, American and French warships exchanged gunfire on several occasions. John Adams, the next president, would inherit this tense situation.

Besides France and Great Britain, the U.S. was also still dealing with the former colonial power Spain but an agreement with Spain had a much happier outcome for Washington. Thomas Pinckney of South Carolina negotiated a treaty with Spain (the **Pinckney Treaty of 1795**) giving the United States navigation privileges on the Mississippi River and the right to use the port of New Orleans. Spain agreed not to incite any Indians against the United States and to recognize American freedom on the seas. This was a boost to the West and the South, and this further encouraged settlement and trade in the West. (The Mississippi River and port of New Orleans were basically the only way that farmers on the frontier could ship their crops to market for sale or export; the ability to use these venues thus removed a large obstacle to western expansion.) Taken together, the two treaties brought enormous advantages to the US: neutrality, commercial prosperity, and territorial expansion.

PAUSE for 60-second Quiz #2: What were some of the challenges facing the new U.S. Government during the early years? Which of the following was NOT an example of these challenges?

- a. War with the Miami Indian Confederacy, resulting in the Treaty of Greenville
- b. Diplomatic tension with Great Britain, leading to the Jay Treaty
- c. Diplomatic tension with France, leading to the Pinckney Treaty
- d. Resistance to tax laws, leading to the Whiskey Rebellion in Pennsylvania

III. A Closer Look: The End of the Washington Era

If he wanted to, Washington could have served a third term. It was not until 1951 with the 22nd Amendment that the Constitution limited a president to two terms. But Washington was exhausted physically, mentally, and financially, and simply wanted to return to Mount Vernon. With the help of Hamilton and Madison, Washington prepared a farewell address that he delivered to the public upon the end of his presidency: He outlined the challenges that America faced and warned his fellow citizens against "the baneful spirit of faction," referring to the party spirit that had disrupted his administration, and he warned against "foreign entanglements." But he could not prevent the formation of parties, nor did his warning against "foreign entanglements" prevent his successors from engaging in active diplomacy with European nations, often leading to de facto alliances. To this day, Washington's farewell address is read aloud every year in both houses of Congress as a tribute to his service and foresight.

On December 12, 1799, Washington noted in his diary, "At about ten o'clock it began to snow, soon after to hail, and then to a settled cold rain." For five hours that day, Washington had been outdoors on horseback, inspecting his property. The next day he complained of a sore throat, and that night he became deeply ill. Doctors, heeding the medical tenets of the day, extracted blood from him and performed other practices that did him more harm than good. Yet Washington never complained of the pain. He calmly gave orders to servants and apologized for the trouble he was causing everyone. Around midnight he breathed his last breath.

Washington's funeral was not the simple ceremony he had requested. Thousands of mourners attended the services, a band played, and a ship anchored in the Potomac fired a grand salute. He

was buried in the family tomb at Mount Vernon. His forty-two page will, which he had personally drafted in 1799, left his estate, which was valued at \$500,000, to his wife, Martha, for use during her lifetime, after which it would pass to his nephew, Bushrod Washington. He freed his personal slave, William, with a \$30 grant of money to be paid him every year for life, and he ordered the rest of his slaves freed upon Martha's death. Washington left some of his wealth to a school for poor and orphaned children and other amounts to support the construction of a national university in Washington, D.C. His two grandchildren received large, choice tracts of farmland in Virginia, and he left his numerous friends gifts drawn from his household and personal effects. Washington's five nephews inherited his five swords along with the instructions to never "unsheath them for the purpose of shedding blood, except it be for self-defense, or in defense of their Country and its rights; and in the latter case, to keep them unsheathed, and prefer falling with them in their hands, to the relinquishment thereof."

Lady Washington, Martha Washington, was like her husband, reluctant to do the work that the nation asked of her. However, she set a positive precedent with her actions as the first **First Lady**. Despite her many objections to life as a presidential spouse—she didn't like being in the spotlight—as she put it, "the greater part of our happiness or misery depends upon our dispositions and not upon our circumstances." With that spirit in mind, Lady Washington attended honorary birthday balls, stood in for her husband at public events, personally greeted the public in an annual New Year's Day open house, held weekly buffet receptions. She set a tone for the charitable work that many first ladies since have been involved in—she took a particular interest in veterans, often giving them money, interceding on their behalf for pardons, and welcoming them at special receptions. She was less sympathetic to the plight of slaves, however, and her views on slavery remained those of a plantation owner, believing "Blacks" as a race were subordinate, inferior, and ungracious. She stayed out of politics, became an advocate for young women's rights. The movements and activities of Martha Washington came to define the responsibilities associated with the role of First Lady. In addition, with her quiet acceptance of a second term, especially when she yearned to return to private life, Martha's sense of self-sacrifice became a model for many presidential wives faced with similar situations. Above all, the lack of privacy, independence, and freedom of speech, as well as the many demands placed upon her as a public figure, would characterize the challenges facing future First Ladies in the years to come.

PAUSE for 60-second Quiz #3

What are some of the ways in which the Washington Administration established the expectations for future presidents' actions and conduct? Which of the following is NOT true?

- a. George Washington voluntarily retired after two terms, despite his legal ability to serve longer
- b. George Washington served as President until his death in office, despite pressure to retire
- c. Martha Washington held social events but stayed out of politics in her role as First Lady
- d. George Washington warned against the dangers of foreign entanglements and political division

IV. The Adams Administration (1797-1801)

A. The Election of 1796

John Adams rose to become Boston's most famous attorney, a Johnny Cochran, Mark Geragos-type figure. He had successfully defended nine British soldiers arrested after the "Boston Massacre," and was one of the leading patriots during the war of independence, a delegate to the Continental Congress, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, in fact part of the Committee that wrote it, had negotiated the Treaty of Paris to end the War, and briefly served as an ambassador in

Europe. In late-1796, the Federalist members of Congress held a meeting in which they nominated Adams and Thomas Pinckney of South Carolina, a diplomat and negotiator of the Pinckney Treaty, to be their candidates for President in the election of 1796. The Democratic-Republicans in Congress likewise met and named Thomas Jefferson and Aaron Burr of New York, who had served in the Continental army and as a United States Senator early in Washington's presidency, as their choices.

It might seem strange to you that each party named two presidential candidates but that was the strategy, hoping their two candidates would win the election. Remember, the person receiving the most electoral votes, if it was a majority of the electoral votes cast, would be the president, and the runner-up would be the vice president. If no candidate received a majority of votes, or if the two candidates tied with a majority of votes, the House of Representatives would decide the election, and each state, regardless of size, would have a single vote. So at this time, people did not run for the office of Vice President, and they did not really have a “ticket” of two candidate, because the President and Vice President could ultimately come from opposite political parties (which became a problem, as we shall see).

In the election of 1796, only Aaron Burr actively campaigned; the campaign was really carried out in the newspapers. The Federalists labeled Jefferson as a Francophile, questioned his courage during the War of Independence—he had never fought in any way, and charged that he was an atheist. A rumor, based on some fact, also emerged that he had fathered some children by a slave, and that red-haired, dark-skinned slaves had been seen running around his plantation at Monticello. The Democratic-Republicans, on the other hand, labeled Adams as a snobby monarchist, an England-lover who was probably going to try to establish a family dynasty by having his son succeed him as President. Rumors swirled that Alexander Hamilton did not like Adams.

In the end, Adams won by only three electoral votes, basically in the North. Jefferson won the South. Thus, the nation would have a President from one party and a Vice President from the other party. In 1804, the Twelfth Amendment was passed, which prevented this from happening again. After that point, there would be a president-vice-president ticket, and so the vice-president would be the person that went along with the president elected.

A. An Unpopular Presidency

Adams' superiority complex and harsh Yankee attitude put him on a collision course with nearly everyone in government. He stuck to his guns and often insisted on doing things his way. With his inability to win support from either Hamiltonians (Federalists; Adams' own party) or Jeffersonians (Democratic-Republicans), Adams made few friends.

Adams inherited an already-tense situation in which France was harassing American ships at sea. The Jay Treaty provoked the French to retaliate by ordering its ships to seize American vessels carrying British goods. In response, Congress increased military spending and built up the U.S. Navy. Prime Minister Charles Maurice de Talleyrand of France insulted the American diplomats by first refusing to officially receive them. He then demanded a \$250,000 personal bribe and a \$10 million loan for his financially strapped country before he would begin peace negotiations.

Negotiations with France went nowhere, and Democratic-Republicans insisted that the transcripts of the negotiations be handed over to Congress. When news of these discussions became public, it was known as the **XYZ Affair**, because the names of the French ambassadors had been blacked out and replaced with X, Y, and Z. A tremendous outcry ensued. Federalist leaders wanted to go to war with France. Congress officially disowned its treaty with France during the Revolutionary

War. Military spending and training increased. Adams was not sure what to do. An unofficial naval war broke out as ships in each navy openly and freely raided the fleets of the other, and Britain continued to impress American sailors and seize ships suspected of trading with France.

Meanwhile, Federalist leaders attempted to quiet opponents at home. In 1798, the Federalist-controlled Congress adopted a set of four laws known as the **Alien and Sedition Acts** attempted to suppress dissent and to prevent further growth of Democratic-Republican Societies and to put a stop to Democratic-Republican propaganda and criticism of Adams and the Federalists. Three of the laws were aimed at immigrants, most of whom tended to vote for Democratic-Republican candidates. The Naturalization Act lengthened the residency period required for citizenship from five to fourteen years. The Alien Act, the only one of the four acts to pass with bipartisan support, allowed for the detention of enemy aliens in time of war without trial or counsel. The Alien Enemies Act empowered the President to deport aliens whom he deemed dangerous to the nation's security. The fourth law, the Sedition Act, outlawed conspiracy to prevent the enforcement of federal laws and punished subversive speech -- with fines and imprisonment. There were fifteen indictments and ten convictions under the Sedition Act during the final year and a half of Adams's administration. One of these convictions was Senator Matthew Lyon of Vermont, a Democratic-Republican who had publicly criticized Adams in 1798. No aliens were deported or arrested although hundreds of alien immigrants fled the country in 1798 and 1799.

To pay for the military measures it enacted during the XYZ crisis, the Federalist Congress enacted a direct tax on homes, lands, and slaves, sometimes called the **Direct House Tax of 1798**. Pennsylvania was called upon to contribute \$237,000 of the intended \$2 million. Because there were few slaves in the state, the tax was assessed on homes and land, the value of the houses determined by the number and size of the windows. The proceedings angered Pennsylvania Germans and many of them refused to pay. John Fries, an auctioneer, assumed leadership of the protesters, organized an armed band of about 60 men, a force that grew to about 400 by mid-day, who marched about the country intimidating the assessors and encouraging the people to resist. In March 1799 the governor called out the militia, and the leaders were arrested. Fries and two others were twice tried for treason (the second time before Samuel Chase) and were sentenced to be hanged, but they were pardoned by President John Adams in April 1800, and a general amnesty was issued on May 21, 1800.

In response to the Federalists' draconian use of federal power, Democratic-Republicans Thomas Jefferson and James Madison secretly drafted a set of resolutions. These became known as the **Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions**. These resolutions were introduced into the Kentucky and Virginia legislatures in the fall of 1798. Jefferson and Madison argued that since the Constitution was created by a compact among the states, the people, speaking through their state legislatures, had the authority to judge the legitimacy of federal actions. Hence, they pronounced the Alien and Sedition Acts null and void. Although no other states formally supported the resolutions, they rallied Democratic-Republican opinion in the nation. Most importantly, they placed the Jeffersonian Republicans within the revolutionary tradition of resistance to tyranny.

The resolutions also raised the issue of states' rights and the constitutional question of how conflict between the two authorities would be resolved short of secession or war. This will be very important to remember later, when the issue of "states' rights" becomes part of the American Civil War. While the "state's rights" at issue in 1860 are really about slavery, the right being argued about in 1800 are really the power of the Federal Government to upend the Constitution. That's not to say that slavery is not a factor in 1800; by 1800, the United States had now increased to 5 million people, still 20% black and 90% of these were slaves. In other words, 4 million whites, 800,000 African

American slaves, 200,000 free African Americans, and as the economic and political differences between the northern and southern parts of the country become more pointed, the issue of slavery will increasingly enter the picture.

In Conclusion, Adams finally did establish peace with France by single-handedly negotiating a peace treaty ending the conflict between French and American ships and naval vessels, but not in time to help restore his popularity. During his final year in office, he was publicly criticized as a man of "vanity" and "egotism" who was "unfit" for the office of chief executive. "It was utterly impossible that I could have lived through one more year of such labors and cares," he wrote. "It is a sad thing that simple integrity should have so many enemies in the world."

C. The Campaign and Election of 1800

Adams faced a difficult reelection campaign in 1800. The Federalist Party was deeply split over his foreign policy and many were disgusted that Adams had fired two members of his cabinet because they disagreed with him. In addition, the Democratic-Republicans had gained political support through the Alien and Sedition Acts. The Federalist members of Congress nominated Adams and Charles Cotesworth Pinckney of South Carolina. The Democratic-Republicans meanwhile nominated Jefferson and Aaron Burr, their candidates in the previous presidential election, but designated Jefferson as their choice for President.

Similarly to the 1796 campaign, the 1800 campaign was filled with personal attacks and lies. But it was Adams' own party that sank him—In October, Alexander Hamilton wrote that Adams was emotionally unstable, irrational, difficult to get along with, and generally unfit to be President. Hamilton worked to elect Pinckney, but New England supported Adams, and as a result, Jefferson and Burr tied for first place with seventy-three votes each, Adams came in third, and Pinckney fourth. With the election a tie, the decision was remitted to the House of Representatives, as specified by the Constitution. Every Democratic-Republican delegation in the House stood by Jefferson; however, some northern Federalists favored Burr, whom they found more palatable than their longtime nemesis from Virginia. After thirty-five ballots and five days of voting, the House was deadlocked.

Throughout the long battle, Alexander Hamilton had urged the election of his old rival, Jefferson. He viscerally disliked Jefferson and objected to his democratic and egalitarian principles, but he feared and mistrusted Aaron Burr as an unprincipled opportunist. In the end, however, the outcome in the House appears to have hung on Federalist bargaining with both Jefferson and Burr. In return for their vote, Federalist House members sought a commitment from one or the other to preserve Hamilton's economic program, keep the enhanced Navy intact, and leave Federalist officeholders in their jobs. Burr appears to have refused to bargain. Jefferson, ever after, denied making such a bargain, although several Federalists claimed that he had agreed to their terms. The truth can never be known. What is clear is that on the thirty-sixth ballot, a sufficient number of Federalists broke from Burr and gave their votes to Jefferson. The final House vote was Jefferson with ten states and Burr with four states while two states (South Carolina and Delaware) abstained. With that, Jefferson became the third President of the United States. When Jefferson assumed office, his opponents stepped down peacefully. This return to domestic tranquility established a powerful precedent for the future.

Yet, at the same time, knowing that Adams had lost the election, the Federalist-controlled Congress passed the Judiciary Act of 1801, which created sixteen federal judgeships. Adams appointed Federalists who opposed the Democratic-Republican principles of his successor, Thomas Jefferson. Many of the papers were signed just before midnight as a gesture of antagonism toward

Jefferson, who called the men "**Midnight Judges**." Jefferson and his supporters were bitter, considering it immoral for Adams to make judicial appointments after his defeat for reelection. By expanding the Judiciary, it seemed he was trying to preserve and enlarge Federalist influence at the expense of the incoming Jeffersonian administration.

Further, Adams refused to take part in Jefferson's inauguration. Instead, in the middle of the night, he quietly slipped out of town and returned home to Massachusetts. Adams' hasty departure has often been branded as the pettiest action of his life. "I left Washington on the 4th," he wrote, "and arrived at Quincy on the 18th having trotted the bogs five hundred miles. . . . I found about a hundred loads of seaweed in my barnyard, and I thought I had made a good exchange-honors and virtues for manure." Adams thus gained a reputation as a corrupt man, a grouch, and a sore loser. Adams has often been criticized along these lines.

But recently, historians have taken a more sympathetic view of Adams. Adams became a punching bag for the Democratic-Republicans, a villain sort of, but they blew things out of proportion. For example, with the "midnight appointments," Adams had urged the expansion of the judiciary more than a year earlier. Plus, he had been reading and evaluating recommendations for these positions for many weeks.

As far as Adams' leaving town goes, his letters reveal no bitterness. Further, the relationship between Jefferson and Adams probably was not good, but wasn't as bad as historians have suggested. There was no suggested protocol about handing over the government. Adams was probably disappointed, he was exhausted from his presidency, his wife was back in Massachusetts, his 30-year old son had died the previous autumn in Massachusetts as a result of alcoholism—he probably just wanted to be with his family. Further, it was a 16 hour stage-coach trip to Massachusetts, and in order to get there in one day, it was necessary to leave at like 4 in the morning.

PAUSE for 60-second Quiz #4

What are some of the controversies of the Adams Administration that exemplify the unpopularity of his presidency, to supporters and opponents alike? Which is NOT an example of such a controversy?

- a. The XYZ Affair with France
- b. The Alien and Sedition Acts against Democratic-Republicans
- c. The "midnight judges" appointed before Adams' departures from office
- d. The Jay Treaty with Great Britain

Key for 60-second Quizzes:

- 1. c. Jefferson was a Democratic-Republican, Hamilton was a Federalist
- 2. c. The Pinckney Treaty was signed with Spain
- 3. b. Washington retired and died in his home in Mount Vernon
- 4. d. The Jay Treaty was in 1795, under the Washington Administration

I. Transfer of Power

A. Democratic-Republican goals

You should remember from Chapter Eight that Jefferson represented a different political faction, who held a different notion of what "America" should be, than the Federalists who has been in power for the last twelve years. When Jefferson took office in 1801, this was the Democratic-Republicans' chance to put their ideas into action. Democratic-Republicans promoted limited government, farming, simplicity; they wore plain pants rather than wigs and knee breeches worn by Federalists. At his inaugural, Jefferson spoke of reconciliation, of putting aside political differences, but the Democratic-Republicans and the Federalists remained bitter enemies.

Jefferson filled government jobs with Democratic-Republicans, ignoring some of Adams' appointments and firing many who hadn't resigned. Jefferson thus cut the influence of Federalists in government jobs. Jefferson had the support of Congress; they repealed all internal taxes, including the Whiskey Tax. Secretary of the Treasury Albert Gallatin cut the army and navy's budgets dramatically and closed foreign embassies. The Jefferson government cut the Army to only 3000 active members and the Navy to six ships. The Jefferson government vowed to spend less and to make government more honest and less wasteful. Congress let expire or repealed the Alien and Sedition Acts; they were never used by the Democratic Republicans against the Federalists.

B. Problems with the Courts

Jefferson then turned to the Judiciary. The most recent Congress had just passed the Judiciary Act of 1801, passed at the very end of the Adams presidency, which created 15 new judgeships filled by Adams' midnight appointments. Under Jefferson, the new Congress repealed that action. Then two impeachment proceedings were initiated to test the waters for removal of the Federalist justices by trial. According to the U.S. Constitution, a federal judge can be removed from office only for "high crimes and misdemeanors."

In the first test, Justice John Pickering of New Hampshire became the target. He had written the New Hampshire Constitution and was now a U.S. district court judge, who was also an alcoholic and undoubtedly insane. He sat to consider *United States v. Eliza*, a case concerning a ship seized in violation of revenue laws. Allegedly, Pickering was drunk and raved profanities throughout the trial. He was tried by the U.S. Senate, based upon articles of impeachment drawn up by the U.S. House. Pickering was removed from office by a strict party-line vote.

The other target for impeachment was Justice Samuel Chase. An avowed Federalist, he had targeted Democratic-Republicans and had worked for their prosecution under the Alien and Sedition Acts. It was true that many of his rulings had been driven by politics, and specifically, his handling of the trial of John Fries, of Pennsylvania, Fries' Rebellion, that provided the motivation to impeach him. Congress failed to convict Chase. Fortunately for Chase, he had defenders among moderate Republicans in the Senate who feared overreaching their congressional authority. In the latter case, the Senate vote failed to carry the two-thirds majority in favor of conviction. The trial was a joke.

Still, under Chief Justice

John Marshall, (1801-1835), the Supreme Court consistently upheld federal supremacy over the states, and protected commerce and capital. Marshall increased the court's power in the landmark

case **Marbury vs. Madison** (1803). William Marbury was one of the midnight appointments made by Adams, but James Madison, Thomas Jefferson's new Secretary of State, blocked the appointment and Marbury sued. If the Supreme Court ruled in favor of Marbury, would Jefferson and Madison ignore it? If they ruled against Marbury, it would be a victory for the Democratic Republicans. The Court ruled that they did not have the authority to compel Madison to honor the appointment. It was out of their role, out of their jurisdiction. Even though the ruling was a sort of non-decision decision (the Court said that Congress was asking the Court to take actions that were unconstitutional), the key development out of this case was the principle of judicial review – the notion that the U.S. Supreme Court was the ultimate authority on interpreting the constitutionality of a law passed by Congress, and the Court could declare laws to be unconstitutional.

C. Louisiana Purchase

Jefferson's acquisition of the Louisiana Territory in 1803 was another source of contention. Jefferson shared with many Americans the idea that the U.S. was destined to expand its "empire of liberty" and made westward expansion a national priority. However, at this time, the U.S. only extended westward to the Mississippi River. Spain had controlled the Louisiana Territory (beginning in the modern-day state of Louisiana but extending northward to Minnesota and westward to Montana) since 1763. France acquired this territory through secret deliberations in 1800 and 1801. Napoleon Bonaparte, then Emperor of France, seemed to be building a French Empire in the New World. Spain ignored Pinckney's Treaty, trying to make the most of New Orleans before it was to hand it back to France. Western farmers grumbled about Napoleon and thought he would close down access to the Mississippi River and to New Orleans.

Jefferson prepared for war with France, but first sent James Monroe and Robert Livingston as ambassadors to France to try to smooth things over. Their objective: to buy New Orleans and a chunk of the Mississippi Valley. France surprisingly offered to sell ALL 827,000 square miles for \$15 million. Once he had failed to recapture Haiti, Napoleon had given up his dreams of an empire in the New World and instead decided he needed the money to pursue his war against Great Britain. The **Louisiana Purchase** doubled the size of the nation geographically, and it offered tremendous opportunities for whites to expand their settlements westward. It would help make Jefferson's dream of a farmers' republic a reality, and it offered space for Indians to be sent to get them out of the war for this white settlement. The only problem was that concluding this agreement contradicted Jefferson's plans to cut spending.

Jefferson wondered whether or not it was constitutional that he purchase the land. This is because Jefferson was a **strict constructionist** when it came to reading and interpreting the Constitution. Basically, if the Constitution does not expressly say something is allowed, then that thing is not allowed. The alternative point of view (shared like people such as Alexander Hamilton) was called **loose constructionism**. Loose constructionists took the view that, if the Constitution did not expressly say something was not allowed, then that thing is fine. In the case of Jefferson and the Louisiana Purchase, he became a loose constructionist, temporarily, because he decided that it was a matter of national security and that it also offered benefits nature wise-and environmentally. Nevertheless, Congress ratified the treaty purchasing the territory by a vote of 24-7. Today, the Louisiana Purchase is known as one of Jefferson's biggest accomplishments.

In 1803, Jefferson sent an expedition headed by **Meriwether Lewis and William Clark**. Meriwether Lewis was a Virginian. He had served in the effort to put down the Whiskey

Rebellion and was Jefferson's personal secretary—today we'd call it a Chief of Staff. William Clark was also a Virginian, but he had more military experience; he had served in the Battle of Fallen Timbers and was living on the frontier in Kentucky. The men led thirty-one other men including Clark's slave Ben York; the expedition also included Lewis' Newfoundland Dog. All the men were hand-picked; the two officers for their leadership abilities, and their detachment for frontier, hunting, woodcutting, specialized craftsmanship, and interpreting skills.

During the middle of the trip, two French-Canadian fur trappers and one of the trappers' Shoshone Indian wife, **Sacagawea**, replaced two men that Lewis and Clark sent home. The captains felt that because of her Shoshone heritage, Sacagawea could be important in trading for horses when the Corps reached the western mountains and the Shoshones. While Sacagawea did not speak English, she spoke Shoshone and Hidatsa. Her husband Charbonneau spoke Hidatsa and French. In effect, Sacagawea and Charbonneau would become an interpreter team. As Clark explained in his journals, Charbonneau was hired "as an interpreter through his wife." If and when the expedition met the Shoshones, Sacagawea would talk with them, then translate to Hidatsa for Charbonneau, who would translate to French. The Corps' Francois Labiche spoke French and English, and would make the final translation so that the two English-speaking captains would understand. And continued the rest of the way through more hostile and unknown Indian territory with the expedition. In November 1805, the expedition reached the Pacific Ocean, then turned around and returned in September, 1806.

As a result of the expedition, the U.S. gained an extensive knowledge of the geography of the West, and Clark's many maps were quite accurate. The expedition encountered fifty new Indian tribes and the Corps of Discovery observed and described 178 plants and 122 species of animals, including the Grizzly Bear, the Pronghorn Antelope, and the Prairie Dog, the Magpie, and the cutthroat trout. They sent specimens back to Jefferson, and several live animals (most of which died); however, Jefferson for several years had a prairie dog, previously unknown in America. Additional outcomes of the expedition was that it encouraged the fur-trade in the West, it strengthened the U.S.'s claim to Oregon, and it made Americans interested in the West.

While the trip was, for the most part, a triumph—only one member of the expedition died; the fate of Ben York, Clark's slave, is a little less wonderful. York became the first African American to cross the continent north of Mexico, and played an important role in the expedition. Indians marveled at his skin color, but also his physical strength. On the journey, York worked with the rest of the men, and voted with the men when important decisions had to be made. York hunted with Clark, whereas in most states, slaves were prohibited from handling firearms unless they lived on the frontier and had a license. York also was known as a bit of a practical joker. Arriving back in St. Louis at the end of the Journey, York shared in the public welcoming party, and received the praise of the community. He asked Clark for his freedom, or to be hired out near Louisville to be closer to his wife, who had a different owner. Clark refused for two years. Only at least ten years after the expedition did Clark grant York his freedom. York went into the shipping business in Kentucky and Tennessee.

In another expedition to the West, in 1805, it's worth noting that Jefferson also sent Zebulon Pike to explore Colorado. He discovered the now-famous 18,000 foot peak in Colorado Springs—Pike's Peak, and was actually captured by the Spanish in 1807, though freed soon after. Jefferson's

second term, though it was marked by the achievements of the Lewis and Clark and Pike expedition, was quite eventful in other ways.

Pause for 60-second Quiz 1: What were some of the ways Jefferson and his Democratic-Republicans put their ideas about government in to practice? Which statement is correct?

- a. Jefferson allowed all Federalists appointed to judicial positions remain in their offices when he (Jefferson) took power
- b. Jefferson expanded the U.S. Army and U.S. Navy to protect America's strategic interests
- c. Jefferson preferred to exercise strict constructionism but became a loose constructionist to purchase the Louisiana Territory from Spain, on the premise of creating an "empire of liberty"
- d. Jefferson preferred to exercise loose constructionism but became a strict constructionist to purchase the Louisiana Territory from France, on the premise of creating an "empire of liberty"

II. Jefferson's Second Term A.

Hamilton-Burr Duel

One of the key events in Jefferson's second term was the Hamilton-Burr duel, which took place in **Weehawken**, New Jersey in July, 1804; Burr shot and killed Hamilton. The duel was the culmination, the final event in a long list of conflicts between Burr and Hamilton. In 1791, Burr defeated Hamilton's father-in-law for a position as New York Senator in a bitterly contested campaign. In 1800, when the Electoral College was tied, Hamilton's maneuvering to elect Adams and Pinckney caused Adams and Jefferson to become president and vice president.

In 1804, when Burr ran for governor of New York, Hamilton campaigned viciously against him, and Burr lost. The *Albany Register* published a letter saying that Hamilton had bashed Burr at a political dinner, and Burr demanded an apology. Hamilton refused, claiming he could not remember the specific comments he had made. Burr demanded that Hamilton deny everything he had ever said regarding Burr's character. Hamilton, having already been disgraced when news of an adulterous affair became public, could not afford further embarrassment. Burr challenged Hamilton to the duel in a letter, and despite the efforts of their friends to mediate and to defuse the situation, Hamilton accepted, hoping to defend his honor.

Hamilton and Burr crossed the Hudson River into New Jersey at dawn. Dueling was illegal in New York, so they found a site high above a cliff in Weehawken New Jersey. The same site had been used for several duels before. Both men were accompanied by "seconds," men who carried the weapons and made sure the protocol was followed. Both men looked away as the dueling began so that they would not witness what happened and could not testify against the men. Hamilton fired first and missed.

Some have attributed Hamilton's misfire to an intentional decision on his part—he did not want to shoot and kill Burr. A letter that Hamilton wrote the night before the duel states:

"I have resolved, if our interview is conducted in the usual manner, and it pleases God to give me the opportunity, to reserve and throw away my first fire, and I have thoughts even of reserving my second fire." When Burr later learned of this, he responded: "Contemptible, if true." Others have attributed Hamilton's apparent misfire to a faulty firing mechanism on his gun.

Burr, probably hoping to merely wound Hamilton in the leg, instead shot Hamilton in the lower abdomen, causing considerable damage to his internal organs, particularly his liver and spine. Hamilton died the following day and was buried in Manhattan. Burr traveled, hoping to avoid capture. He was charged with murder in New York and New Jersey but never brought to trial. Burr, the active Vice-President, eventually returned to Boston. Until 2006, Aaron Burr was the first Vice-President to shoot someone during his vice-presidency.

B. The Burr Conspiracy

With his political career over, Burr allegedly hatched a plot to establish a new empire carved out of Louisiana territory. After being charged with murder for killing Alexander Hamilton during their famous duel in 1804, Aaron Burr fled to Philadelphia in an attempt to escape arrest. Here he met Harman Blennerhassett, and James Wilkinson, who would become crucial to the planning and attempted execution of his conspiracy. Burr's true intentions are still ambiguous; however, it is generally believed that his major objectives were to separate Western states and territories from the rest of the union and to free and conquer the Spanish possessions of Texas and Northern Mexico. Burr envisioned a new empire in the West over which he would rule.

Burr traveled to the West to recruit people for his mission, and eventually authorities discovered his plans; one of Burr's own men revealed the plans. Wilkinson warned Jefferson that Burr was "meditating the overthrow of [his] administration" and "conspiring against the State." Jefferson alerted Congress of the plan, and ordered the arrest of anyone who conspired to attack Spanish territory. He warned authorities in the West to be aware of suspicious activities. Convinced of Burr's guilt, Jefferson ordered his arrest. Burr surrendered to local authorities.

Burr was charged with treason for assembling an armed force to take New Orleans and separate the Western from the Atlantic states. He was also charged with high misdemeanor for sending a military expedition against territories belonging to Spain. The government then dropped this second charge for lack of evidence.

Burr's trial brought into question the ideas of executive privilege and the independence of the executive. Burr's lawyers asked Chief Justice John Marshall to subpoena Jefferson, claiming that they needed documents from Jefferson in order to accurately present their case. Jefferson proclaimed that as President, he reserved the right to decide "what papers coming to him as President, the public interests permit to be communicated [and] to whom." He insisted that all relevant papers had been made available, and that he was not subject to this writ because he held executive privilege. He also argued that he should not be subject to the commands of the judiciary, because the constitution guaranteed the executive branch's independence from the judicial branch. Marshall sided with Burr, deciding that the subpoena could be issued despite Jefferson's position of presidency. Though Marshall vowed to consider Jefferson's office and avoid "vexatious and unnecessary subpoenas," his ruling was significant because it suggested that like all citizens, the President was subject to the law.

Burr's case required Marshall to consider the definition of treason. It raised the question of whether or not intent was enough to convict someone of treason. Marshall ruled that because Burr had not committed an act of war, he could not be found guilty. Because the First Amendment

guaranteed Burr the right to voice opposition to the government, “merely suggesting war or engaging in a conspiracy was not enough to require a conviction.” In order to be convicted of treason, Marshall ruled, an overt act of participation must be proven with evidence. Intention to divide the union was not an overt act: “There must be an actual assembling of men for the treasonable purpose, to constitute a levying of war.” A strict constructionist, Marshall further supported his decision by indicating that the Constitution stated that two witnesses must see the same overt act against the country, and only Wilkinson would testify against Burr.

Years later, he returned to New York City to practice law and was tried and acquitted for his role in the duel. He died in 1836 in Staten Island, New York, having never apologized to Hamilton's family or shown any remorse for ending Hamilton's life, though he once remarked "Had I read Sterne more and Voltaire less, I should have known the world was wide enough for Hamilton and me."

C. International Affairs

In Jefferson's second term, the Burr Conspiracy wasn't the only distraction that the administration faced. Problems with Europe again returned. England and France were again at war, and once again, each independently outlawed all American commerce with their opponent. The British navy also began seizing American ships with cargoes bound for Europe and once again began to kidnap American soldiers and force them to serve in the Royal Navy. The problem partly stemmed from the practice of British sailors jumping ship to join U.S. merchant vessels. Thousands of such deserters were considered fair prey by the British navy, which also routinely impressed American citizens on the pretext that they were British deserters, many of whom were in fact just that. In 1806, Jefferson sent diplomats to England, but their trip was a failure.

Tensions mounted, and in the summer of 1807, the British warship *Leopard* attacked an American naval vessel, the *Chesapeake*, just outside of Hampton Roads, Virginia. The British boarded the ship, seized four, and killed three. Cries for war erupted throughout the nation. Americans were outraged.

Jefferson banned all British ships from U.S. ports, ordered state governors to prepare to call up 100,000 militiamen, and suspended trade with all of Europe. He reasoned that U.S. farm products were crucial to France and England and that a complete embargo would bring them to respect U.S. neutrality. Jefferson wanted to avoid a war that would interrupt the economy and increase the power of the federal government. He had several options: He could allow things to continue the way they were, he could use some force with warships to escort the merchant ships or by arming the merchant ships, he could try to exert economic pressure on Great Britain, or he could encourage American manufacturing to make up for the loss of imports.

In 1807, Congress passed the Non-Importation Act and the **Embargo Act**. Its purpose was to prohibit American ships from departing American ports for foreign ports. It caused economic devastation; the South accepted the Embargo, but the North complained. Smuggling was widespread, especially in the North. The Embargo Act led to a resurgence in the Federalist Party. In 1809, shortly before the end of his presidency, Congress replaced the Embargo Act with the non-Intercourse Act, which banned trade with England, France, and their colonies, but allowed it with

other countries. It authorized the President to renew trade with whichever country made a gesture of peace first. James Madison, America's next president, inherited this hostile situation.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #2: What were some of the setbacks encountered by the Jefferson Administration? All of the following statements are true except which one?

- a. The Burr Conspiracy led to the Supreme Court limiting the right of a President to claim executive privilege in legal cases
- b. The Burr Conspiracy led to the loss of several western states, who seceded from the United States
- c. The Embargo Act harmed American economic interests, instead of French and British economic interests
- d. The British Navy continued to impress American sailors into its own (British) ranks

III. Jefferson's retirement and later years

Thomas Jefferson retired to his Virginia plantation home, Monticello. The former President was happy to be free from executive duties and eager to satisfy his boundless curiosity for life. In retirement, Jefferson pursued science and natural history through research, experimentation, and invention. He continued in his post as the elected president of the American Philosophical Society until 1815. He tackled Plato's *Republic* in the original Greek as well as Greek versions of the Bible. All the while, he kept up an extensive private correspondence with friends and acquaintances all over the world. Nothing, however, attracted Jefferson's attention more than his pet project, the University of Virginia. Jefferson designed all of its campus buildings, set up its curriculum, selected its faculty, and joyfully nurtured it into existence. He proudly thought his work on the university a fitting conclusion to his life of public service.

Even as he struggled to make ends meet, Jefferson enjoyed his popularity until becoming ill in early 1826. He had sold much of his private library to the federal government to replace the books burned by the British when they occupied Washington, D.C., during the War of 1812, but his expenses were large. The onetime master of over 150 slaves still owned many of them although most had been used as collateral for borrowed money. Indeed, at his death, Jefferson freed no slaves partly because he worried about what would happen to them as free people but mostly because they had been mortgaged to his creditors. Jefferson's debts reflected his often conspicuous lifestyle. He loved to entertain his guests with fine wine and foods. Monticello frequently overflowed with guests; sometimes as many as fifty people stayed the night.

Racked with pain from rheumatism and an enlarged prostate, Jefferson could barely move when invited to attend the celebration of the 1826 Fourth of July festivities in Washington, D.C. He and John Adams, who was also alive but too ill to attend, were to be the honored guests on the fiftieth anniversary of the presentation of the Declaration of Independence by the revolutionary Continental Congress. Barely conscious, Jefferson lapsed into a coma and died, perhaps willfully, after hearing from his doctor the whispered words that he had lived until the Fourth. Adams died the same day.

IV. The Presidency of James Madison (1809-1817) and the War of 1812

James Madison was the hand-picked successor to Jefferson. Madison had been at the Constitutional Convention, he had played a role in the writing of the Bill of Rights, he was a

congressman from Virginia, and had been Jefferson's Secretary of State. At 5 feet, 4 inches in height (163 cm) and 100 pounds (45 kg), Madison was the nation's shortest president.

A. Tecumseh, Tenskwatawa, and Tippecanoe

When Madison became president, America had several problems. First, conflict between the Indians and the Americans in the Northwest (meaning the Great Lakes region) raged. The United States continued to gain title to Native American land after the Treaty of Greenville, at a rate that created alarm in Indian communities. William Henry Harrison became governor of the Indiana Territory and, under the direction of President Thomas Jefferson, pursued an aggressive policy of obtaining titles to Indian lands. Two Shawnee brothers, **Tecumseh** and Tenskwatawa, organized another pan-tribal resistance to American expansion.

Tecumseh's goal was to get Native American leaders to stop selling land to the United States. While Tecumseh was in the south attempting to recruit allies among the Creeks, Cherokees, and Choctaws, Harrison marched against the Indian confederacy, with 1,000 men, planning to destroy an Indian village in Indiana. The Indians attacked the Americans, but the Americans held firm, defeating Tenskwatawa and his followers at the **Battle of Tippecanoe in 1811**. The Americans hoped that the victory would end the militant resistance, but Tecumseh instead chose to openly ally with the British, who were soon at war with the Americans in the War of 1812.

B. The War of 1812

The story of the Madison years, though, is really that of the War of 1812. How did it begin? Why did it begin? What happened and what was the result?

1. Background

When Madison took over the Presidency in 1809, conflict with the British continued. Despite the Non-Intercourse Act, British Royal Naval vessels continued to intercept unarmed American merchant ships and continued to kidnap American sailors and force them to serve in the British Navy. Madison had his mind made up: he wanted to go to war, and in the summer of 1812, Madison sent his message to Congress, and Congress declared war 2 ½ weeks later on Great Britain. Why did it take such a while?

War would bring death, debt, taxes, standing armies, and military and commercial losses. Madison knew that public opinion had to support the war, or it would never work. Federalists were opposed to the war, because they knew the country was unprepared. In 1811, in the United States House of Representatives, a loose political faction called the **War Hawks**, under the leadership of speaker Henry Clay, began agitating for a declaration of war against Britain, both as a response to real grievances and as an opportunity to acquire the British colonies.

But between late-1811 and the summer of 1812, American prospects improved significantly because of developments in England. George III lapsed into insanity, and the British prime minister was assassinated. After fighting the French for years, Britain was in economic disarray. At that time, Madison then urged Congress to declare war, citing the impressments of American sailors, interference with neutral trading rights, and British alliances with western Indians. 2 ½ weeks later, Congress declared war.

Poorly equipped and poorly prepared, the United States military faced many obstacles, but nevertheless persisted. The result of the war with Britain was a tie.

2. Combat operations

The war was conducted in four theatres of operations, beginning in roughly the order here:

- (a) Canada and the Great Lakes Region
- (b) The Atlantic Ocean
- (c) The coast of the United States
- (d) The Southern States

a. The United States invaded Canada, unsuccessfully, though. The British captured Detroit and much of Michigan and Ohio. Finally, the Americans built warships on the Great Lakes faster than the British and gained the upper hand. The United States eventually regained control of the Old Northwest. In the Battle of the Thames in October 1813, Tecumseh died and with his death, Native American unity was destroyed. Americans burned Toronto, and looted and raided the Parliament Building.

b. In the seas, America's small and outnumbered Navy (because of Jefferson's costcutting measures), struggled against the British and performed poorly. The U.S. outfitted private merchant ships, called privateers, to fight the British, or to carry weapons as they attempted to trade with Latin America, Portugal or Spain. This helped somewhat, but the Americans lost several ships in the first year of the war.

c. Along the Coast of the United States, most of the fighting occurred in either Maine or the Chesapeake. The British claimed the Northern half of Maine, a mostly unsettled area; the issue of ownership would not be resolved until 1842. More notably, though, the British launched a counter-offensive against the United States concentrating on the Chesapeake region—the BaltimoreWashington area.

In part as retaliation for the American destruction of Toronto, Royal troops occupied Washington, D.C. in August 1814. They burned the White House, but not before Dolley Madison directed employees to remove important documents and herself saved Gilbert Stuart's full-size portrait of George Washington. The major battle in the region occurred a few weeks later at Baltimore, where Francis Scott Key, imprisoned on a British ship, watched the bombardment of **Fort McHenry** from the harbor and wrote the verses of "the Star-Spangled Banner," (which became the national anthem in 1931). The United States successfully defended Baltimore against the British. Although the British inflicted heavy damages symbolically, they achieved little militarily and failed to capture any territory.

d. There were really two separate wars going on in the South—one between Americans and the Indians, and the other between Americans and the British. The last campaigns of the War took place in the South, against the Creeks along the Gulf of Mexico— especially in the Florida Panhandle, Southern Mississippi and Southern Alabama, and in New Orleans. The Creek Indians rose up, and **Andrew Jackson** raised his Tennessee Militia to conquer them. Jackson's men

defeated the Creeks at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend in Mississippi in March 1814. The Creeks ceded 2/3 of their land, half of Alabama and part of southern Georgia—to the United States, thus beginning westward expansion in the South. Andrew Jackson saw no difference between the Creeks that had fought with him and the Red Sticks that fought against him. Conflict continued in Florida until 1818 with the Indians, however.

To prevent a British invasion, Jackson seized several Gulf Coast cities, then marched on to New Orleans to defend it against the British. The Battle of New Orleans was the last battle in the war. Between December 1814 and January 1815, he defended the city against a force led by Major General Sir Edward Pakenham, who was killed in an assault on January 8, 1815. The Battle of New Orleans was hailed as a great victory in the United States, making Andrew Jackson a national hero, eventually propelling him to the presidency.

3. The Hartford Convention New England had never supported the War. Delegates from five New England states met in Late 1814 to discuss constitutional amendments to protect New England's interests. Meeting in Hartford, CT, the 26 delegates proposed curbing the policies of the ruling Republicans by

- (a) Prohibiting any trade embargo lasting over 60 days;
- (b) Requiring a two-thirds Congressional majority for any declaration of war, admission of a new state, or interdiction of foreign commerce;
- (c) Shifting the bulk of Federal tax payments to the slaveholding South;
- (d) Limiting future Presidents to one term;
- (e) Requiring each future President to be from a different state than his predecessor. (These last provisions were aimed directly at the ruling Virginia Dynasty.)

The Republican-dominated Congress would never have recommended any of New England's proposals for ratification. Hartford Convention delegates intended for them to embarrass the President and the Republicans in Congress—and also to serve as a basis for negotiations between New England and the rest of the country.

Some Hartford Convention delegates may have been in favor of New England's secession from the United States, and forming an independent republic. No such resolution was adopted at the convention; however, Massachusetts actually sent three commissioners to Washington, D.C. to negotiate these terms. When they arrived in February, 1815, news of Andrew Jackson's success at the Battle of New Orleans, and the signing of the Treaty of Ghent, preceded them and, consequently, their presence in the capital seemed both ludicrous and subversive. They quickly returned to Massachusetts. Thereafter, both the Hartford Convention and the Federalist Party became synonymous with disunion and secession, especially in the South. The Federalist Party was ruined as a national party, and survived only in a few localities for several more years before vanishing entirely.

Meanwhile, diplomats in Ghent, Belgium signed the **Treaty of Ghent** on December 24, 1814, ending the war. (News of the treaty had not reached New Orleans before the battle was fought.) On February 17, 1815, President Madison signed the American ratification of the Treaty of Ghent and the treaty was proclaimed the following day. By the terms of the treaty, all land captured by either side was

returned to the previous owner, the Americans received fishing rights in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and all outstanding debts and property taken was to be returned or paid for. Later that year, John Quincy Adams complained that British naval commanders had violated the terms of the treaty by not returning American slaves captured during the war, since the British did not recognize slaves as property.

During the blockade of the Chesapeake, in fact, British Rear Admiral Cockburn had been instructed to encourage American slaves to defect to the Crown. Royal Marine units were raised from these escaped slaves on occupied Chesapeake islands, and fought for the Crown. (In fact, the Star-Spangled Banner has a verse praising the fact that slaves liberated by the British and enlisted into their military were not able to defeat the Americans at Fort McHenry.) Some men, and dependents were taken to the naval base in Bermuda, from which the blockade was orchestrated, where they were employed about the dockyard, and where a further Marine unit was raised from their numbers as a dockyard guard. Orders were eventually given to send these Marines to the British Army to be re-enlisted into West Indian Regiments. Many resisted this change of service and were given land to settle in the West Indies. Many of those who agreed to transfer to the Army found themselves back in the USA, taking part in the Louisiana campaign.

4. Effects on Canada

The repelling of the stronger American force helped to build unity in British North America between French and British settlers there. It also created an anti-American attitude that affected Canadian Politics for quite some time. The Americans never blocked the St. Lawrence River, but nevertheless after the war, afraid that it might happen in the future, Britain built an expensive canal that provided an alternate supply route, linking Kingston, Canada to Ottawa. Ottawa became the capital because it would be easier to defend in case of a future war.

5. Effects on Great Britain

The Royal Navy, embarrassed by American privateers, made some changes to its naval fleet, but largely overlooked the war.

6. Effects on America

With peace finally established, Indian resistance had come to an end and westward expansion could continue to the west and South. Manufacturing had grown as a result of the War, mainly in New England. Most important, America had defeated the British, and America was swept by a sense of euphoria and national achievement in finally securing full independence from Britain. Embarrassed by the Hartford Convention and rendered powerless by the Democratic-Republicans' victory, the Federalists fell apart and ceased to be a factor in national politics. However, the Democratic-Republicans began to divide over their economic policies.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #3: What were some of the outcomes of the War of 1812? Which of the following is true?

- a. The United States conquered Canada
- b. Great Britain attacked and burned the U.S. Capitol at Philadelphia
- c. The United States gave back land to Indians who fought against Great Britain

d. Great Britain and the United States more did not exchange large swaths of territory or riches due to the war

Key for 60-second Quizzes

1. c. Jefferson was a strict constructionist, which is why the Louisiana Purchase was difficult for him to rationalize
2. b. The Burr Conspiracy did not actually come to fruition, even though Burr allegedly planned to split off several western states
3. d. The war was a draw, with no permanent changes in handholding or payments of indemnities

I. A Changing Society

A. Era of Good Feelings

James Monroe was the last of the Virginia Dynasty of Presidents. Pictured in the famous painting of Washington's Crossing of the Delaware, Monroe fought at the battle of Trenton. Known for his flawless character and honesty, Monroe was liked but not known for his intellect. Nevertheless, he came into the presidency after the fall of the Federalist Party and presided over a period of political calm, known by many as the Era of Good Feelings. Known as a hands-off president, he confidently delegated responsibilities to well-chosen and highly capable advisors and cabinet members.

There were several issues that emerged during the Monroe Presidency:

B. Missouri Compromise

The debate over slavery returned with the **Missouri Compromise**. Five new states had entered the Union since 1812, and three of them were slave states. Missouri petitioned for statehood, but what would its status be? If Missouri entered as a slave state, the slave states would have a two-vote advantage in the Senate. Under a compromise that was worked out, Missouri entered as a slave state but Maine entered as a free state to counteract it. Further, South of Missouri, future states would be open to slavery, but north of Missouri, slavery would be banned. No new states were admitted any time soon after, but Southern fears of an end to slavery and northern fears of the spread of slavery persisted. The issue of Texas raised the issue of slavery or freedom in new states again. That's something for a future class.

C. Debate over Slavery

Monroe is also known for founding the **American Colonization Society** (ACS), an organization that organized journeys for slaves to return to Africa; many settled in Liberia; its capital was Monrovia. We should note that the colonization solution was put forward by whites who wanted to abolish slavery but who were not in favor of racial equality – they wanted to get blacks out of the country (ergo the push to “send them back” to Africa). Of course, the international slave trade had ended in 1808, and by the 1820s, there were generations of enslaved African-Americans who have been born in the United States; thus there would be relatively few free blacks to send “back” to Africa – they were Americans but were not able to enjoy the status of being American citizens.

D. Border Problems

Monroe's administration experienced a few border disputes. Secretary of State Adams reached several agreements with the British pertaining to limiting naval ships and defining the U.S.-Canadian border.

But as negotiations were being finalized, the United States claimed much of Florida. To make matters worse, Indian raids against Georgia settlers, encouraged and abetted by British ships, infuriated the President. In 1818, Monroe sent Andrew Jackson, hero of the Battle of New Orleans in 1815, to occupy Florida. Without permission, Jackson hunted down, captured and hanged British accomplices and proclaimed himself the governor of Florida. With the Cabinet divided, Monroe eventually agreed to support Jackson, and in 1819, with the **Adams-Onís Treaty**, Spain ceded (gave) Florida to the United States without a fight. Spain renounced any claims it had to the Pacific Northwest, and the United States also agreed to assume \$5 million in claims that Americans had made against the Spanish government.

E. The Monroe Doctrine

Monroe is also known for an 1823 speech he made, in which he stated that “the American continents are henceforth not to be considered subjects for colonization of any European powers.” In 1852, it came to be known as the **Monroe Doctrine**. Monroe also stated that Europe should not interfere in the affairs of New World nations, and vice-versa, and the United States did not get involved in Latin America for quite a while after as a result.

F. The Election of 1824

The Election of 1824 pit four candidates against each other:

- William Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury gained 40,856 popular votes, and 41 electoral votes
- John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State gained 113,112 popular votes, and 84 electoral votes
- Henry Clay, the Speaker of the House, gained 47,531 popular votes, and 37 electoral votes
- Andrew Jackson, hero of the War of 1812 and of Florida fame, gained 151,271 popular votes and 99 electoral votes.

While Jackson won the popular vote, and he had the most electoral votes, he did not have the required 50% of the electoral votes, and as specified in the Constitution, the election went to the House of Representatives to decide among the top three vote-getters.

William Crawford suffered a stroke, which eliminated him from consideration. Clay dropped out, and used his position as Speaker of the House to promote John Quincy Adams. Some deal was made, and the House quickly elected Adams. Adams in turn selected Clay as his vice-president. Immediately, Jackson suspected that a “**corrupt bargain**” had propelled Adams and Clay to office.

F. John Quincy Adams Presidency (1825-1829)

Adams had plans to promote science, education, road construction; absolutely nothing was accomplished. Congress blocked everything he tried to do. It didn't help at all that Adams was exactly like his father, personality-wise. Eager to distance himself from allegations of corruption, he refused to play the patronage game. Thus, the government remained filled with people hostile to Adams.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #1: In what ways did the United States grow in size during the Monroe era? Which answer is NOT true?

- a. The U.S. added the state of Florida
- b. The U.S. added the state of Mississippi
- c. The U.S. added the state of Missouri
- d. The U.S. added a claim to dominion over Latin America

II. The Jacksonian Era

A. The Election of 1828

The Election of 1828 pitted Adams against Jackson, who had vowed revenge for losing in the “corrupt bargain.” It was one of the dirtiest campaigns in history, a smear campaign on both sides.

Jacksonians portrayed Adams as morally depraved: they said that he had slept with his wife before marriage, that he procured a prostitute for the visiting Czar of Russia, that he was a gambler and a Sabbath-breaker. The allegations were mainly untrue.

Adams' campaign portrayed Andrew Jackson as a loose cannon with an unsavory reputation. A compulsive gambler, a possible war criminal, a man who had killed people in duels. They also attacked his wife Rachel Jackson, claiming (correctly) that she and Jackson were together before she was legally divorced. Exposed by a Cincinnati editor and a personal friend of Henry Clay, Jackson believed that Clay was to blame. Making himself out as the victim, Jackson took things personally, and worked to crush his political opponents.

Jackson won the election in a landslide. In December, 1828, Rachel died just after the election and before the inauguration, striking a major blow to Jackson. Like his father, JQA refused to attend the inauguration. In a strange twist, he returned to Washington in 1830 as an outspoken antislavery advocate and served several terms as a member of the House of Representatives from Massachusetts.

B. The Presidency of Andrew Jackson

1. First Term (1829-1833)

An intense and often intimidating man, Andrew Jackson asked to be called "General" rather than "President." A brawler, fighter, gambler, duelist, he was known for his temper and for his dramatic outbursts. He might have made an ideal football coach!! His presidency was largely a war against individuals—individuals that slighted him, embarrassed him, or didn't see things the way he did.

The first thing Jackson did was clean house—he fired all government employees left over from JQA and replaced government jobs with people loyal to him.

2. The Petticoat Affair

The **Petticoat Affair** became a major public scandal. Peggy Eaton, the wife of Secretary of War John Eaton, friends of Jackson from Tennessee caused a big controversy. Similar to Jackson and his wife, news broke that Mrs. Eaton had not been legally divorced prior to marrying John Eaton. Thus, John C. Calhoun's wife and the wives of other cabinet members refused to socialize with her. Jackson told the Cabinet that they had to, but the women wouldn't, and the saga played out for two years. Determined for his way or the highway, Jackson demanded that his cabinet resign, and they did.

Jackson went through four secretaries of state, five secretaries of the treasury; if anyone crossed him or disagreed with him, he cut them loose. He relied instead on informal advisors and confidantes that became known as his "Kitchen Cabinet."

3. Indian Removal

Jackson also opened up the way for further westward expansion. With his recommendation, Congress passed the **Indian Removal Act of 1830**. It authorized Jackson to forcibly evict the Indian Tribes east of the Mississippi River. The Act affected the "Five Civilized Tribes"—the Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, Seminole, and Cherokee.

Cherokees in Georgia, highly civilized, lived in cabins like whites did. They had their own written constitution, their own alphabet and newspaper, and owned their own property. Largely of mixed ancestry, some even owned cotton plantations and slaves. As racial attitudes hardened and Georgia began to impose its will on the Cherokee, the case went to the Supreme Court, and in *Worcester v. Georgia*, Chief Justice John Marshall ruled in favor of the Cherokee. Georgia had no

right to impose its authority over Cherokee territory; and by extension, the ruling implied that neither did the United States.

In response to *Worcester v. Georgia*, Jackson, who had made his name in large part off Indian-killing and Indian-hating, announced of Marshall, “he made his ruling, now let him enforce it.”

The U.S. Army deported the Choctaws, Chickasaws and Creeks during the 1830s, and in Illinois Indians rose up but were defeated in the Blackhawk War. Cherokee held out until 1838, when the U.S. Army kidnapped and jailed the Cherokees’ leader John Ross. Rounded up at gunpoint, the U.S. Army seized the property of the Cherokee and forced them to march west to present-day Oklahoma. Along the journey, through the winter, ¼ of the 15,000 deportees died, and it became known as the **Trail of Tears**. A few isolated groups of Cherokee held out and others passed themselves off as whites or evaded capture, but for the most part, this land now became available for white settlement. The Seminoles evaded the United States until 1842, many by hiding in the everglades. Americans expressed little regret over the fate of the Eastern tribes; in fact Jackson said in his farewell address that it was for their own good.

4. Nullification Crisis

Jackson’s presidency also saw a state’s rights standoff—the **South Carolina Nullification Crisis**. Angry over tariffs that hurt the South, South Carolina under John C. Calhoun’s leadership, claimed the right to “nullify” the tariff. Similar to the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, Calhoun declared that the people of each state, acting in special popular conventions, had the right to nullify any federal law that exceeded the powers granted to Congress under the Constitution. The law would then become null and void in the state, and Congress could either repeal it or propose a constitutional amendment clarifying things. If the amendment was ratified, the state could either accept it or secede from the union.

When Congress passed another tariff that was equally as undesirable to South Carolina, the state called for a popular convention. To defuse the crisis, Congress modified the tariff, and South Carolina backed down altogether.

C. Jackson’s Second Term

Jackson had survived the petticoat affair, the Indians, secessionists--During Jackson’s second term, he faced a new challenge: The Bank of the United States

In 1832, Congress voted, prematurely, to renew the charter of the Bank of the United States. It was a political move, led by Speaker Clay and the bank’s president Nicholas Biddle. Jackson despised the two, and called the Bank a “hydra-headed monster.” Subscribing to the belief that the bank was a corrupt institution and would benefit some Americans at the expense of others, he determined to smash the Bank of the United States and to prevent its re-charter.

Jackson vetoed the Bank’s re-charter calling it unconstitutional in 1833. He then instructed his Secretary of the Treasury to redirect federal deposits into various state banks called “Pet Banks.” The first secretary, and then the second, refused, finally, this was done. Jackson was defiant. Although Congress censured him for his unconstitutional act, the Democrats succeeded in getting the censure rescinded and deleted from the Congressional record.

D. Martin Van Buren Presidency (1837-1841)

The next president, Martin Van Buren, became known as a “wanna be” aristocrat, portrayed with some accuracy, as what we would call today, a metrosexual and an epicure.

The Panic of 1837 and the Panic of 1839, times of enormous economic difficulty, unemployment and bankruptcy caused by the fall of cotton prices plagued the nation, and Van Buren did nothing about it. A poor decision maker, he preferred to do nothing at all.

E. William Henry Harrison Presidency (1841)

In 1840, the Whigs nominated William Henry Harrison, a frontier general from Ohio, an Indian fighter and a supporter of the Bank of the United States. The campaign featured open rallies, songs and slogans, including “Tippecanoe and Tyler Too.” Using the symbol of a log cabin against Van Buren’s English coach, the sixty-eight year old Harrison overcame accusations that he was too old and won the election.

Eager to prove the allegations that he was too old and unfit to be president, Harrison delivered the longest inaugural address ever, on a cold day in early-March in Washington, a two hour speech. Further, he refused to wear a hat or coat, and was struck with pneumonia; he died 31 days later, the first President to die in office.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #2: In what ways did the United States grow in power during the Jackson era? Which answer is NOT true?

- a. The executive branch of the U.S. government claimed the power to remove Indians from their lands
- b. The executive branch of the U.S. government claimed the power to force states to accept federal law (instead of nullifying it)
- c. The executive branch of the U.S. government claimed the power to divert federal deposits from the Bank of the United States into “pet banks”
- d. The executive branch of the U.S. government claimed the power to resume the Atlantic Slave Trade

III. The Market Revolution

The 1820s and 1830s was a time of prosperity and growth, a period known as “The Market Revolution.” This mainly applies to the North and West.

A. The North: Market Economy and Society

In the eighteenth century the world of independent small farmers gradually transformed into a world of businessmen. The independent family farmer gradually became dependent on the market rather than subsistence farming and bartering and either became a capitalist farmer, a wage laborer, or a westward migrant.

Historians have disagreed about the causes of this “transition.” To some, the desire to free ones’ family from debt and to improve the family’s standard of living drove it. To others, increased access to transportation networks and the availability of labor encouraged larger scale production. Further, environmental damage from logging and other ecologically destructive practices, coupled with population increase and inheritance made good land tougher to come by and made competition more intense. As farms shrank and the soil became depleted, competency became unattainable, neighborly cooperation fell by the wayside, and competition increased. Farmers had several options: they could sell their farms to capitalists and move west; they could migrate to the cities once they had

lost their lands or could no longer support their families—providing the sweatshop, piecework, mass-production-type labor that stimulated industrial development and urbanization; or those that held on could become capitalist farmers. Embedded in the market, capitalist farmers concentrated on staple crops or specialized production, changed their techniques, sought a bourgeoisie lifestyle, purchased machinery and hired laborers.

The transition to a market-economy brought cultural and economic changes.

B. Cultural Changes:

As farm families went into the villages—the hubs of economic activity—to trade, worship, vote, or visit. There they saw new furnishings and standards of domesticity and order and aspired to transform their material world to gain “respectability.” Larkin and Stuart Blumin noted that furniture, clocks, cook stoves, engravings, china, silverware, and other commodities streamed into rural markets. The attraction for refined living increased the demand for consumer and luxury items which in turn stimulated domestic manufacturing and industry. Cities grew and a professional class of white-collar workers, supervisors, and managers, increasingly separated from those who labored with their hands, emerged. Thus, a totally different class dynamic emerged in the North than in the South. A certain culture of “uplift” and “improvement” emerged, something that we’ll talk about later, an idea that any one could refine himself and improve.

Many people went to work in urban factories and mill towns, as cotton cloth production increased dramatically from 4 million yards in 1817 to 323 million yards in 1840; about half of the workers were women.

Places like **Lowell, Massachusetts** and Paterson, New Jersey saw the rise of giant textile mills, in which the cotton was woven into cloth. The mills employed women who lived in company boardinghouses under constant supervision and strict rules. Female employees had independence from their families and the companionship of each other but had long hours, poor pay, difficult working conditions, and numerous rules to live by. They could be fined for lateness, they were not allowed to drink or play cards, male visitors were limited, and there was a 10 P.M. curfew. They worked over eleven hours a day, six days a week. They lived in poorly lit and stuffy factories. Single, and between 16-30 years old, these young women often sent money back home to their families, poor farm families in New England and New York state that could no longer support them.

Women published their own newsletters/magazines such as the Lowell Offering of the Factory Girl’s Garland, in which they often announced the stress of factory work. By the 1850s, Irish women began to replace the New England farm women in the mills.

The growth of craft industries also became a major development of this period, with semi-skilled workers at first working out of their homes to supplement the family’s income and then moving to urban centers, transportation hubs, and producing those goods to send to larger markets.

In the North, shoemaking is the best example of this, in the South, Columbia, SC’s furniture industry (which spread from New Jersey), is a good example.

C. Economic changes:

There were massive economic changes as part of this transition, or that actually fueled the transition.

The Invention of the **Cotton Gin**—the invention of the cotton gin in 1793, a mechanical device that plucked the seeds from the cotton, made it possible to process cotton 50 times faster. By the 1820s, cotton production had spread to the deep South and moved Westward, with Mississippi and east Texas surpassing South Carolina by 1840. Combined, the South produced more than 60 percent of the world's supply.

The **transportation revolution**—it became easier and faster to transport goods from farms to markets.

Rights to the Mississippi River and to the use of New Orleans definitely helped. The invention of the steamship made it possible to go upstream with ease. Steamboats reduced the trip from New Orleans to Louisville from 90 days to only eight days.

Canals, especially the **Erie Canal**, though costly, allowed for transportation from Albany to Buffalo, or from Albany to the Great Lakes. It shortened the trip from 20 to six days and costs decreased by a factor of 20. In 1835, the canal was widened and deepened. By 1840, canals crisscrossed the Northeast and Midwest; canals were mainly a thing of the 1820s-1830s, replaced by railroads.

In the 1830s, the construction of railroad tracks grew rapidly. In 1833, the nation's second railroad ran from Charleston to North Augusta.

The Deep South built fewer canals, railroads, and factories and remained mostly rural.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #3: What was the Market Revolution and what are some examples of changes it brought to American society?

- a. Canals allow farmers and merchants to more easily ship goods and make money
- b. Depleted nutrients in the soil of farms on the East Coast prompt farmers to move westward in search of more fertile land
- c. Invention of the cotton gin allows cotton farming to overtake tobacco as a highly profitable agricultural pursuit in southern states
- d. Access to New Orleans allows merchants and farmers to access to the Mississippi River

Key for 60-second Quizzes:

- 1. b
- 2. d
- 3. d

Chapter Eleven: 19th century thought

Terms:

Questions:

1. What were some of the characteristics of American religious revivalism during the 1830s and 1840s?
2. What were some of the other social reform movements (outside of American Christianity) that were popular during the 1830s and 1840s?
3. What were some of the characteristics of transcendentalism during the 1830s and 1840s?
4. What were some of the characteristics of communitarianism during the 1830s and 1840s?
5. What were some of the characteristics of abolitionism during the 1830s and 1840s?

Videos

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ajn9g5Gsv98&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=13> (14:25)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=beN4qE-e5O8&list=PL8dPuuaLjXtMwmepBjTSG593eG7ObzO7s&index=14> (15:05)

Reformers and worshippers sought to transform Northern society from about 1830-1850. In response to the social disorder and moral confusion associated with the emerging free-labor economy, with the market revolution and the changes it brought in family life, in where people lived and how, in the changes that resulted from increased immigration in the North. Four distinct types of movements emerged: 1) religious revivals, 2) reform movements, particularly with regard to gender and humanitarianism, 3) through transcendentalism, and 4) with communitarianism. Collectively, reformers and worshippers sought to transform Northern society from about 1830-1850.

I. Religious revivalism

Religious revivals, especially those of the Methodists and Baptists, offered a solution to the social disorder and moral confusion associated with the emerging free-labor economy. A new religious revival swept through the Northern states in the early 1830s, seeking to “Christianize” the world, to instill faith in Christ, sobriety, and moral behavior that would bring about the millennium, Christ’s reign on earth. One effect of the movement was that conversion and sobriety became the keys to economic success. In Rochester, New York, for example, employers often forced their workers to attend church, because the values of evangelicalism fit well with the demands of the market economy. New York State was especially affected.

A. Religion and Class

Religion and social class were linked. Preachers like Elias Smith and Lorenzo Dow led the way, expressing anger at the traditional churches and at their oppression of the lower classes. **Revivalism** thus gave the message that everyone was equal in the eyes of God, and also that simple circumstances did not make one any less in the long run. The Baptists and the Methodists especially increased their presence.

Preachers tended to be self-trained, from poor families, they gradually emerged for their charisma and for their ability to move people. The preachers relied on their speaking skills, and for provoking emotional responses from their audiences. Often in large camp meetings, they represented the sense of democracy spreading across the country. The camp meeting included

people from a variety of religious backgrounds. They featured converts speaking in tongues, dancing, shouting, and experiencing convulsions. Preachers used humor, sarcasm, and easy to understand language. Preaching was full of passion, simplicity, drama. Storytelling techniques and jokes often appealed to the common people. Salvation was immediately accessible and available, and common people should be able to shape their own faith and should be able to choose their own leaders.

With the emergence of folk music, religious hymns often took the music of popular songs and rewrote the words. Moreover, ordinary people crafted songs that expressed many emotions.

Presbyterian **Charles G. Finney**, a preacher, changed the church by using crude speech and revivalist-preacher like tactics. His preaching set an example of being more informal. He involved women and had frenzied services to spruce up the Presbyterian Church and make it more active. He used any talent or method he could think of to inspire his audience.

Nathan Bangs tried to promote the Methodist Church in New York City. He toned it down a little bit to make it respectable so that middle class city people would join.

Preachers like Billy Graham, Oral Roberts—they follow a long tradition and share similarities with the preachers of the **Second Great Awakening**. Contemporary fundamentalism reflects the same democratic spirit and populist impulses. It is a grassroots movement with democratic structure and spirit, opposed to ecclesiastical authority, and it is built upon the Second Great Awakening's goal to make Christianity fully accessible to common people. It draws upon millenarian and restorationist themes. It is centered on popular communication, often appealing to the poor. Fundamentalism is available to everyone. Fundamentalists also opened educational and leadership opportunities to common people, founding 250 bible schools, and embraced preachers with the common touch. It built a subculture. Fundamentalist leaders excelled as communicators and entrepreneurial organizers, with energetic, resourceful and inventive personalities. Fundamentalists retained the right to think for themselves. All this shows that American Christianity continues to be powered by ordinary people.

B. Second Great Awakening

The Second Great Awakening also saw the founding of New Churches such as the **Mormons**. Mormons claimed that their leader Joseph Smith, Jr. had received a special revelation from God. Mormons believed that Christ had appeared to Native Americans and that North America was the center of Christian history. Mormonism gained many followers for other reasons. It stressed the importance of family values and of the family, however, encouraged polygamy as one way to increase the population and as a man and woman's duty (more actually of a burden for women) to bring as many people as possible into the world who could then live as Mormons.

Persecuted by Protestants, Smith and his followers moved from New York to Illinois. Persecuted in Illinois (Smith was arrested and lynched by a mob in Illinois), the Mormons realized that to practice their religion freely, they would have to completely withdraw from society.

C. The Black Church

Because black Methodists in other middle Atlantic communities encountered racism and desired religious freedom, a former slave from Delaware, Richard Allen called them to meet in Philadelphia to form a new denomination, the **African-Methodist-Episcopal Church (AME)**, in 1816. The AME continued to increase its membership throughout the antebellum period. Even in the South,

African churches emerged, but found themselves banned and illegal in Charleston after the Denmark Vesey conspiracy in 1822.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #1: What were some of the characteristics of American religious revivalism during the 1830s and 1840s? Which answer is NOT correct?

- a. Belief in the idea of Christians' equality in the eyes of God
- b. Reliance on informal, open access to Christian teachings for the uneducated
- c. Tendency to use persuasive speaking techniques
- d. Belief in the idea of Christians' equality of African-Americans to white Americans

II. Reform Movements

A. Revival and Reform

Revivalism closely related to a number of active reform movements.

Spurred on by religious revivals, the 1830s saw the rapid growth of American reform movements. Alarmed by immoral behavior, reformers tried to remake their society along Christian and middle-class lines.

1. Temperance

One example was the **temperance movement**. The average man in the 1830s drank 3 times what modern people do in a year. Working men even drank through the day. The American Temperance Society, organized in 1826, grew to include 5,000 local chapters in less than ten years. In 1851, the state of Maine made it illegal to purchase or buy alcohol in the state (since repealed). In ten years, the Temperance Society claimed that it reduced average alcohol consumption in half.

2. Gender

Revivalism also greatly influenced the antebellum efforts to shape the meaning of gender. The New York Female Moral Reform Society aimed to convert urban prostitutes to Protestantism, to shut down brothels, and to fight the sexual double-standard and male sexual license.

3. Education

Reformers also stressed the importance of education. If people were educated, it was believed that they would not fall into sin and trouble. Beginning in the 1830s, **Horace Mann** instituted a number of reforms in Massachusetts schools. Massachusetts schools became highly structured, funded by the state through taxes, attendance was required, students were placed into grades where possible based upon age and ability, textbooks were standardized, and the school year was firmly established. Children were expected to learn similar lessons on responsibility, hard work, and American values.

Through ostracism and education, the movement emphasized women's value—particularly their moral superiority to males—to educate their children and to instill proper morals in their family. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, a religiously-based book, also presented a view of women that asserted the sanctity of the home, the god-like nature of women, and the ideal of matriarchy, and it placed women as the crucial catalyst in the future of the nation.

B. Humanitarianism

Humanitarianism constituted another of the major reform movements. As John Thomas asserts, evangelicals established voluntary associations that formed a vast network of reform

movements that aimed to reform the morals of society. A belief in the outcome of inevitable and infinite perfectibility and improvement characterized the movement. Reformers criticized poverty and profusion and urban life. They advocated the better treatment and education of the handicapped and criminals. Many humanitarian reformers declared pain intolerable, unacceptable, and obscene. Many attempted to abolish corporal and capital punishment, and demanded that virtuous people treat criminals and the insane better. Prison reformers believed that people could be made good.

Led by **Dorothea Dix**, a Massachusetts teacher, reformers worked to improve conditions for the mentally ill.

Given an opportunity to express their opinions and to effect changes in society, women were not eager to return to the world of domesticity. Two women in particular emerged as leaders in a new campaign for equal women's rights: Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. In 1848, Mott, Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony called a convention at Seneca Falls New York which issued the famous Declaration of Sentiments stating that "All men and women are created equal."

The **Seneca Falls Declaration**, which listed forms of discrimination women faced, recorded the severe limitations on women's legal rights in America at this time: women could not vote; they could not participate in the creation of laws that they had to obey; their property was taxed; and a married woman's property and wages legally belonged to her husband. Further, in the relatively unusual case of a divorce, custody of children was virtually automatically awarded to the father; access to the professions and higher education generally was closed to women; and most churches barred women from participating publicly in the ministry or other positions of authority.

Stanton's *Declaration of Sentiments* proclaimed that "all men and women were created equal" and that the undersigned would employ all methods at their disposal to right these wrongs. Ultimately the document was adopted and signed with hardly any alterations and was to be published as a pamphlet for the whole world to digest.

While the Seneca Falls convention did not lead to any immediate changes, it nevertheless provided the basis for a future generation of women to question the inequalities in their world and to do something about it.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #2: What were some of the other social reform movements (outside of American Christianity) that were popular during the 1830s and 1840s? Which answer is NOT correct?

- a. The temperance movement
- b. The sexual reform movement
- c. The women's right to vote movement
- d. The African-Americans' right to vote movement

III. Transcendentalism

A third type of reformer, the **transcendentalist**, believed that the self-contained individual could best hold society together. Transcendentalism constituted an alternate route to the millennium. Transcendental, referred to the belief that reality transcended reason, that man (and woman) could perceive reality through intuition. The Transcendentalist emphasized intuition as a source of knowledge superior to the senses (remember Locke?).

A. Sources

Transcendentalist drew on three sources:

1) It was a reaction against **New England Unitarianism**. Unitarianism was a rejection of traditional religion, more based on individual reason, the power of one's own mind and will. Transcendentalists, then, were former Unitarians who left the Unitarian Church. These people included Ralph Waldo Emerson, Theodore Parker, and George Ripley. Over time Unitarianism had become the church of the conservative upper classes, and to Emerson and the others, the services were dull and boring. Moreover, they believed that religion was a personal thing and that it was not necessary to have an organized church in order to be a religious person.

2) Transcendentalism also drew its inspiration from the **Romantic Movement** in literature. Romanticism emphasized spontaneous and emotional sensibility, a love of nature, and an appreciation of feeling and emotion.

3) Third, Transcendentalism drew upon European philosophy. Emmanuel Kant went on to say that humans had an innate or intuitive kind of moral predisposition. In any given situation they knew intuitively what they ought to do and then used reason to determine whether they should do what they felt they ought to do. The point that made its way into transcendental thinking was that humans could rely on themselves and their felt perceptions to determine their moral conduct.

Transcendentalists believed in a God whom they perceived as dwelling everywhere. God was in nature and in men and women; men and women could experience God in nature or within themselves. The Bible represented intuitive insight from the past but, for the present, such insight could only come from within. They referred to God by various special terms to represent his universality: the Over soul, the Universal Spirit, the Supreme Mind, the Universal Power, the Universal Consciousness.

The Transcendentalist often found himself in conflict with society. **Henry David Thoreau** believed that to pay a tax to support the Mexican American War was wrong, and he refused to pay. Thrown in jail, he wrote the essay "Civil Disobedience." The Transcendentalists became abolitionists, believing that all people were equal, and all people should be free to develop their own skills and their own lives.

The Transcendentalists also developed a utopian experiment, Brook Farm. Founded by George Ripley in 1841 outside of Boston, about 80-100 residents lived in an unsuccessful farming community for about 5 years.

B. Forms

Transcendentalism took two literary forms: the sermon and the essay. The two most famous short Transcendentalist works are essays: **Ralph Waldo Emerson's** essay "On Self Reliance" and Thoreau's essay "On Resistance to Civil Government."

According to "Self Reliance," Emerson wrote:

"To believe your own thought, to believe that what is true for you in your private heart is true for all men, — that is genius."

"Speak what you think now in hard words, and to-morrow speak what to-morrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradict every thing you said to-day."

“To be great is to be misunderstood.”

Emerson is also credited with the statement, “let every man walk to the beat of his own drummer.”

C. Henry David Thoreau

Henry David Thoreau wrote “On Resistance to Civil Government” during the Mexican War, when in 1846, the state of Massachusetts imposed a head tax on its citizens to support the war effort. To many the war was a war to extend slavery which they say as an evil. Thoreau refused to pay the tax, was arrested and spent a night in jail. When a friend paid the tax for him, he was released. The event led Thoreau to write his famous essay “On Resistance to Civil Government” which has influenced a number of movements against oppression, including the movement in India for independence from British rule and Martin Luther King’s doctrines of passive disobedience.

Criticizing the government, he believed that he did not have to pay taxes that he did not agree with. “The only obligation which I have a right to assume is to do at any time what I think right....”

In the essay, he criticized the U.S. for allowing slavery to continue and for encouraging its spread. “It is disgraceful to be associated with the United States government. “I cannot for an instant recognize as my government [that] which is the slave’s government also.” “There are thousands who are in opinion opposed to slavery and to the war, who yet in effect do nothing to put an end to them.” By passive action rather than violence, he hoped to make a statement.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #3: What were some of the characteristics of transcendentalism during the 1830s and 1840s? Which author and summary statement is NOT correct?

- a. Emerson = self-reliance
- b. Thoreau = self-reliance
- c. Atheism
- d.

IV. Communitarianism/Utopian Communities

A fourth type of reform movement, **communitarianism**, offered a belief that to break from society without disrupting it was the best way to effect change. While the Transcendentalists had an unsuccessful utopian community, Brook Farm, it was not the reformers, the humanitarians, or the Transcendentalists who were known for their utopian communities.

Rather, it was a group of individuals who wanted to create a new meaning of the family and who hoped to create perfect societies. The family was under attack from changes in society, the breakup of families who had to move away to get land, or who had to go to the cities just to survive. Dealing with the changes in society and in American culture, these utopian communities were quite novel. Yet almost all collapsed when reformers realized that their ideas would never work in the long run, or when they could not keep the populations going.

There were several communitarian experiments:

A. The Shakers

The Shakers, an offshoot of Quakerism, peaked during the 1830s-1850s, reaching a membership of about 6,000 people. They believed in celibacy—no sex. As a result, they adopted orphans into the community and attracted converts. At age 21, people were free to go on their way if

they wanted to, but most stayed. Women held leadership positions in the community, but there were sharply defined gender roles. Males and females lived in separate homes. Shakers were known for a style of furniture, known as Shaker furniture. It was plain in style, durable, and functional. Shaker chairs were usually mass-produced since a great number of them were needed to seat all the Shakers in a community. Around the time of the American Civil War, the Shakers at Mount Lebanon, NY, greatly increased their production and marketing of Shaker chairs. They were so successful that several furniture companies produced their own versions of "Shaker" chairs. Because of the quality of their craftsmanship, original Shaker furniture is costly. One Shaker chair, actually a tall stool, sold for just under US \$100,000

Today there are very few remaining Shakers left, in Sabbathday Lake, Maine.

B. The Oneida

The Oneida Community, in the Finger Lakes region of New York is known for its system of "complex marriage."

1. Complex marriage

The Oneida Community believed that monogamy was bad because it made women property and subjugated them as slaves and prostitutes; in theory, every male was married to every female. In practice, this meant that most adults had continuous sexual access to a partner. Community members were not to have an exclusive sexual or romantic relationship with each other, but were to keep in constant circulation. To help prevent a "special love" from forming, each Community member had his or her own bedroom. This extended even to couples who came to the Community already married. A married couple entering the Community was not required or even encouraged to legally dissolve their union, but rather to extend the borders of it to the rest of the Community in complex marriage. The average female Community member had three sexual encounters, or "interviews", a week.

2. Continence

However, the cult was not based on sex-sex-sex. Rather, neither partner was expected to climax, because not doing so was a sign of self control and discipline, another of their values. By doing so, sexual encounters could last for a while, and both partners would be satisfied.

3. Perfection

Further, in the Oneida Community, there was a goal of perfection—both as individuals and as a community, to create an isolated community of perfection that would be a kingdom of God on earth, almost like the "city on a hill" mission. Every member of the community was subject to criticism by committee or the community as a whole, during a general meeting. The goal was to eliminate bad character traits.

D. Mormons

Another type of utopian community was actually the Mormon Church.

Joseph Smith, a New York farmer, proclaimed a vision which led to the establishment of the Mormon Church. Plural marriage was seen as a necessary condition for salvation. The Mormons encouraged huge families. In the early years, men traveled extensively seeking converts, and women were involved in politics, business, and medicine.

V. Abolitionism

These four above movements all met over the issue of slavery, and by the 1820s-1830s, great attention was placed on slavery. What follows here is a brief history of abolitionism in the Northern United States. Next time, when we discuss Southern life, we'll see how the South responded to the growing popularity of abolitionism.

A. Slow growth

Abolitionism was slow to catch on. In America, the first opponents of slavery were the Quakers. John Woolman and Anthony Benezet were Quakers, among the first opponents of slavery, writing in the colonial period. Woolman, from New Jersey, argued that slavery was not Christian, and asked people to put themselves in slaves' shoes—how would you feel if that were you, his message was. Anthony Benezet, writing a little later, wrote that Africans were civilized and successful in Africa, and highly capable of great things in America if given opportunities. Few Americans noticed the Quaker abolitionists.

B. Increasing pace

During the Revolution, many Northern states freed their slaves, some gradually, and by the 1820s, all the Northern states except Delaware were free of slavery. In 1808, Congress abolished the slave trade. But it was the Missouri Compromise, and British abolitionism that led to an American movement to end slavery throughout the United States by the early-1830s. To elaborate on the British point, in 1823, the British Society for Mitigating and Gradually Abolishing the State of Slavery throughout the British Dominions, put pressure on the House of Commons. The House of Commons passed laws making manumission easier, allowing for slaves to purchase their freedom and then to purchase property and to save money in banks, and prevented slave families from being split up. In 1833, the House of Commons abolished slavery in British territories and it took effect in 1834. So obviously these developments influenced Americans who thought that America should follow that example.

C. Colonization

During the 1820s, Americans supported the American Colonization Society. Founded by John Marshall, James Madison, James Monroe, and Henry Clay, the Society purchased land in Liberia by 1821. They encouraged voluntary emancipation and voluntary resettling outside the United States for slaves. The American colonization society was supposed to please the South in that it would eliminate white southerner's fears of free blacks everywhere in the South. Most members assumed that there would be too many prejudices on both sides if the slaves were freed, and that blacks and whites simply could not live together. The Society, which went out of business in 1860, shipped a total of 10,000 African Americans to Liberia, yet 4 million remained. The Society controlled the colony of Liberia until 1847 when, under the perception that the British might annex the settlement, Liberia was proclaimed a free and independent state, and provided with a constitution that was said to be fashioned after the American model. They did not become reintegrated into an African society. Once in Africa, they referred to themselves as "Americans" and were recognized as such by local Africans and by British colonial authorities in neighboring Sierra Leone. The symbols of their state — its flag, motto, and seal — and the form of government that they chose reflected their American background and diaspora experience.

D. New strategy

Two of the original supporters of the colonization movement, **William Lloyd Garrison** and T.D. Weld, a minister from Ohio, originally supported the movement, but they realized that owners were using society to transport *free* slaves, not to free new ones. Weld and Garrison thus saw the

society as a cover to get rid of already free blacks. To Garrison and Weld, the colonization society was not freeing slaves, it was simply getting rid of free blacks in Southern cities.

In January of 1831, Garrison announced a new strategy in the brand new newspaper called the Liberator. It became the best and most known abolitionist newspaper in America. Garrison and others made radical demands—forget colonization, forget gradual emancipation, they said. They called for an immediate end to slavery. In 1833, Garrison and his like-minded friends met in Philadelphia and organized the **American Antislavery Society**, but far the most radical abolitionist group so far.

They demanded several things: 1) immediate emancipation, 2) nonviolence, 3) moral persuasion 4) local efforts—people gave speeches and organized local communities, newspapers, etc, to try to convince people that slavery was wrong.

E. Divided Reception

Slowly the Antislavery Society won support in the North, but few in the South joined them.

There were a few notable exceptions:

James Birney from Alabama freed his slaves and in 1840 and 1844 ran as a third party candidate of the Liberty Party. Birney, formerly the secretary of the American Antislavery Society, tried to make slavery a national political issue by demanding immediate abolition. Few Americans took notice and wrote him off as a crackpot. In 1845, Birney was seriously injured in a horseback riding accident, and was therefore erased from the public spotlight.

Two Quaker sisters from Charleston, SC, **Sarah and Angelina Grimke**, the daughters of a wealthy slave owner became active abolitionists and they went north and joined the antislavery society. Sarah said that she tried to board a steamer to a place where there was no slavery at age five after she saw a slave being whipped. Later, in violation of the law, she taught her personal attendant to read. At a time when women were not expected to take an active public role, they spoke out nonetheless.

Abolitionists were not necessarily popular in the North, though. Mobs led by gentlemen attacked abolitionists.

Northern pro-slavers did business with South, indirectly benefiting from slavery. Abolition movement threatened economic culture. The world class was scared that if the slaves were freed, they would come to the North and would take their jobs and their women. Angry mobs almost killed William Lloyd Garrison in 1835, and Elijah Lovejoy, an abolitionist newspaper editor, was forced out of his burning home and shot. Then his printing press was thrown into a river.

F. New Tactics

By 1835, despite these setbacks, the American Antislavery Society launched a great postal campaign to flood the country with pamphlets and publications. They sent their publications to influential citizens. President Andrew Jackson's postmaster general, however, approved the right of the South to destroy and censor the mail. Jackson personally disapproved of the abolitionists and their mail campaign shut down.

Abolitionists tried a new tactic, circulating petitions in congress. Any chance they got, they presented petitions in Congress or made long speeches about the evils of slavery. Former President John Quincy Adams became one of the leaders of these efforts. They had petitions that demanded the abolition of the interstate slave trade, slavery in DC, and for congress to eliminate the 3/5 clause, etc.

However, Congress moved to shut down these abolitionists immediately; in 1836, it passed the **Gag Rule**, which specified that abolitionist petitions would be filed away but never discussed. Southerners did not want to debate slavery, and Northerners feared the possibility of divisions within political parties, within states, within the nation. The gag rule remained in effect until 1844, when the issue of Texas made it necessary to talk about slavery.

John Quincy Adams and Josiah Giddings, a representative from Ohio, forced the subject of slavery into debate at every possible chance. Congress could not be silent anymore.

The Gag rule transformed the antislavery movement, and by the late 1830s, the antislavery movement unraveled. The big reason was that it could not reach a national audience and it could not influence congress. However, there were internal divisions. Garrison attacked prominent ministers who refused to attack slavery. Garrison welcomed African Americans like the brilliant **Frederick Douglass** as equals into the movement. Douglas traveled to Antislavery Conventions throughout the North making speeches. Many people believed that blacks should not have an equal role in the movement. Garrison also wanted to treat women as equals within the movement, but women were discriminated against in the movement. Further, Garrison was outspoken and emotional; he criticized the federal government, the Constitution, and slave holders. He did not want to work within the system because he thought politicians were untrustworthy and slow to act.

The question of the annexation of Texas, and War with Mexico made slavery seem much stronger and brought a return to the slavery debate by the late-1840s, after several years of relative silence, or at least of little influence. This is something we'll return to.

I. Resistance to Industrialization and the Market Revolution

The South never industrialized like the North, and thus did not experience a “market revolution” like the North. Slavery limited the spread of transportation and cities in the backcountry. Immigration was much less because there were fewer available jobs. The culture of the South precluded industrialization. Only after the war did the south industrialize.

As a result of their heavy investment in **cotton** production and slaves, southerners had little money to invest in industrialization. The relative cost of maintaining slavery in the cities outpaced the cost of maintaining slavery on the plantations. Southerners feared an insurrection. Following in the beliefs of Jefferson, they disliked the idea of city life, of a strong white urban banker and businessman class and of a potentially-uncontrollable mass of African Americans in the cities. The plantation system was not conducive to the growth of towns and industrial enterprises. Towns contained merely the banks, stores, shipping facilities and warehouses needed to sustain the plantation. By concentrating slaves in the cities, it seemed like an insurrection would be more likely. Further, the banking system in the south encouraged plantation ventures by extending easy credit to planters.

The South did not experience massive developments in transportation. Comparatively few canal or railroad projects were completed. Few factories were built. Especially in the established coastal plantation regions, the planters and politicians there resisted roads and canals because they didn't want the upcountry to develop and then compete with them. The South contained only 10% of the nation's industry. By 1850, the industrial production of the state of New Hampshire equaled the industrial production of half of the South.

The South also lagged behind the North in reform movements. Adopting an “if it ain't broke don't fix it” attitude, the South resisted change. They feared abolition, did not institute school reform, and women's rights were stifled. As evidenced by the South Carolina Nullification Crisis in 1831, the South clashed more and more with the north's economic needs and opposed tariffs, internal improvements.

A. Southern values

The South had different values from the North, as one of the leading historians of the history of slavery, a professor at Emory University named Eugene Genovese has written. Specifically, he insisted, planters had a different conception of virtue. Southerners valued family and status, honor, luxury, ease, accomplishment, paternalism, male dominance. They rejected the following northern values that thrift and hard work, commerce, business and money should be pursued. The South valued the accumulation of property and the ownership of property, but it meant more to be a successful from rags-to-riches entrepreneur in the North. Further, Southerners would defend these values at any cost. Northern travelers used the words “agrarian, independent, anti-government, traditional” to describe the South.

B. Slave ownership

Here are some figures that might challenge your preconceptions of the South: By 1860, only 1/4 of all white southern families owned slaves. Of these, 50% owned five or fewer, 75% owned ten or fewer. Only 12% of slave owners owned twenty or more slaves, and only 1% owned 100 or more.

There is tremendous diversity among those who owned slaves. Immigrants, Native Americans, blacks, city dwellers, and women all contributed to the diversity of the master class.

The ownership of slaves was for many German and Scotch-Irish immigrants, a status symbol and a possible way to wealth. Still, few participated in the plantation economy. In places like Lexington, Virginia, or Greenville, South Carolina, there might be a few slaves working on a cattle farm, for example. Slaveholding was widespread among Native Americans who remained.

In places like Louisiana and New Orleans, lighter skinned free blacks owned slaves. Black masters were often viewed by whites as a threat to the principle of white supremacy. Women comprised 10% of the slaveholding class—typically widows, they relied on the help of overseers to manage the plantation.

Even though there was great diversity among who owned slaves and how many slaves they owned, as well as where slaves worked, the average slave owner was a 54-year old white male, born in the South. He owned fewer than 10 slaves. The vast majority were not planters.

Further, people should move in and out of the slave owning class. Some owners worked with their slaves, and for the small farmer, life was unpredictable, restless, and economically insecure. People often gradually saved and tried to buy up land and slaves. Many times, they then moved west where land was cheaper.

Pause for 60-Second Quiz #1: What are some of the causes of, and some of the effects of, southern resistance to industrialization? Which answer is correct?

- a. All white southern families owned slaves
- b. All slave-owners based their pro-slavery arguments on economics
- c. All slave-owners based their pro-slavery arguments on religion
- d. All slave-owners were white

II. Social Division in White Southern Society

A. The Planter Class

Planters are usually thought of in terms of *Gone with the Wind*; people who lived in lavish homes and owned large numbers of slaves. Planters did own enormous homes, large numbers of slaves. They benefited from luck and inherited wealth; few were rags to riches stories.

Planters served as leaders of their social, political, ideological, and religious communities. Their wealth, their **paternalism**, gave them the authority positions in society. They held political offices, they were the police, the judges, and the juries. They were smarter, harder-working, and worth more in their own minds than the non-slaveholders. They believed that they spoke for the community, and especially when the behavior of blacks became a public concern (some crime or fear of insurrection). Planters believed also that they would protect the poorer whites from the slaves.

The planter's wealth came not from their possessions, not from their crops, but from the slaves they owned. Planters struggled with managing large plantations, with selling their crops, and with buying, maintaining, supervising, and selling slaves. Plantation wives often had to cope with being distant from their friends and relatives and being surrounded by people they owned. Their isolation

was compounded by the sorrow of knowing that in many cases, their husbands, sons, cousins had fathered children with their slaves.

B. Planters and pro-slavery arguments

As the abolition movement took off in the 1830s, so did the pro-slavery arguments of planters. (We'll address Uncle Tom's Cabin and its impact at a later date.

Most southern planters began to look at slavery not as a negative evil but as a positive good. George Fitzhugh, a Virginian, wrote ***Sociology of the South***, in which he argued that southern slaves were better cared for than northern workers. Factory workers were fired when they got too old to work and cut loose, whereas old slaves were cared for. It was the Northern system that was cruel, not the Southern one. Fitzhugh believed that slavery was normal, natural, and necessary to a civilized society. Slavery was an economic necessity and if emancipated, slaves couldn't care for themselves.

Other southerners used the Bible to justify slave holding. Ministers tried to argue that none of the Biblical prophets or Christ himself had ever criticized slavery. They asserted that there was a tradition of slavery in the Bible, and in Ancient Greece and Rome, and therefore it should be acceptable. **Rev. Dr. Richard Furman**, the leader of the Southern Baptist Convention, also became an outspoken supporter of slavery. He wrote *Exposition of the Views of the Baptists Relative to the Coloured Population in the United States* in 1823, and it was later republished several times. In it, Furman stated that in the Old Testament, the Israelites were directed to purchase slaves from the Heathen nations, and that these persons were "to be their bond-men forever" and "an inheritance for them and their children" according to the book of Leviticus.

Some preachers admonished masters to treat their slaves in accordance with the Golden Rule, however there was no enforcement of this either through laws or within the community. The efforts to recognize slave marriage, to keep families intact, led to fear. David Walker's *Appeal*, a book that criticized colonization and called for slaves to rise up, made planters want to keep their slaves as uneducated as possible, thus they did not like the idea of improvement and perfection and education that the North did. Churches and individuals felt guilty but did little to change slave treatment or slave quality of life, and reform efforts were few.

Some, like James Henry Hammond, an eminent planter and senator from South Carolina, argued that African Americans were intellectually and emotionally inferior and dependent, and that slavery was doing them a favor. "Providence has placed the black man in our hands for his good, and has paid us from his labor for our guardianship," echoing the words of Furman. Said Furman, "The children, the aged, the sick, the disabled, and the unruly, as well as those, who are capable of service and orderly, are the objects of his care: The labour of these, is applied to the benefit of those, and to their own support, as well as that of the master. Thus, what is effected, and often at a great public expense, in a free community, by taxes, benevolent institutions, bettering houses, and penitentiaries, lies here on the master, to be performed by him, whatever contingencies may happen; and often occasions much expense, care and trouble, from which the servants are free."

A number of private authors published books supporting slavery—one is John Pendleton Kennedy's ***Swallow Barn*** or *A Sojourn in the Dominion*. Originally written in the 1830s, he decided to republish it in the early 1850s, he said, as "an antidote to the abolition mischief." The main character Merriwether feels that slavery is wrong, theoretically, but proves to his Northern visitor that

his Negro slaves "could never become a happier people" than they are at present, as slaves at Swallow Barn.

C. Southern opponents of slavery

Not all southerners united to defend slavery, though. We've already seen how the Grimke sisters and how James G. Birney, a former slave owner in Alabama, became the Liberty Party candidate, moved to Cincinnati and was at one time the Secretary of the American Antislavery Society. Still, with the mail tampered with to prevent antislavery pamphlets, with their leading politicians and public figures defending slavery, many whites approved of slavery. To Hinton Helper, who wrote *The Impending Crisis* in 1857, slavery inhibited the South's economic potential, limiting the opportunities available to small farmers. "Instead of keeping out money at home, patronizing our own mechanics, manufacturers, and laborers, we send it all away to the North, and there it remains." He advocated freeing the slaves and sending them back to Africa and then developing the South like the North. Obviously, his writings were not popular in the South.

D. The Yeoman class

The largest single group of southern whites were non-slaveholding people called **yeomen**. These were small farmers who either grew crops to support their families or for local, small-market involvement. They typically owned between 50-200 acres, and were most common in the upcountry of North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia. The majority of yeomen relied on animals for their livelihood. They did not want to be in debt or beholden to anyone. They cherished their liberty and independence, and created and continued a lifestyle that would allow this. They raised cattle and hogs, they had small farms here they planted corn too. They disliked work and supervision, so they were "careless farmers"—they let the pigs run loose and had what they wanted—liquor, leisure, tobacco, and food. They preferred fishing to working. Being lazy to these yeomen southerners, many of them of Scotch-Irish backgrounds, did not mean sitting about being slob—they worked when they needed to and they helped their neighbors out. But it meant having time to have fun. Relying on livestock and corn allowed them to make a living and provided them with the food and drink they liked and the lifestyle that worked for them.

Yeomen relied on help from their neighbors; they were never 100% sufficient.

Yeomen, who may have owned none, or just a few slaves, typically approved of slavery. Feeling like they were better than slaves made them feel better about themselves. Further, they supported the plantation class because of the idea of states' rights, and hands-off government, and because of the fear of northern abolitionists and reformers who seemed a threat to the south's culture. Some hoped that they could improve their circumstances, and saw slave ownership as the path to wealth.

Dealing with the fear of debt, of economic or political dependence to the planters, and oft just trying to survive, yeomen lived in the upcountry and in plantation-slavery regions. So thus, the picture of tidewater Virginia or Berkeley County, South Carolina is not one entirely of plantations; there were small farms in between the plantations. Further, in the upcountry, though there might be some cotton plantations, more likely there were many small farmers with perhaps a couple of slaves. Further, in less settled, mountain areas, yeomen were very poor, extremely unlikely to own any slaves at all.

As far as the yeoman class goes, to what extent were they impacted by the Second Great Awakening? The Second Great Awakening proceeded slower and less dramatically in the South, but it was there and it was a factor in yeoman life. Many men were uncomfortable discussing religion or

with its emotion and introspection, felt effeminate; it was not manly, and subordinating one's behavior to church rules would make them less of a man, they believed. It would compromise their ultimate authority within the household. Camp meetings were invaded by rebels, prostitutes, pranksters, and jokers. The evangelical preachers faced concerted opposition, especially along the Southern frontiers.

A new approach by a new group of ministers changed all this—they made it masculine to be an evangelical. Men were told they were “fighting for God.” That they were heroes in a military sense, that they were honorable. The Church tended to overlook private/family behavior and instead ask men to help out their neighbors and to contribute to society by spreading the Word to others.

The Baptists and the Methodists also spread to the South, but they were among the leading supporters of slavery.

E. White Women in the South

We've seen that white women in the North were on the cutting edge of the reform movements, but what about the South? What was life like for them? It was much more restrictive. Women were subordinate, they were expected to submit to their husbands and to not take a public role.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #2: Who were the planters and the yeomen, and how were they similar in some ways but different in others? Which answer is not correct?

- a. Planters were more likely to own many slaves
- b. Planters were likely to own no slaves
- c. Yeomen were less likely to own many slaves
- d. Yeomen were likely to own no slaves

III. Slave life in the antebellum South

It is important to point out that slaves worked and lived in a variety of settings:

The average southern slave lived on a plantation surrounded by at least ten other slaves.

A. Plantation Life

In South Carolina and Georgia low country areas, producing rice or Sea Island cotton, the **task system** was successful—slaves had assigned acre plots of the plantation to be responsible for, they had certain jobs to complete. For example, a slave might have to plant two acres of rice in day. A task was almost always based on a piece of land. If they finished those in less time than expected, could take a break and tend their own gardens and raise crops to sell in the towns or to poorer whites. By 1850, slaves produced a variety of crops, some raised their own animals, some also sold their woodworking, baskets, or fished and hunted in their free time. Slaves were also accumulating some possessions that they could pass down to their children.

The slave day began an hour before sunrise—5 AM, and continued until sunset. Men and women worked side by side in field **gangs**. Slaves worked in all seasons. In spring they planted, summer they tended and weeded crops, in the fall they harvested, and in the winter they prepared the fields for the upcoming season and did maintenance and construction work.

Aside from farming-related activities, slaves were involved in cutting firewood, doing household chores. The elderly slaves worked in gardens or cared for the youngest of children. Young children did the weeding and other tasks. After working until dusk, slaves went to their cabins, prepared

meals based on their basic allotment of food and crops that they grew on their own—which might include collard greens or some squash, and went to sleep on the cold ground, only to be awakened at dawn the next day.

In West African culture, unstilted sloppy hair was associated with bad morals or was seen as embarrassing. Further, hair served as a sign of style and individuality. For plantation slave women, the humidity and the dirty conditions of the fields made their hair difficult to manage; they brushed and detangled their hair, styled it, and put it in a bandana to keep the dirt out; they then removed the bandana on Sunday. Other slave women braided their hair in elaborate styles; this allowed a sense of individuality and also became a source of pride in a life that gave them little else to be proud of. Women created their hair accessories and styles themselves.

Slave labor was commanded at the price of violence. Slaves who resisted masters or refused to work faced violence and torture. White overseers and black drivers whipped and punished slaves.

Not all slaves were forced to do field work. Some excelled as blacksmiths, carpenters, gin operators, and skilled house servants—nannies, cooks or butlers. There was a definite rivalry between **house servants** and **field laborers**. Not all slaves lived on plantations; some lived on small farms, working side-by-side with their owners. Others worked in the cities, where they might be hired out or literally rented to small businesses for work as blacksmith, carpenters, or other skilled jobs (see photo of Charleston). A small minority worked in grain processing plants in Virginia or in small iron foundries, but this was rare. Manufacturing was limited to begin with, and of the very few individuals involved in manufacturing, they were 95% white.

B. The slave family and culture

Although they came from a variety of African backgrounds, slaves forged a common language which allowed them to communicate with one another. Because this “**Pidgin English**” might be difficult for whites to understand, it was part of their common shared identity.

Regardless of the job they did, slaves created important family lives. Since their families could be separated at any time, it was difficult to forge any lasting family ties but they did. The typical slave family was a two-parent household, broken up only by sale. Masters rarely got involved in setting up relationships. Marital loyalty was a value, but premarital sex was tolerated—though slaves could not “legally” get married, they were often recognized as married within their African American communities, and some masters allowed their slaves to get married and to consider themselves married as a morale booster for the slaves—the master might throw a party for the slaves, they could celebrate and deflect their attention from the hard work at hand, and might see the master as kind.

Slave families valued the extended family even more than whites. They also established friendships and connections with slaves on neighboring plantations, and in the cities a vibrant African American culture emerged, however, as a result of Denmark Vesey’s conspiracy, white authorities cracked down on slave clubs and gatherings.

C. Slave markets

The threat of being sold was one that affected all slaves. The biggest slave markets were in New Orleans, Charleston and Savannah. Though the slave trade had ended, slaves could still be sold from one owner to the next, and many brought their slaves to these cities to make a big sale or went there to make a big purchase.

Many whites saw slave ownership as the path to prosperity and wealth. For others, paternalism motivated them—some justified slavery by saying that they were doing the slaves a favor. For some, owning a slave proved one's status in society, could prove one's gentility and masculinity (perhaps attracting a woman). For white women, owning a slave could offer some release from the demands of motherhood and wifedom. Some slaves were bought to be broken, to prove the master's power and will to others, including to the slaves. Others purchased slaves for sex—it was the one thing that no one talked about. In perhaps the ultimate contradiction, slavery was the path for whites to freedom, leisure, and wealth.

D. Slave Religion

Slaves developed distinctive religious practices often modeled closely upon evangelical religion. The Second Great Awakening slowly reached the south, especially along the frontiers, where slaves joined the Methodist and Baptist churches. The likelihood that they would have little say in these churches, had a white preacher, and had to attend when and where they were told to and were constantly bombarded with messages on the importance of hard work and good behavior led many to shun organized religion altogether. Many clung to African traditions. Most slaves created their own Christianity on the plantations; they. As Frederick Douglass wrote, "The songs of the slave represent the sorrows of his heart." Slaves also expressed themselves through folk tales, which helped the young to survive in a brutal world.

E. Slave Resistance

Slaves were never content in slavery. Plots to escape, however, were rare because most slaves lived in fear. They did not want to lose their families, they recognized the odds against them. Three major rebellions come to mind: Gabriel's Rebellion in 1800, South Carolina's Denmark Vesey conspiracy in 1822 and the successful Nat Turner Revolt in Virginia in 1831. There were remarkably few slave revolts in America compared to other slave societies; In Jamaica and Guyana, thousands of slaves rose up. Brazil comes to mind as a place with several bloody slave revolts in the 1830s alone.

1. Gabriel's Rebellion

In **Gabriel's Rebellion**, Gabriel, a slave blacksmith in his mid-twenties living just outside of Richmond, Virginia, recruited perhaps a couple hundred slaves to march on to Richmond and capture the governor (who was then at the time James Monroe). A heavy thunderstorm postponed the attack and a few slaves then turned Prosser in. Prosser and the other leaders were eventually captured and executed.

2. Denmark Vesey's Revolt

In Charleston, **Denmark Vesey's** conspiracy in 1822 met a similar fate. Vesey was a fifty-five year old free black carpenter in Charleston, and he planned what would have been the largest slave rebellion in U.S. history. His insurrection, which was to take place on July 14, 1822, became known by about 9,000 slaves and free blacks throughout Charleston who were to rebel. The plot was leaked by slaves opposed to Vesey's movement, and 131 people were charged with conspiracy by White Charleston authorities. 67 men were convicted and 35 hanged, including Denmark Vesey.

By the way, the Denmark Vesey plot (or, rather, the discovery of it) and the fear it caused among whites in Charleston, was the reason for the founding of The Citadel military academy in Charleston, South Carolina – the idea was to have a corps of cadets trained in military arts who would defend the (white) city against the next slave rebellion.

Also, the church where Denmark Vesey planned and recruited participants for his rebellion was burned to the ground. Another church was rebuilt in its place, the Mother Emanuel AME Church. This church was the site of a [white supremacist's mass murder of African American congregants](#) in 2015. While the perpetrator's motives were certainly informed by a racist hatred of black people, it is not clear whether the symbolism and history of this church played a role in his choice to target it.

3. Nat Turner's Rebellion

The most famous slave revolt was led by a literate slave preacher named **Nat Turner**. He lived on a small farm in southeastern Virginia and launched on short notice, a slave revolt. Starting with a few trusted friends, the movement numbered in the fifties, and included a few free blacks. The slaves traveled from house to house, freeing slaves and killing all the white people they found. They used hatchets, knives, axes and guns instead of firearms. Turner gave the orders to "kill all whites," and as a result, almost 60 men, women and children were killed. Within 48 hours, the rebellion was suppressed within 48 hours, but Turner eluded capture for months. On October 30 he was discovered in a swamp by a white farmer and then arrested.

After his capture, his court appointed trial lawyer, Thomas Ruffin Gray, took it upon himself to publish "The Confessions of Nat Turner," derived partly from research done while Turner was in hiding and partly from conversations with Turner before his trial. This document remains the primary window into Turner's mind. Due to its author's obvious bias, it is a subject of much contention among historians. In 1967, novelist William Styron wrote a novel by the same name in which he wrote from the perspective of Turner. The state legislature of Virginia considered abolishing slavery, but in a close vote, affected by the recent uprising, decided to retain slavery and instead support a repressive policy against slaves and free blacks. The freedoms of all black people in Virginia were tightly curtailed, and an official policy was instated that forbade questioning the slave system, on the grounds that any discussion might encourage similar slave revolts.

4. Silent Sabotage

Rebellion did not always take the form of rebellion or escape. Slaves could achieve a level of relief by committing acts of **silent sabotage** on a daily basis. Feigning injury or illness, working slowly, pretending not to understand, and trying to show a sense of humor in difficult situations—these were all ways of coping with the tragedy of daily life in slavery.

5. Running Away

As an alternative to revolt, slaves ran away, some via the **Underground Railroad**. While small groups of Quakers were helping slaves escape from the late-1700s, it was not until the abolitionist movement of the 1830s that the Underground Railroad began. Moreover, it was not until the 1850s, when slavery was really under attack that the Underground Railroad blossomed. Numbers vary; the average suggests that about 50,000 slaves escaped via the Underground Railroad. It mainly affected slaves in Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and Kentucky—not slaves in the Deep South.

A network of safe houses located about every ten to fifteen miles and of people helping them along the way to escape and to get established, often in Northern cities, made it possible for slaves to reach their freedom. After 1850, with the passage of the Fugitive Slave Act, something we'll get at later, escaping slaves had to go to Canada to make sure they would be safe. As a result, Windsor and Toronto, Ontario's black population includes many former American slaves as well as immigrants from the Caribbean and Africa that came later.

6. Smuggling

A surprising number of slaves escaped in trains or ships. Sometimes they borrowed or forged "free papers," legal papers that said that they were free. One reason that slaveholders did not want slaves to learn to read and write was that they feared that they would forge these papers. Sometimes slaves borrowed papers from free blacks. When Frederick Douglass escaped by riding the train from Baltimore to New York, he borrowed the freedom papers of a black sailor. He could show these to the train's conductor as proof that he had the right to be traveling northward. He later mailed these back to his friend.

One way to smuggle slaves out of the south was to pack them up and ship them as freight. In the winter of 1857, a young woman in Baltimore was boxed up by her friend, taken to the train depot, and sent to Philadelphia. The young woman lacked air, water, and food. Several times the box was turned over, sending the young woman tumbling. The next day, the box arrived in Philadelphia around 10 A.M. The friend, who was free, had traveled to Philadelphia to be there when the box arrived. He hired a hackman (a man who drove a one-horse wagon) to pick up the box and deliver it to the home of Mrs. Myers, a free black woman. Mrs. Myers, who was originally from Baltimore, frequently received fugitives traveling on the Underground Railroad.

Mrs. Myers was so afraid that the young woman would be dead after the journey that she asked her neighbor, who was an undertaker, to be present when she opened the box. The young woman did survive, but she was very weak. At first, she could not speak. They finally got her out and helped her upstairs where she went to bed for the rest of the day. It was three days until she was strong enough to talk in a normal way. She had almost died in that box, but her desire for freedom was so strong that she risked it. After three or four days with the Myers family, the young woman was sent on to Canada.

7. "Passing"

Slaves sometimes wore disguises to avoid being recognized and returned to slavery. The story of Ann Maria Weems is an interesting one. She belonged to a slave trade in Montgomery County Maryland (just north of D.C.) Her owner refused to grant her freedom even when her friends came forward offering money. A white doctor, a conductor for the Underground Railroad, picked her up in his carriage, she was disguised as a young boy and was told to act as a coachman who assisted with the carriage and horses. She traveled To Philadelphia, and to New York, and eventually to Canada.

8. Underground Railroad

Harriet Tubman was a slave born on a small plantation in Maryland. Sometime in the fall of 1849 she escaped northward, leaving behind her free husband who did not want to follow. On her way she was assisted by sympathetic Quakers and other members of the Abolitionist movement, both black and white, who were instrumental in maintaining the Underground Railroad.

Called "Moses" by those she helped escape on the Underground Railroad, Tubman made many trips to Maryland to help other slaves escape. According to her estimates and those of her close associates, Tubman personally guided more than 300 slaves to freedom in about 19 expeditions. She was never captured and, in her own words, "never lost a passenger." She also provided detailed instructions to many more who found their way to freedom on their own. Her owner, Eliza Brodess, posted a \$100 reward for her return, but no one ever knew that it was Harriet Tubman who was responsible for spiriting away so many slaves from her old neighborhood in Maryland.

After the American Civil War, it was reported that there had been a \$40,000 reward for Tubman's capture; but this was a myth to further dramatize Harriet's greatness in the post-war period. She was successful in bringing away her parents and her four brothers: Ben, Robert, Henry, and Moses, but failed to rescue her beloved sister Rachel, and Rachel's two children, Ben and Angerine. Rachel died in 1859 before Harriet could rescue her.

During the American Civil War, in addition to working as a cook and a nurse, she served as a spy for the North. Again she was never captured, and she guided hundreds of people trapped in slavery into Union camps during the Civil War. In 1863, Tubman led a raid at Combahee River Ferry in Colleton County, South Carolina, allowing hundreds of slaves to run to their freedom. This was the first military operation in U.S. history planned and executed by a woman. Tubman, in disguise, had visited plantations in advance of the raid and instructed slaves to prepare to run in to the river where Union ships would be waiting for them. Union troops exchanged fire with Confederate troops in this incident; there were casualties on both sides.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #3: What are some of the examples of slaves' resistance to slavery? Which answer is NOT correct?

- a. Running away was one way a slave could resist the system of slavery
- b. Armed uprising was one way a slave could resist the system of slavery
- c. Silent sabotage was one way a slave could resist the system of slavery
- d. Being smuggled from the plantation to the nearest town was one way a slave could resist the system of slavery

Key for 60-second Quizzes:

- 1. d
- 2. b
- 3. d

I. Texas

A. Mexican context

In the 1820s, Mexico had encouraged colonization of its northern province, **Texas**. Mexico thought that proper settlement might prevent any future expansion by the United States, and would boost its economy. The region around present-day Houston and San Antonio, basically the eastern half of Texas today, seemed good for cotton, and it was sparsely populated. So the Mexican government encouraged a number of Americans to immigrate to Texas.

B. Points of conflict with the United States

1. Cultural differences: By 1830, there were 9,000 former Americans and only 3,000 Spanish-speaking residents. It was obvious that in less than ten years, Texas had changed, and there were really two different ways of life represented. They required the immigrants to become Catholic and to become Mexican citizens. Few became practicing Catholics.
2. In 1829, Mexico abolished slavery, but English-speaking Texans protested and were allowed to keep their slaves but not allowed to legally import them.
3. Trade restrictions
4. Illegal immigration angered the Mexican government and led to threats and military surveillance
5. Political problems—in 1824, Texas was combined with another province to the South, Coahuila. The capital of the area, then, was several hundred miles away and the government was dominated by Coahuilans, because they controlled the population.

C. Texan Independence

By 1834, there were 20,700 Yankees and only 4,000 Spanish-speakers. The build-up of these various problems and tensions, the cultural differences, the restriction of slavery, the trade restrictions, Mexico's complaints about immigration, and the feeling that they had no political voice—and that they were still English-speaking Americans at heart, not Mexicans, led to an independence movement in 1835.

1. War

Santa Anna, then the president of Mexico, determined to put down this movement. He arrived in San Antonio in early 1836 with a force of 6,000 men. Texans evacuated the city, but left 150 men under the command of William Travis in an abandoned Spanish mission called the **Alamo**. 32 volunteers later arrived, including Davie Crockett, Jim Bowie (who they named the Bowie Knife after), and others. Santa Anna attacked the fortress, and for about ten days, the Texans held out against Santa Anna. Finally, Santa Anna demanded an unconditional surrender, and when the Texans refused, they were all killed or executed.

2. Atrocity

The loss at the Alamo motivated Texans to seek revenge. About a month later, Texans lost at the village of Goliad, and when they surrendered, expecting to be treated as prisoners of war, the Mexicans killed all 365 of them.

3. Victory

Things looked bleak for the Texans, but in April, at the **Battle of San Jacinto**, the Texans attacked Santa Anna's army and won an amazing victory, and Santa Ana signed a treaty declaring Texas to be independent.

Mexico's government declared the treaty void and illegitimate, and vowed to reconquer Texas, but because of a number of other distractions, this never happened. Texas, for a brief while, became an independent country, and began to talk to the U.S. about becoming an American state.

Texas immediately wanted to join the union as a slave state. It would have numerous advantages for the mostly-English speaking, and former American settlers in Texas. But Congress wanted to avoid a confrontation over slavery and the state remained an independent republic until 1845.

By 1844, a nationalistic movement called **Manifest Destiny** was sweeping the country. This vision held that the nation (comprised nearly exclusively of white European-descended citizens) was destined to spread from the Atlantic to the Pacific. With the election of 1844 and the victory of James K. Polk, it seemed that national expansion would become a priority of the United States.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #1: What factors influenced the creation of Texas and how did it come to be a state of the U.S.? Which answer is NOT correct?

- a. Slavery – Mexico outlawed slavery but allowed American settlers to practice it; Congress later did not want to add another slave-holding state to the union
- b. Manifest Destiny – Americans wanted to extend their country from Atlantic to Pacific Oceans and Texas would help accomplish this
- c. Politics – Mexico wanted to be able to better control its northern provinces (e.g. Texas), so they allowed Americans to immigrate and settle there
- d. Culture – Mexico wanted to decrease the number of Catholics living in their northern provinces (e.g. Texas), so they required Mormons to move to Texas

II. The Mexican-American War

A. Disputed Border

Texas, which since 1836 had been an independent nation, had wanted to become part of the United States. But because of the slavery issue in the United States, it had not happened. In 1845, the United States agreed to bring Texas into the Union as a new state. Mexico had two problems with this:

1. Mexico had never recognized or accepted Texas's independence
2. They disagreed

on where the border was-Texas claimed it was on the **Rio Grande River** and Mexico claimed it was on a river farther to the North.

American troops sent to the border and to Veracruz, war broke out in 1846, and in less than a year and a half, the United States won, and marched into Mexico City victorious.

As a result of the peace settlement, Mexico lost half of its territory to the United States, including **California** (which revolted against Mexican rule in 1846), Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Colorado, and all of Texas. The United States agreed to pay \$15 million, but this was not much for what they got: 500,000 square miles of land.

B. Tragedy

Mexico's tragic loss of soldiers, battles, and territory was a huge psychological blow that shattered the nation's honor and dignity. Former Mexican citizens were almost universally considered foreigners by the U.S. settlers who moved into the new territories and found themselves the victims of discriminatory laws and mistreatment. Mexico believed that the United States had acted in an arrogant way throughout the negotiations. Mexico harbored a permanent resentment against the United States. It left Mexico demoralized, disunited, and once again, subject to political infighting.

C. Triumph

The Mexican War was a tremendous military triumph. The United States had acquired 529,000 square miles of land, and present day California, Nevada, Utah, most of New Mexico and Arizona, and even some of Wyoming and Colorado.

1. Territorial Growth

America had grown rapidly to nearly 23 million people, and it now stretched across a continent. It was united by a common language, a common culture, economics and trade. Americans shared a rich history. Construction had just begun on the Washington Monument. The **Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo** seemed to be another proud achievement of American Nationalism.

2. Complications But, in fact, the true impact of the Mexican War was devastating. As Ralph Waldo Emerson had predicted, the Mexican War would be like swallowing arsenic. U.S. victory set off a chain of events that would divide America North and South, would lead to unsatisfactory and short-lived compromises, and would ultimately result in war.

D. Slavery Question The territory acquired from Mexico brought up the question of slavery and the right of Congress to prohibit or restrict slavery in the territories. This came at a time when Congress was already divided because of disputes over tariffs and internal improvements and because of an active abolitionist movement.

How would the congress divide the new territory acquired from Mexico?
Four options were proposed during 1846 and 1847, all before the war even ended.

1. Wilmot Proviso

On the evening of August 8, 1846, Congress met to discuss a bill for money for the war with Mexico. Representative David Wilmot, a Democrat from Pennsylvania offered an amendment to the appropriations bill.

Wilmot proposed in any territory acquired from Mexico, “neither slavery nor involuntary servitude shall ever exist in any part of the said territory, except for crime, where over the party shall first be duly convicted.”

Wilmot was antislavery, but he had no sympathy for blacks. In fact, he may have been a racist. Blacks competed with free whites for work. Wilmot envisioned Texas to be a refuge for white laborers; this was a Jeffersonian view, not one of plantations with black slaves, and certainly not one of industry and manufacturing. Wilmot believed that slavery hurt whites, and should not expand.

“If slavery is not excluded by law,” insisted one agreeing congressman, “the presence of the slave will exclude the laboring white man.”

In short, Wilmot’s amendment, the **Wilmot Proviso**, stated that slavery should be prohibited in any territory acquired by the war with Mexico. The Wilmot Proviso brought up the great issue that eventually would divide the nation. Did Congress have the right to limit slavery in the territories?

The proviso passed in the House, but not in the Senate. It came up several times again, but was never passed. Still, Wilmot had sparked a controversy.

2. Wick Proposal

In 1820, the Missouri Compromise had admitted Maine as a free state and Missouri as a slave state, but had specified that any territory in the land acquired by the Louisiana Purchase, and above a certain line of latitude, 36-30’ would be free of slavery.

William Wick, a little-known congressman from Indiana suggested a second solution to the problem of slavery in the territories. This suggestion came up repeatedly in Congressional debates.

Wick proposed extending the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific—In other words, the Missouri Compromise should apply to the new territory. Any territory below a certain latitude (36-30’) would be reserved for slavery, whereas any territory above the line would automatically become free soil.

This might have been the best solution. It had worked for thirty years. It was clear, and unambiguous. It came up several times in Congress, promoted by several different people, but it too failed to pass.

The idea was somewhat popular. Even President Polk supported it. Some Northerners worried that it would give slavery to New Mexico and Southern California. Proslavery folks rejected it because it would concede that Congress could limit slavery in the territories.

3. Calhoun Proposal

Southern Democrats, led by John C. Calhoun, opposed any barrier to the expansion of slavery south of the Missouri Compromise line. They believed that Congress had no power whatsoever to limit slavery in the territories. Calhoun's reasoning was essentially states' rights.

For example, Calhoun argued that "the territories of the United States belong to the several states composing the union" and that Congress had "no right to make any law or do any act whatever that shall," as he said, discriminate between the states or deprive any states or territories of their full and equal rights.

Calhoun claimed that the Wilmot Proviso was unconstitutional. Since slaves were property, and the Constitution protected property, then people should be able to bring their slaves wherever they chose. Therefore, the Missouri Compromise and even the Northwest Ordinance of 1787, was unconstitutional. This had tremendous implications.

Northerners disagreed strongly. Many southerners adopted Calhoun's view. Limiting slavery would concentrate slaves in the old regions of the South, which were becoming used up, and would increase the risk of a revolt.

4. Popular Sovereignty

There was a fourth solution to the problem of slavery in the territories. Democrat Lewis Cass of Michigan proposed the idea that eventually became known as **popular sovereignty**. Cass believed that slavery should be left to the control of the territorial government. He did not say when the government could decide on slavery—did they have to decide when they became a territory, or when they became a state? Still, Cass believed that citizens of a territory should settle the issue of slavery themselves. Cass did not believe that Congress had any right to regulate slavery either, but he believed that the citizens of a territory should have the power to determine their own issues.

Popular sovereignty was unclear. It did not say when the people of a territory could regulate slavery. Cass's idea was popular because it left the option open.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #2: What were some of the causes and effects of the U.S.Mexican War? Which answer is correct?

- a. The Adams-Onís Treaty ended the war and granted all of Texas but only southern California to the U.S.
- b. Congress unanimously agreed to admit California as a slave state to the union
- c. Southerners in Congress opposed any limitations on slavery in the territories gained from Mexico
- d. Northerners in Congress backed the idea of popular sovereignty, which was the idea that people in the existing states should vote on the question of slavery in the territories

III. The Election of 1848

The election of 1848 took place with these conflicting ideas in mind. In fact, much of the political debates of the next few years would result in arguments by supporters of these four concepts.

A. Internal Divisions

In the Election of 1848, the Whig Party nominated Mexican War hero Zachary Taylor, a Louisiana Planter and general who tried not to take sides. The Democrats nominated Lewis Cass of Michigan, but the Democrats were divided over popular sovereignty. Some sided with David Wilmot. Some sided with popular sovereignty, other Democrats sided with John C. Calhoun.

B. Free Soil Movement

A group of New York Democrats, Liberty Party abolitionists, and Massachusetts Whigs created the **Free Soil Party**. Their platform called for 'Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labor and Free Man.' they vowed to "fight on, and fight ever, until a triumphant victory shall reward our exertions." They flat out opposed the extension of slavery but not because they felt that African Americans deserved to be treated equally to whites. Rather, free-soilers feared that slave labor in the territories would compete economically with free white (wage-based) labor, meaning it would make it impossible for free white men to move out there and find jobs, because slaves would be doing all the work more cheaply. The Free Soil Party nominated former President Martin Van Buren of New York, then quite old, and Charles Francis Adams, a Massachusetts Whig and the grandson of John Adams.

"Will the people of the South vote for a Southern President or a Northern one?" one Southern newspaper asked. "We prefer old Zack with his sugar and cotton plantations and four hundred negroes to all their compromises."

C. Taylor Wins

Zachary Taylor was elected. Van Buren won only ten percent of the vote. Nevertheless, an increasing number of Americans opposed the spread of slavery, and that the antislavery movement could not be ignored.

D. Gold Rush

In January 1848, just days before the signing of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, An accidental discovery would forever change a new nation: Gold. The **California Gold Rush** began. Within a year, 80,000 people streamed into the state. California needed a government to oversee its rapid growth, lawlessness and price gouging, and to prevent conflicts between different ethnic groups.

Few gold-rushers were southerners. Slave labor would deny opportunities for work to many whites who were already there. So, Californians proposed to enter as a free state.

E. Mormon Church

Let's back up a step and discuss briefly the Mormon Church. Though Church membership grew rapidly from 1830 to 1845, hostility, fear, and controversy, however, surrounded the church. The rapid growth of church membership, the financial success of the

members and their church, religious beliefs that were outside mainstream Christian tradition, the practice of plural marriage (polygamy), a large well-armed militia, the blurring of lines between church and state, and the perception by some non-Mormons that the church was a threat all fueled intolerance. Hostilities escalated, and the Mormon Church moved west, stopping briefly in Missouri in the late-1830s and then settling in Nauvoo, Illinois.

On June 27, 1844, Joseph Smith and his brother Hyrum were killed by an angry mob while jailed in Carthage, Illinois. By 1845, the Mormon population in the Nauvoo area had swelled to 11,000 people, making it one of the largest cities in the state. In September of that year, vandals burned more than 200 Mormon homes and farm buildings in an attempt to force the Mormons to leave.

A move to the Far West had been discussed by church leaders as early as 1842, with Oregon, California, and Texas considered possible destinations. In 1844, Joseph Smith had specifically mentioned the Great Salt Lake area, and this area had become the prime candidate for settlement. Finally in 1846, the church moved beyond the Rocky Mountains into the then unsettled territory, then Mexican territory, where they hoped to be insulated from further harassment, antagonism, and persecution. But as tensions increased, the Mormons realized they had to go. There were growing rumors of some sort of U.S. government intervention, fears that troops would march on their city. Several thousand Mormons made the trip.

The initial movement of the Mormons took place in two waves. In the first segment, in 1846, the immigrants traveled about 265 miles before stopping for the winter along the Missouri River. The second segment was the rest of the way to Salt Lake City, about 1,032 miles. Under the leadership of **Brigham Young**, the new leader of the Mormons, the journey crossed primitive roads and Indian trails. They established several camps along the way where they planted crops and established supply stores for people who followed.

In July, 1847, the first Mormons reached Salt Lake City. The next 20 years would see about 70,000 Mormons traveling by wagons and handcarts to the Valley of the Great Salt Lake. Overland wagon travel declined after the completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869, when emigrants could travel across the plains by rail.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #3: What are some other examples of the tension over slavery during the 1840s (aside from Texas- and Mexican relations)? Which answer is NOT correct? a. Free Soil Movement
b. Mormon message of abolitionism
c. Gold Rush
d. Election of Zachary Taylor

IV. A Nation In Need of Compromise?

A. Problems Old and New

Texas, a slave state, had claimed part of New Mexico, where the Mexican government had banned slavery. Texas was in a tense border dispute, and Congress had struggled to

resolve it. There were several solutions floating around, but Congressmen could not agree on any of them.

Two additional problems threatened the peace of the nation. Northerners became increasingly angry that nearly seventy-five years after the Declaration of Independence, the slave trade still continued in Washington, D.C., the capital of democracy. Northerners had been trying to ban the slave trade in D.C. for some time. Finally, Southerners complained about the weak enforcement of an old fugitive slave law. Slaves were running away, and southerners were unable to get them back. Any compromise would have to address these five issues.

New President

Zachary Taylor soon aggravated the South. He rejected Calhoun's ideas that the protection of slavery depended upon its expansion. The South thought he had sold them out. Here was this supposedly great Louisiana Planter, who seemed content to let California and New Mexico become Free states. Taylor vowed to go to war with Texas over New Mexico. He said that if the Wilmot Proviso ever passed, he would not veto it. This scared southerners and warned them that slavery was under attack! If California entered the Union as a free state, it would tip the balance between slave states and Free states, and the South would be the minority in the Senate, Senator Jefferson Davis said.

"For the first time...we are about permanently to destroy the balance of power between the sections," Jefferson Davis said, reminding senators that California would give free states a majority in the Senate. He saw the admission of California as a wicked plan, "a monstrous trick and injustice."

Disgruntled with Taylor and fearing the worst, John C. Calhoun pleaded with southern states to meet and discuss their fears. Nine southern states responded to Calhoun's pleas, and at the Mississippi slaveholder's convention, they agreed to send delegates to a southern convention in Nashville in June 1850.

By 1849, Militant southerners had begun to discuss **secession**. What would happen in Nashville? Southerners called for a fugitive slave act, northerners wanted to abolish the slave trade in Washington, California and New Mexico petitioned to be added to the government as Free states and Texas was involved in a border dispute with New Mexico.

America desperately needed a settlement, and to resolve these issues.

B. Henry Clay

Kentucky Senator Henry Clay, the hero of the Compromise of 1820, now proposed a series of eight new resolutions which he hoped would patch up the differences between the North and South and solve the problems that plagued America.

Months of debate followed. A series of senators offered conflicting speeches.

Dying of tuberculosis, John C. Calhoun had to be helped into the Senate. He watched as another senator read his speech begging for compromise. The North was about to

dominate the nation in both population, area, and with a majority of free states, and thus a majority of Congressmen.

“Unless something decisive is done, I again ask, what is to stop this agitation before the great and final object at which it aims—the abolition of slavery in the States—is consummated? Is it, then, not certain that if something is not done to arrest it, the South will be forced to choose between abolition and secession? It is a great mistake to suppose that disunion can be effected by a single blow. The cords which bind these States together in one common Union are far too numerous and powerful for that. Disunion must be the work of time. If the agitation goes on, the same force, acting with increased intensity, as has been shown, will finally snap every cord, when nothing will be left to hold the States together except force.”

If the North loved the Union, it would have to be the North who conceded an equal amount of territory to the South and adopt a Fugitive Slave Law, or face the consequences.

Daniel Webster begged the north to compromise. “I wish to speak today not as a Massachusetts man, nor as a northern man, but as an American. I speak today for the preservation of the Union...” he said, “Hear me for my cause. He shuddered at the thought of secession.

Jefferson Davis vowed “I will never take less than the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific Ocean,” and said that California *could* support slavery. “The African race are altogether better adapted,” he insisted, to working the mines of California just as they were suited to working rice, sugar, and cotton plantations. It was only constitutional that California have the option for slavery, at least in some of its territory.

New York’s William Seward claimed that a “higher law” called Congress to ban slavery altogether right now. Slavery and compromise, Seward said, were both “radically wrong and essentially vicious.”

With so many different voices, compromise seemed impossible.

The Senate rejected the elements of Clay’s bills. Clay tried to lump all the proposals together into an “omnibus,” but this failed too. Entirely exhausted and burnt out, Clay went on vacation.

On June 3, the delegates of nine southern states met in Nashville. With Calhoun now dead, would the South unite? The answer was no. For one thing, Louisiana and North Carolina did not send delegates. For another, a majority of southerners disagreed with the radicals, and wanted to stay within the Union. Plus, Congress was still trying to hash out a compromise. The Nashville delegates agreed that they could not do anything and would wait to see how things played out. They adjourned and agreed to meet again in November.

That summer, after participating in the dedication of the Washington Monument, President Taylor fell ill and died.

His successor, vice-president, Millard Fillmore, desperately wanted a compromise. With Calhoun dead, Daniel Webster now appointed to the Cabinet, and Henry Clay unsuccessful, exhausted, and away on vacation, **Stephen Douglas**, a young Senator from Illinois, took over. Douglas was only thirty-seven, but already had a long career in politics. He was known as “the little Giant” because he was five foot-nothing, had an oversized head and shoulders, and a booming voice and abrupt and violent gestures. Douglas was well-liked in Congress.

He successfully built alliances of congressmen, rather than just try to create something everyone would agree on, he created proposals and then just tried to find enough people to support them. He got the proposals passed, one by one, by September, 1850.

C. The Compromise of 1850

The **Compromise of 1850** included the following items:

1. Congress admitted California as a free state
2. It organized territorial governments for New Mexico and Utah under the popular sovereignty idea
3. The Compromise settled TX/NM border dispute and gave Texas its present-day borders. Congress assumed Texas’ debt and Texas gave up its claim on New Mexico’s land.
4. Congress abolished the slave trade in Washington, D.C.
5. Congress approved a harsh fugitive slave act.

Millard Fillmore called it a “final and irrevocable settlement.” It was, however, a hollow victory. It looked good only on paper. Was it really a compromise, or was it just a temporary fix? After all, South Carolina and Mississippi had hardly voted for any of the bills. Northern Whigs rarely voted for the bills, too. It was the Border States that carried the bills to pass. What effect did the Compromise of 1850 have on America? What happened? (We’ll see in the next chapter.)

Pause for 60-second Quiz #4: What was the Compromise of 1850 and why did it come to pass? Which answer is correct?

- a. It tried to tip the balance in the Senate in favor of free states
- b. It implemented popular sovereignty in all states (old and new)
- c. It abolished slavery in the District of Columbia
- d. It included a new, much harsher fugitive slave law

KEY for 60-second Quizzes:

1. d.
2. c.
3. b.
4. d.

I. Effects of the Compromise of 1850 A.

California

After the Compromise of 1850, Congress admitted California as a free state. Then Congress organized territorial governments for New Mexico and Utah under the popular sovereignty idea. Next, the Compromise settled the border dispute between Texas and New Mexico and gave Texas its present-day borders. Per the Compromise agreement, Congress assumed Texas' debt and Texas gave up its claim on New Mexico's land. Congress also abolished the slave trade in Washington, D.C. Finally, Congress approved a harsh Fugitive Slave Act.

Members of the Southern states met again, but this time, South Carolina was the only state that really wanted to secede. Radicals in Georgia, South Carolina, and Mississippi continued, behind the scenes, to try to gain support for secession. Over the next year, secessionists would lose steam, and the South would remain in the Union—for now.

B. Fugitive Slave Act

Perhaps the biggest immediate impact on the nation was the effect of the **Fugitive Slave Act**. Here are its provisions:

1. It created a force of federal commissioners who could pursue escaped slaves into any state, and return them to their owners.
2. It denied the accused the right to a trial by jury.
3. The commissioners could force people to help in their effort, and would be paid.
4. Any one who refused to cooperate would be fined or imprisoned.
5. It subjected free blacks to capture and kidnapping, and to being carried off without judicial process.

C. The Response to the Fugitive Slave Act

Historians estimate that as a result of the Fugitive Slave Act, thousands of free blacks— maybe as many as 20,000, fled to Canada. Others lived in constant fear that they would be recaptured, possibly falsely, and sent back into slavery. The Underground Railroad intensified its efforts to aid runaway slaves. African Americans created organizations to patrol the streets of cities such as Chicago, to be on the lookout for slave catchers. In 1853, blacks held a national Convention organized by Frederick Douglas.

The Fugitive Slave Act fueled antislavery resistance in the North. Nine northern states passed laws stating that they would not comply with the Fugitive Slave Act. The public even resisted with force.

D. Shadrach Minkins

Shadrach Minkins, an escaped slave from Norfolk, Virginia, became the first high-profile case of a slave captured as a result of the Fugitive Slave Act.

Minkins, a waiter in a Boston coffee house, was seized by Federal Marshals in February, 1851 and brought to the Court House. The furious mob rushed the courtroom door, overpowering the marshals inside. About 20 black men grabbed Minkins "by the collar and feet" and ran out the door, down the hallway and stairs, and into the crowded street. The crowd was so large and so hostile that the marshals dared not pursue the rescuers.

Transferred to several safe houses and given food, clothing, and places to sleep, Minkins eventually made his way to Montreal where he lived out his life for another 25 years. Though the federal government arrested nine abolitionists, all were eventually found not guilty.

E. Anthony Burns

In a second prominent case, **Anthony Burns**, an escaped slave owned by Charles Suttle of Alexandria, Virginia, who had relative freedom and was actually working in Richmond, boarded a ship headed north and arrived in Boston as a fugitive in March of 1854. This new-found freedom, however, would be short-lived. Soon after his arrival he sent a letter to his brother, who was also a slave of Charles Suttle. Even though the letter was sent by way of Canada, it found its way into the hands of their master.

Suttle travelled to Boston to claim his "property," and on May 24, under the pretext of being charged for robbery, Burns was arrested. Boston abolitionists, vehemently opposed to the Slave Act, rallied to aid Burns, who was being held on the third floor of the federal courthouse. Two separate groups met at the same time to discuss Burn's recapture: a large group, consisting mainly of white abolitionists, met at Faneuil Hall; a smaller group, mostly blacks, met in the basement of the Tremont Temple. The blacks decided to march to the courthouse and rescue Burns, as they had done for Shadrach. The whites couldn't agree upon what to do.

As the crowd gathered outside the courthouse, led by a white minister, the blacks charged the building with a battering ram, but in the confusion, a deputy was stabbed and the crowd failed to gain entry. President Franklin Pierce ordered marines and artillery to assist the guards watching over Burns. He was convicted of being a fugitive slave, and Pierce ordered a federal ship to return Burns to his master in Virginia after the trial

Newspapers published stories of bold "rescues." In reality, 332 fugitives were captured, and over 90 percent of them, about 300, were sent back to the South. But as long as newspapers stressed Northern defiance, the South got angry.

The Fugitive Slave Act reminded the North of the cruelties of the slave-power and increased antislavery opposition. It kept slavery in the public's attention.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #1: What was the Fugitive Slave Act and why was it controversial? Which answer is correct?

- a. It required fugitive slaves be returned unless they made it to a free state
- b. It required people living in free states to help find fugitive slaves
- c. It allowed people in free states to refuse to help find fugitive slaves
- d. It required proof of the enslaved status for the accused fugitive slave to be found guilty of running away

II. Uncle Tom's Cabin

A. Anti-Slavery Novel

In 1852, Harriet Beecher Stowe published *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Playing on emotions the book villainized slavery and ***Uncle Tom's Cabin*** further worried the South.

It was further evidence of Northern meddling, of the assault on slavery, of the unfair portrayal of the South. Between the publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and the end of the Civil War, a number of anti-Tom novels, parodies or rebuttals to the book came out. From defending the plantation as a good place to attacking the North for its treatment of "white slaves"¹ (the working class) to depicting blacks as either happy in slavery or racially unfit for freedom, these books were wellread throughout the nation.

B. Anti-Tom Novels 1. *Antifanaticism*

I'd like to quote from the preface to *Antifanaticism*, by **Martha Haines Butt**, published in 1853.

Much has been said and written about the South by persons who never resided there, and who are ignorant of Southern feelings and Southern manners. Widely do these differ from those which such persons meet with in the frigid regions of the North. We greet each other, and the stranger, with warm sympathy, glowing hospitality, and a generous welcome, which makes the visitor at once feel at home under a Southern roof, and which assures him that the bosom warmed by such feelings cannot be the resting- place of cruelty and oppression.

Mrs. Stowe, and other fanatics, blinded by ignorance, and swayed by prejudice, may conjure up their "thousand and one" Uncle Tom stories, with which the imagination of novel-writers abounds, to deceive those who are as ignorant as themselves, and, perhaps, as reckless of truth; but no reasonable person, who has ever been at the South long enough to become acquainted with its usages, will give credit to the description which Mrs. Stowe, and those of her stripe, give of the treatment of slaves at the South. They are not mangled or cruelly tortured, as she represents in her work. It is not at all probable that a Southerner of refined and delicate feelings, and such are wealthy Southerners generally, would sell a much-valued slave, who had nursed him from his infancy, and also rescued the life of his child. No, no! So far from this, he would give him his freedom if he desired it, and something to begin the world with. But so attached does such a slave become to such an owner that he would not leave him on any consideration.

Many persons North are impressed with the idea that a southern plantation is a place of torture and cruelty, where slaves are driven like dogs, and never meet with a kind word or smile of approbation, however much it may be merited. On the contrary, nothing presents a more pleasing aspect than to see the respective cabins comfortably fitted up, with a little garden, or potato, or melon patch, attached.

¹ By the way, "white slaves," meaning hereditary, race-based, chattel slavery, did not exist in the United States. See Jamelle Bouie and Rebecca Onion, "Slavery Myths Debunked: The Irish were slaves too; slaves had it better than Northern factory workers; black people fought for the Confederacy; and other lies, half-truths, and irrelevancies," *Slate* (September 29, 2015), <https://slate.com/news-and-politics/2015/09/slavery-myths-seven-lies-half-truths-and-irrelevanciespeople-trot-out-about-slavery-debunked.html>

Everything around has the appearance of happiness. When the slaves have completed their daily toil, they retire to their quarters and enjoy a repast among themselves.

People of the North, who have never visited the South, should not give heed to stories which are but the figments of a worse than distempered imagination. Our slaves are infinitely better off than the white servants of the North. They have kind owners who care for them, and do all in their power to promote their happiness. When sick, they have prompt medical aid and kind nursing, as well as the counsel and prayers of humane and pious ministers. It is not the design of the author to exaggerate at all; what she states, she knows to be truth. She feels confident that the condition of slaves at the South is not what it has been represented by fanatical writers, as many a Northerner who has sojourned among us will bear witness.

The author was somewhat surprised to see what mistaken notions Mrs. Stowe has. She seems to think that our Southern people are under the impression that slaves have not immortal souls, susceptible of the sanctifying influence of grace here and glory hereafter. Could Mrs. Stowe but attend some of their religious meetings, and hear the songs of praise, the prayers, and even sermons of some of our slaves, she would think otherwise. Who taught those poor ignorant slaves the knowledge of God, and his Son, Jesus Christ? Not Northern men, but Southern masters, and Southern ministers; who, for their comfortable accommodation, as well as religious instruction, have erected suitable houses of worship, where the Sabbath, with all its high and holy delights, may be enjoyed.

The work before you is without any pretensions. It is the first attempt of a youthful author, who desires to deal justly and truly with the subject announced. She hopes her remarks will not create any unpleasant feelings among her Northern friends. She feels it her duty, as a warm-hearted Virginian, to defend the South, but, in so doing, she would not willingly offend the North.

2. The following, from Aunt Phyllis' Cabin by Mary Eastman

Slavery, authorized by God, permitted by Jesus Christ, sanctioned by the apostles, maintained by good men of all ages, is still existing in a portion of our beloved country. How long it will continue, or whether it will ever cease, the Almighty Ruler of the universe can alone determine.

I do not intend to give a history of Abolition. Born in fanaticism, nurtured in violence and disorder, it exists too. Turning aside the institutions and commands of God, treading under foot the love of country, despising the laws of nature and the nation, it is dead to every feeling of patriotism and brotherly kindness; full of strife and pride, strewn the path of the slave with thorns and of the master with difficulties, accomplishing nothing good, forever creating disturbance.

The negroes are still slaves--"while the American slaveholders, collectively and individually, ask no favours of any man or race that treads the earth. In none of the attributes of men, mental or physical, do they acknowledge or fear superiority elsewhere. They stand in the broadest light of the knowledge, civilization, and improvement of the age, as much favored of Heaven as any other of the sons of Adam."

C. The Southern Media

A media campaign also took place, mainly in the South, to speak out against the rising tide of Northern abolitionism and to fire at *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. In editorials in the Charleston Courier and the Mercury, in the New Orleans Daily Picayune, and in Southern magazines, readers could read slanted, proslavery opinions and bogus news and pro-slavery, anti-North propaganda.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #2: What was *Uncle Tom's Cabin* and why was it controversial? Which answer is NOT correct?

- a. It was a book published by an anti-slavery activist that harshly criticized slavery
- b. It was a book that inspired a wave of pro-slavery literature in the South
- c. It was a book that inspired a wave of anti-slavery literature in the South
- d. It was a book that was seen by the South as more evidence of the growing assault on slavery by the North

III. More episodes in the Presidency of Franklin Pierce

A. Changing Popular Attitudes

Thus, by the early 1850s, the newly-elected presidency of Franklin Pierce was in a wreck. But its problems would continue as two more episodes emerged in the debate over the expansion of slavery.

It reopened the debate over the expansion of slavery in two ways:

1. Manifest Destiny became unpopular as the North became convinced that the south was trying to spread slavery to the Caribbean.
2. Popular Sovereignty failed in Kansas with the Kansas-Nebraska Act

B. The Fear of Slavery Spreading to Cuba and Central America

In 1853, Manifest Destiny became unpopular. Manifest Destiny was the idea that the United States should expand freedom, expand its territories, and that it was inevitable and desirable, that the U.S. do this. The Cuban government had seized an American merchant vessel without cause, and Pierce's secretary of state sent an ambassador to Madrid (Cuba was a Spanish colony) to negotiate for the purchase of Cuba. Meanwhile, the former governor of Mississippi began planning a military invasion of Cuba, which Pierce supported. When the public learned about all this, northern opinion turned against Pierce. It was just another example of southerners trying to seize more territory for slavery. Pierce called off the invasion of Cuba.

A group of American ambassadors, all southerners, issued a document called the Ostend Manifesto in which they advocated acquiring Cuba by any means possible. If Spain refused to sell Cuba, the ambassadors claimed "by every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting it

from Spain.” This was a huge embarrassment for the Pierce administration, even though it quickly denounced the Manifesto.

Several American adventurers had led military expeditions to places like Baja California and Nicaragua. Though the U.S. government failed to recognize these regimes, it seemed proof to antislavery northerners that the South was planning to build a foreign empire for slavery. Manifest destiny thus became extremely embarrassing, and even undesirable.

C. Kansas and Nebraska

The need to organize the territory of Nebraska and Kansas renewed the controversy over slavery in the territories and the government’s right to regulate it. This marked the second failure of the Pierce Administration.

America needed a railroad to encourage settlement to the Pacific Coast, and to link the Midwest to the Pacific for trade and transportation.

Farmers in the Midwest had long eyed Kansas and Nebraska as a good place to set up farms. For many years people had discussed plans to set up a national railroad to link the Midwest to the Pacific. By the 1850s it was one of the few areas in the country that had almost no white settlement and had no territorial government in place (Montana, North and South Dakota, and Oklahoma are the only other places that come to mind).

Secretary of War Jefferson Davis had arranged three surveys—one option would have the railroad begin in New Orleans or Memphis. Davis had even convinced new President Franklin Pierce to purchase the area now comprising southern Arizona and part of southern New Mexico for \$10,000,000 commonly known as the **Gadsden Purchase**. (Gadsden was the grandson of South Carolina’s own Christopher Gadsden, a founding father and member of the Continental Congress). Southerners hoped that the railroad would extend through slave territory. But many were suspicious that this land would be used for slavery, so it was not a popular choice.

A railroad would open up the West to settlement. Stephen Douglas, now the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Territories, wanted the railroad to start in Chicago, and through his home state of Illinois. Not only would it make tremendous profits for his constituents, Douglas owned land and could profit too. But this would never happen until the territory to the west of Illinois was organized. Douglas hoped that by establishing governments, removing the Indians and building a transcontinental railroad, he could push America to even more greatness, and maybe set himself up for a Presidential run in the future.

The only way the South would support this plan was if the railroad went through slave territories. In order to get the votes, Douglas had to please the South.

1. The Kansas-Nebraska Act

Douglas proposed a compromise that became known as the **Kansas-Nebraska Act** of 1854. Kansas and Nebraska would be organized as territories. It repealed the Missouri Compromise, and declared it “inoperative and void.” The settlers would be able to decide whether or not they wanted slavery. Douglas thought that this would be a good solution. The bill passed.

2. Criticism of Douglas and the KS-NB Act

Douglas did not realize that Northerners would be so upset. All the way back to Illinois, he encountered Northern resentment. An angry mob greeted him upon his return to Chicago.

Douglas' critics charged him with three offenses. First, he had carelessly destroyed the peace of the Compromise of 1850, second, he had violated the sacred Missouri Compromise and the faith between the sections, and third, essentially that he was a blowhard who was trying to suck up to the South and set himself up for a presidential run.

3. Abraham Lincoln

Lincoln, still relatively unknown at this point, was furious. He spoke out against the Kansas Nebraska Act:

"It is wrong; wrong in its direct effect, letting slavery into Kansas and Nebraska—and wrong in its prospective principle, allowing it to spread to every other part of the wide world, where men can be found inclined to take it..."

He continued, to say that he hated slavery.

"I hate it because of the monstrous injustice of slavery itself. I hate it because it deprives our republican example of its just influence in the world— enables the enemies of free institutions, with plausibility, to taunt us as hypocrites—causes the real friends of freedom to doubt our sincerity, and especially because it forces so many really good men amongst ourselves into an open war with the very fundamental principles of civil liberty—criticizing the Declaration of Independence, and insisting that there is no right principle of action but selfinterest."

Lincoln began his rise to the Presidency, which would not come for another six years.

Nebraska was so far north
that it had no chance of becoming a slave state.

Kansas on the other hand, was right next to Missouri. Proslavery and antislavery settlers rushed into Kansas, determined to fight for control of the territory.

They were supported by
Massachusetts abolitionists, who sent guns and supplies.

D. The Response in Kansas

Many proslavery men called **Border Ruffians** from Missouri came into Kansas. They hoped that if they could quickly set up a proslavery government, that other southerners would join them. Then, they could quickly petition for statehood, and Missouri would have Kansas as a slave-state neighbor. Few people realized that what slave owner in his right mind would come to Kansas when he could go to Texas or Arkansas? Plus, if slavery was prohibited at any point, slavery would become illegal.

Kansas became a violent battleground over slavery. In fact, "**Bleeding Kansas**" became a preview of the Civil War.

In 1855, abolitionist **John Brown** moved to Kansas, where some of his sons had settled. Proslavery forces were using threats and violence to influence elections in an attempt to make Kansas a slave state.

At one point, both proslavery and antislavery sources had set up their own governments. The Border Ruffians and proslavery mobs rioted and destroyed the Free State hotel in Lawrence, Kansas. On May 24, 1856, seeking revenge for a proslavery attack on the town of Lawrence, Brown led a group of men that murdered five proslavery settlers in Pottawatomie Creek. They dragged five proslavery settlers from their homes along Pottawatomie Creek and hacked their bodies with swords, and dumped the corpses in to the water. Brown vowed that he could only die once, but he would fight against slavery for the rest of his life.

A motive is not clear.

- All of the men his sons murdered were associated with a proslavery district court.
- May have believed that he could prevent the court from acting against him by killing the justices.
- May have seen himself as a prophet or instrument of God.
- Taking revenge for Sack of Lawrence?
- Taking revenge for the death of a son shot in an ambush?

The murder was not prosecuted. Congressional committee decided not to investigate the massacre.

The Kansas Nebraska Act did not lead to a railroad—it wasn't built until after the war. It did not lead to the extension of slavery. It resulted in violence, division, and bloodshed over the question of slavery. The struggle in Kansas made it clear that the North and the South would fight over slavery.

With the heightening of tensions in Kansas in 1856, a number of other events occurred in rapid succession that threatened to tear the nation apart.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #3: How was the Kansas-Nebraska Act related to wider discussions about slavery? Which answer is NOT correct?

- The North feared that the South would do all it could to extend slavery, even expanding to Cuba and Mexico
- The location of the railroad line would either encourage the growth of slave states or the growth of free states
- Stephen Douglas led the debate in favor of the Act because he needed Southern votes for his presidential run
- The Act encouraged “border ruffians” to cross the border from Nebraska into Kansas and set up a pro-slavery government

IV. Deeper into Violence A.

Brooks and Sumner

Charles Sumner gave a speech entitled “The Crime Against Kansas,” a carefully rehearsed 8 hour speech during May 19th and 20th, 1856. He devoted most of the speech to denouncing the lawlessness in Kansas, blaming most of it on the pro-slavery Border Ruffians.

But the acerbic Sumner began making personal attacks on his enemies, many of whom were Southerners. He attacked Andrew Pickens Butler, senator from South Carolina, comparing him to Don Quixote and making fun of Butler's impaired abilities, the result of a stroke. Butler was sick, old and incapable of defending himself.

A relative of Butler's, representative **Preston Brooks** of Edgefield, who was not in attendance, learned of the incident and was furious. He knew that the Southern code of honor required that he defend Butler. Brooks couldn't duel Sumner—Sumner would probably refuse anyway, and he wasn't a Southern gentleman to begin with. Brooks looked all over Washington for Sumner for a couple of days, but with no success.

On May 22nd, he entered the Senate and accosted Sumner at his desk. As Sumner rose from the desk, unable to move in any direction because of the cramped space available, Brooks began beating Sumner over the head with a metal-tipped rubber cane, until the cane shattered and Sumner was rendered unconscious.

The caning created a martyr for the abolitionist movement. Sumner was reelected to the Senate but his chair stayed empty for three years. Northerners saw the empty chair and denounced Southern barbarism. Some biographers suggest the injuries were more psychological than physical—that Sumner was embarrassed more than he was disabled.

Brooks was censured, so he resigned. Yet, he was nearly unanimously re-elected to his seat. The pieces of the cane were displayed in Charleston, and he became a southern hero. Eventually, some of the cane was used to make rings to commemorate the incident. People from South Carolina and the South sent new canes to Brooks to praise him for his actions. This violence incensed the nation on both sides.

B. Dred Scott v. Sandford In 1856, the SCOTUS became tangled up in the sectional conflict.

1. The Facts of the Case

Dred Scott was owned by Peter Blow, an AL farmer who moved to St. Louis and opened a hotel. When Blow died, Scott was sold to John Emerson, an army doctor. Emerson took Scott with him to the Wisconsin territory, free territory. Emerson then returned to Missouri in 1838. In 1843, Emerson died and Scott's title passed to his widow, Irene Sanford Emerson.

Scott sued for his freedom in a Missouri Court in 1846. Scott's lawyers argued that residence in a Free State and territory made him free. They won. The case went to the MO Supreme court on Emerson's appeal. In 1852, the MO state Supreme Court reversed the circuit court decision, ruling Scott had returned voluntarily, with his family. In 1853, Emerson remarried a Republican antislavery congressman from Massachusetts. At this point, Irene either gave, sold or left Scott under the care of her brother JFA Sanford. Sanford moved to NY, hiring out the Scott family. Now the case entered the federal jurisdiction, because Scott was suing a resident of another state. In 1854, the US Circuit Court rejected Sanford's plea of abatement that there was no jurisdiction and the case went into the Federal Court system.

2. The case reaches the Supreme Court

At issue was the question, did Scott's residency in a Free State make him free? Could Congress exclude slavery from the territories?

The Court heard the case twice, with **Roger B. Taney**, the Chief Justice, a Maryland native and a fanatical defender of slavery, presiding.

On the Court, there were a total of five Southern Democrats (3 from the Deep South), two Northern Democrats (who typically favored popular sovereignty), and a Northern Whig and a Northern Democrat who were anti-slavery.

At first, the Court was going to declare that it had no jurisdiction, but instead, the Court made an opinion. However, none of the justices could agree on their reasons for the 7-2 decision against Scott.

Taney wrote the majority opinion, one that would make you sick in how racist it sounds to us today.

Taney ruled that no black person could be a citizen of the US and could not exercise the rights of a citizen of the US that a black man had "no rights" which the white man was bound to respect" This was incorrect—Blacks had been granted citizenship in several Northern states.

Taney argued that Scott was not free, that the Missouri Compromise had been unconstitutional, and that in fact Congress could NOT legislate slavery in the territories.

This decision suggested that popular sovereignty might be invalid, and that in fact, all territories might be open to slavery.

Scott vs. Sandford discredited the SC and weakened it for years to come.

C. The Election of 1856

That fall, it was time to elect a new president. For the Democrats, Stephen Douglas wanted the nomination, but his reputation had been tarnished by his involvement in the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Instead, the Democrats chose **James Buchanan**, a relatively unknown bachelor, a man who was popular in the South because he was involved in the Ostend Manifesto, active in trying to acquire Cuba.

The **Republicans**, a political party that had only just emerged, ran western explorer John C. Fremont, a hero of the California independence movement. Fremont, nicknamed "The Pathfinder," had no political experience, but he was an abolitionist.

The American Party, also called the "**Know-Nothing Party**," nominated former president Millard Fillmore and capitalized on anti-immigration ideas.

The Republicans campaigned on promises to repeal the Kansas-Nebraska Act, to oppose the extension of slavery, and for internal improvement projects. They blamed the Democrats for the fiasco in Kansas, and promised a better America for all Americans.

Buchanan won, though it was a close election. The rapid rise of the Republican Party and its great success certainly alarmed the South. While the Republicans did not win, their following increased, and the election of 1856 lay the groundwork for the election of 1860.

D. James Buchanan Presidency (1856-1860) and the Lecompton Constitution 1. Lecompton Constitution

In 1857, new president James Buchanan decided to get the debate over. He wanted to get slavery out of Congress and solve the Kansas problem by admitting Kansas as a state.

The proslavery faction rigged an election and chose delegates to draft a proslavery convention. The antislavery people refused to participate. The Convention, made up almost entirely of proslavery people, met in October, 1857 in Lecompton, and drafted a constitution modeled after Missouri's. The constitution would extend slavery, it said that the constitution could not be changed for seven years, it excluded free blacks' rights, and it guaranteed slave-owners already in the territory that they could keep their slaves.

The delegates knew that the constitution now had to be ratified. But of course, free soilers boycotted the vote, and the constitution was overwhelmingly approved. Buchanan sent the constitution to Congress, urging them to admit Kansas as a state to restore peace. Buchanan's action set off a battle in Congress marked by long-winded speeches and even violence. On one occasion, Lawrence Keitt, a half-drunk South Carolina Senator, insulted a Republican abolitionist and a brawl broke out.

2. Fall out

The administration was corrupt; it bought votes in the heavily Democratic Senate by promising bribes, patronage, commissions in the military, food, whisky and women.

Stephen Douglas broke with the administration, which forever tarnished his reputation in the eyes of the Democratic Party, and especially among the Southern Democrats. Douglas denounced the Lecompton constitution as a fraud, which angered the South. He had already proposed the Kansas-Nebraska Act in the first place, which angered the North. In response, Buchanan removed Douglas's friends from government jobs.

As 1858 arrived, the discussion continued. The House defeated J.J. Crittenden's resolution; if it had passed it would have required another election in Kansas to approve or deny the constitution, and with federal troops supervising.

Buchanan's administration proposed the English Compromise, named after W.L. English, a free-soil settler from Kansas. The compromise would make possible the sale of large parcels of land, thus making large individual plantations impossible. Voters then defeated the land grant and rejected the constitution. Kansas remained a territory until 1861, when Abraham Lincoln made it a state.

E. The Lincoln-Douglas Debates (1858)

The Battle over Kansas

destroyed Douglass' career, yet he still beat Lincoln in the 1858 Senate election on the heels of the famous Lincoln-Douglass debates. Lincoln was opposed to any expansion of slavery into new United States territories, while Douglas supported the doctrine of popular sovereignty, believing that a territory's residents should vote on whether or not to allow slavery. Douglas could no longer

support this doctrine legally, because of the *Dred Scott v. Sandford* decision. Instead, he stated that the people could still control slavery in the territories by not passing laws to protect slave owners and return run away slaves. Because Douglas articulated this position while he was in the debate in Freeport, this position became known as the **Freeport Doctrine**. These debates characterized the sectionalized political dichotomy at the time between Democrats and "new" Republicans. The Democratic Party at the time assumed a position like Douglas, in support of Popular Sovereignty, whereas the Republicans subscribed to the school of thought presented by Lincoln that supported a virtual containment of slavery.

F. John Brown

At this point it's appropriate to discuss really what became the events that made the Civil War extremely likely, one of these is John Brown's raid on Harper's Ferry.

1. Planning

John Brown, the mentally unstable abolitionist, had contributed to the bloodshed in Kansas from 1855-1856. After Pottawatomie, he turned into a full-time abolitionist, determined to rid America of slavery. He traveled the country from 1857-1859 trying to raise money. Eventually, he made six friends who were willing to support him. This group, called the Secret Six, consisted of abolitionists, ministers, and reformers. How much they knew of the plan that Brown was now developing is unclear, but it seems that most knew quite a bit.

We don't know when he began to plan for we don't know when he began to plan Harper's Ferry. He may have discussed it with **Frederick Douglass** years earlier. He may have been planning it with his family over the dinner table. In any case, he had been planning for as much as 10 years. Brown was secretive and did not trust others. Many didn't bother to find out what he was planning. It was possible he wanted to start a slave rebellion or collect slaves and set them free. Brown drafted and presented a constitution in Ontario, Canada in the spring of 1858, describing the dictatorship he would impose on the South.

Brown planned to seize a federal weapons armory at Harper's Ferry, Virginia (now in West Virginia). He would seize the weapons, incite the slaves to rise up, and proclaim an independent republic in the upper South. In the spring of 1859, he rented a farmhouse in Maryland, 5 miles away. He and his followers waited for more men and money, finally stopped waiting.

2. Execution

On October 6, 1859, Brown left 3 men at the house on watch, and he and 18 other followers put their plan into action. He marched across the Potomac, captured the night watchman, and seized federal rifle works and armory. He sent men to capture Louis Washington, the biggest slave-owner in the area. There weren't many slaves in the area to revolt. Ironically, the first casualty was a black man. He may have been waiting for the slaves to rise up, but they didn't. In fact, they were too far spread out and probably didn't receive word of what was happening quickly enough.

By the next day, there were enough militiamen to recapture the town, forcing raiders to retreat to the farmhouse.

Most of the men were dead or wounded by this time. The war department sends Colonel Lee, Jeb Stuart and a unit of marines. They arrived by train on the 18th. They tried to convince Brown to surrender. They try unsuccessfully to kill Brown.

3. The Aftermath

Brown lost 10 killed, 7 captured, and 5 escaped. They killed 4 and wounded 9. Led army of 22 against state + nation. No effort to escape. Left documents and maps, incriminating friends in farmhouse. Not adequately supplied. Not well-organized; slaves didn't cooperate. Shoddy operation. Some concluded 1) Brown was insane or 2) he failed intentionally, realizing that he could contribute more to the cause if he became a martyr for it.

Brown's raid convinced the Southerners that northern abolitionists were trying to hatch a slave rebellion. It was proof of Northern lunacy.

Virginia's governor, Henry Wise, ordered a psychiatric evaluation of Brown, yet called it off during 6 weeks before execution. The trial proceeded quickly; it last only a week, and Brown was found guilty of treason against the state of Virginia. However, this was bogus, because he was not a resident of Virginia. He was found guilty of inciting a slave rebellion. This too was bogus because a slave rebellion never happened. He was also found guilty of murder, but there was no proof that he himself was responsible for the murder.

Brown spoke on his behalf, and as he had been injured in the raid, actually was carried in to the court on a stretcher. This created quite a scene. He was sentenced to die in only 5 weeks. One of the secret six had a plan to rescue Brown with a hot air balloon but Brown wanted to die. "Let it be done," he said.

Brown was hanged in Charleston, West Virginia on December 2, 1859. Witnesses included Major Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson, heading a group of VMI cadets, and the determined secessionist (fire-eater) Edmund Ruffin of Virginia. He bribed a VMI cadet, got a VMI uniform, and sat up front. Ruffin supposedly fired the first or second round at Fort Sumter, he rode into Manassas, fired the round that hit the Bull Run bridge, exploded, blocked the area, and started the retreat, and next time we'll learn what happened to him after Appomattox.

The execution of John Brown set off an explosion in the North. Moderates in North America tried to convince the South that the radicals did not speak for the North as a whole. Lincoln and Seward criticized the attack. On the other hand, many of the leading abolitionists, including Emerson, Thoreau and Garrison, praised him.

The South panicked and became united behind slavery. In late 1859-early 1860, the crisis of fear resulted. Mobs seized supposed abolitionists, lynchings, blacklisting occurred. Fire-eaters crusaded.

G. The Election of 1860

In April 1860, the Democratic Party divided at the convention in Charleston. This guaranteed a Republican victory and made secession and civil war inevitable. The Convention was initially held in Charleston from April 23 to May 3, 1860. The southern wing of the party demanded the adoption of a platform which explicitly protected the institution; however, the north refused to acquiesce. As a result, many southern delegations stormed out of the convention hall in protest. As a result of Convention President Caleb Cushing's ruling that two-thirds of the entire convention's vote (rather

than of the vote of those actually voting), after 57 ballots, Stephen A. Douglas, the frontrunner, failed to capture the two-thirds majority needed for the nomination. Douglas was opposed by the south because he continued to support popular sovereignty, instead of explicitly supporting slavery.

The failure to nominate a candidate in Charleston required the convention to be reconvened in Baltimore, Maryland on June 18. Upon reassembling new battles were fought on credentials, as replacement delegates were seated to replace those that had walked out. This led to another round of walk-outs; the northern delegates selected Douglas and the Southern delegates, meeting in a different place, chose John C. Breckinridge.

In the election of 1860, Abraham Lincoln won on a Northern platform that did not deny southerners the right to own slaves but did deny the right of slavery to spread into the territories. Capturing every single northern and western state but not winning a single state south of Pennsylvania, Lincoln easily won the election. The election of Lincoln seemed a threat to the rights of the South. With slavery confined to the South and denied the right to expand, the region would soon be surrounded by abolitionist Yankees who wanted to destroy the Southern way of life.

Next, we'll see the South's response, the outbreak of war, and will discuss the Civil War itself, focusing especially on soldiers' lives and their motivations to fight.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #4: What are some of the events of the 1850s that seemed to foreshadow the American Civil War? Which answer is correct?

- a. Charles Sumner, Senator from Massachusetts, beat Preston Brooks, Representative from South Carolina, nearly to death on the floor of the Senate
- b. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled in Dred Scott v. Sanford that blacks had no rights and that slavery could proceed everywhere in the United States
- c. Abraham Lincoln won the Lincoln-Douglas debates and was elected President of the United States in 1858
- d. John Brown successfully provoked a large-scale slave rebellion in Virginia in 1859

KEY for 60-second Quizzes

- 1. b
- 2. c
- 3. d
- 4. b

I. Significance of Lincoln's election

A. Northern Candidate

Lincoln had been elected on the strength of the Free states alone. With Republicans opposed to slavery's expansion, the South's power base could only diminish. It was not unrealistic for the South to believe that Lincoln would use federal aid to induce the Border States to voluntarily free their slaves. With slavery abolished there, and with the addition of new states—like Kansas, Nevada, etc, the necessary $\frac{3}{4}$ majority would exist to pass a constitutional amendment banning slavery. Or perhaps the Republicans would incite an insurrection or a riot to free the slaves in the South. It was obvious to the South that the North was attacking slavery. Republicans seemed to encourage the growth of Free states, to encourage the flight of slaves, to abolish slavery in the territories and in D.C. Given all these possibilities, the South believed that secession was the only way to protect Southern liberty and equality. (That is, Southern "liberty" to own slaves and White Southerners' "equality" in the U.S. Senate with free states.)

B. Secession of the Lower South

On December 20, 1860, South Carolina seceded from the Union. A peace convention held in Washington on February 4 failed to achieve anything meaningful. Instead, on February 7, the Confederate Convention was effective and efficient. The rest of the Deep South followed, and on February 7, 1861, the states stretching from South Carolina to Texas—SC, GA, AL, FL, MS, LA, TX—organized the **Confederate States of America** and elected **Jefferson Davis** president. Jefferson Davis was one of the more moderate of the secessionists. **Alexander Stephens** of Georgia, vice president.

The Confederate States of America wrote a constitution that reinforced states' rights, gave the legislative branch more powers than the other two branches, and in all aspects protected slavery. The Confederate democracy was based on the ideal of protecting private property. Note that they protecting states' rights only when this doctrine is convenient to them and the preservation of slavery – Southerners are almost always talking about slaves when they talk about "property," and when slaves ran away to Northern states (states where slavery was outlawed and African-Americans were people, not property), Southern states resisted letting those Northern states protect their own (free) states' rights to let escaped slaves remain free.

The Upper South and the Border States declined to secede, hoping that Congress could make some sort of settlement. Senator John Crittenden of Kentucky proposed what's known as the **Crittenden Compromise**: extend the old Missouri Compromise line-36'30, to California, and proposed an "unamendable amendment" to the Constitution stating that slavery could not be prohibited anywhere it already existed. Yet neither the Crittenden Compromise nor any other compromise could undo Lincoln's election, a direct threat to the Southern way of life. (Meaning agricultural economy based on slave labor.)

A policy of waiting carefully prevailed, but the government had to execute the laws and maintain the existing government. As he finished off his term, Buchanan asked northerners to stop criticizing the South and to repeal their personal liberty laws and obey the Fugitive Slave Act. But republicans refused to make these concessions. Confederate troops then began seizing United States army forts and facilities.

C. Lincoln takes office

Lincoln made a whistle-stop tour as he traveled to Washington, but the tour made him seem uneducated and ineffective, and he ended up calling off the public appearances and arrived in Washington under the cover of darkness for his inauguration.

In his inaugural speech, Lincoln's theme that morning was to preserve an undivided union, and he pledged to leave slavery where it existed and to enforce the Fugitive Slave Act. Republicans saw the speech as firm and moderate, Democrats (Southerners) as inciting war.

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone over this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union, when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #1: Why did the Southern states secede and how did Lincoln react? Which answer is true?

- a. Southern states wanted to preserve slavery in the face of Republican pressure to abolish it
- b. Lincoln promised to abolish slavery immediately
- c. Lincoln pledged to go to war
- d. Southern states wanted to be allowed to gradually abolish slavery

II. The Attack on Fort Sumter

A. Siege and Surrender

Upon Lincoln's first day in office, he was handed a letter from Major Robert Anderson, commander of the federal fort at **Fort Sumter** in Charleston harbor. Anderson informed the President that he was out of food and unless resupplied, he would have to surrender in six weeks. After a month, Lincoln finally sent a relief expedition. He notified the governor of South Carolina that this was simply a relief expedition, and that no guns or men were being brought in.

Jefferson Davis had to respond to this situation. Secession was constitutional, he believed, and to allow the United States to hold property and maintain military forces within the Confederacy would destroy its claim of independence. Davis therefore instructed the Confederate commander at Charleston to demand the immediate surrender of Fort Sumter, and if refused to open fire. When Anderson refused to surrender, Confederate cannons began firing on the fort on April 12 at 4:30 A.M.

33 hours later, Anderson surrendered. In response, Lincoln called for troops to put down the rebellion. "Let our enemies perish by the sword." Four states in the Upper South, led by Virginia, then seceded. There would be no compromise.

B. High stakes

As Eric Foner said in *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War* (1970), "[f]or each believed that its own system must expand, not only to ensure its own survival, but to prevent the expansion of all the evils the other represented. To agree to the containment of slavery, the South would have had to abandon its whole ideology that had come to view slavery as a positive good."

When the Civil War broke out after the Confederate attack on Fort Sumter in the spring of 1861 both sides assumed that it would be a short war. The Civil War, however, was neither short nor easy. Both sides suffered from high casualties and the war claimed more than 600,000 lives.

C. What they fought for: 1. South

Southern soldiers compared the civil war to the Revolutionary War. The CSA wanted to protect its national independence and the southern way of life, which included slavery. Soldiers' letters spoke of liberty, self-government, of their willingness to die for their country. They feared subjugation and enslavement to Yankee rule. Most letters focused on day-to-day events and basic concerns, rather than these issues. Negative attitudes seemed highest among poor North Carolinians. NC desertion was highest.

The lower South was more patriotic and emotional about their beliefs. For many southern soldiers, the defense of home and hearth against an invading enemy also motivated them, as did hatred and revenge. Confederate soldiers despised the "Black Republicans," and the money-grubbing abolitionists. They wanted to defend their women from the vile Yankees. They wanted to avenge their friends' deaths, and to seek revenge for those whose property had been confiscated or destroyed. For some, it became pathological, delighting in the sight of the Yankee dead. The initial patriotism and ideological commitment of many Confederates became hatred and revenge.

According to one southern soldier, it was "a struggle between Liberty on one side and Tyranny on the other." To another, he fought "in defense of innocent girls and women from the fangs of lecherous northern hirelings." To another, the soil had been "polluted by a horde of Abolitionist incendiaries."

2. North

Northern soldiers believed that *they* were upholding the legacy of the American Revolution. Remembering the Revolution, they expressed a desire to preserve the Republic. As Lincoln said, once the North conceded that a state could secede at will, Republican government by majority rule would come to an end. The dis-United states would fragment into several petty, squabbling aristocracies, proving the Democratic experiment could not work. Many Union soldiers believed that preserving the Union would be a beacon of freedom for humanity, that it would set the tone for liberty and for democracy throughout the world.

1/4 of all white Union soldiers were foreign-born. The Irish drew clear parallels with the struggle for Liberty in Ireland. It was a test: could a modern free government sustain itself against internal enemies? Could republics succeed? Many believed that secession would start anarchy. They were fighting for law and order. Others expressed simple patriotism. Northerners too were willing to die for the cause of the Union, expressing emotional and dramatic language. Most Yankees did not have the same consciousness of fighting to defend home and hearth like the Confederates, but those from Confederate states and border areas expressed bitter hatred and desire for vengeance, and these feelings burned in their hearts. Many perceived (like southerners) an arrogant aristocracy and a conned masses. The soldier's idealism faded over time, but not a deep senses of purpose and determination. The North did not give up, and white soldiers professed to fight for the freedom of another race.

In the words of a Pennsylvania Private in the Shenandoah Campaign, “I cannot believe Providence intends to destroy this Nation, a great Asylum for the oppressed of all other nations and build a slave Oligarchy on the ruins thereof.” Another wrote, “the hope of the freedom of Nations and Millions in Europe and Elsewhere [will be] driven back and obscured for ages,” if the Union didn’t win.

D. Union Advantages

The Union had significant advantages over the Confederacy. In population, they outnumbered the Confederate States 22 million to 9 million. The Confederate States of America were not urbanized. The typical county seat had a population of less than a thousand, and cities were rare. Only New Orleans was in the list of top 10 U.S. cities in the 1860 census. Only 15 southern cities ranked among the top 100 US cities in 1860, most of them ports whose economic activities were shut down by the Union blockade. The population of Richmond swelled after it became the national capital, reaching an estimated 128,000 in 1864, but this still made it only about the 10th largest city overall in the former U.S.

The north had nine times the industry of the South, especially in textiles, boots, iron and firearms. The Union at the start controlled over 80% of the shipyards, steamships, river boats, and the Navy. It augmented these by a massive shipbuilding program. This enabled the Union to control the river systems and to blockade the entire southern coastline.

They had more railroads, and produced more meat, wheat and corn. The Confederacy focused mainly on cotton and tobacco, and though many poor farmers produced wheat and corn, not as much as the North. Transportation was slower and less reliable in the South, too.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #2: What were some of the causes for which North and South each fought? What were some advantages wielded by each? Which answer is NOT true? a. The North fought to protect the union of states that was the U.S.A.
b. The South fought to defend independence from a national government and it fought for the right to hold slaves
c. The North had a larger population (ergo more soldiers and workers to support them)
d. The South had more large cities (ergo more places to easily recruit soldiers and workers for the war industry)

III. The War/Military History

Except for naval battles and at Gettysburg, the battles were almost all fought in the South, which tried the patience of the South and destroyed its land, homes, farms, and resources. The Civil War lasted four years, from April 1861-1865.

A. Northern Strategy

Winfield Scott, the commanding general of the U.S. Army, devised the **Anaconda Plan** to win the war with as little bloodshed as possible. His idea was that a Union blockade of the main ports would strangle the rebel economy; then the capture of the Mississippi River would split the South. The war was fought just off the coast (the most notable example being the battle between the CSA Virginia (Merrimack) and the Monitor; the Union’s naval supremacy was unquestioned.

The war was fought along the Mississippi River at Vicksburg, Memphis and New Orleans; in the eastern states, especially in Virginia, Maryland, and later with Sherman's March through Georgia and SC; and along the western margins of the Confederacy in Tennessee, where Union general Grant was most active. There was even fighting in New Mexico territory, which was claimed and run by Confederate supporters who wanted New Mexico to become a confederate state, and in Oklahoma, where many of the Indians were sympathetic to the Confederacy.

B. Southern Strategy

To win independence the South had to convince the North it could not win, but it did not have to invade the North. The strategy of the South was mainly to hold off the North and to get international support— money, maybe even troops (they hoped from Great Britain or Germany) to win the war. In 1862 the British considered mediation —The Union victory in the Battle of Antietam caused them to delay this decision. The Emancipation Proclamation further reinforced the political liability of supporting the Confederacy. As the war continued, the Confederacy's chances with Britain grew hopeless, and they focused increasingly on France. Napoléon III proposed to offer mediation in January 1863, but this was dismissed by Seward.

Despite some sympathy for the Confederacy, France's own seizure of Mexico ultimately deterred them from war with the Union. Confederate offers late in the war to end slavery in return for recognition were not seriously considered by London or Paris.

C. Selection of the main battles and their significance 1. First Bull Run/First Manassas (1861) The first major land

battle was the **First Battle of Bull Run** (a.k.a. 1st Manassas), in July, 1861. The South won, forcing Union troops to retreat to Washington, D.C. In response, the South tried to seek European recognition and aid and Congress increased the size of the northern Army. This is the Battle in which Stonewall Jackson earned his nickname, "Stonewall."

2. Battle of Shiloh (1862)

In early-1862, the Union focused on the Mississippi River region. With battles along the Tennessee River, in Tennessee, and Kentucky, battles like Fort Donelson and the Battle of Shiloh were decisive union victories.

3. Second Bull Run/Manassas

In the Second Battle of Bull Run (a.k.a. 2nd Manassas), fought in Northern Virginia, the Confederacy won, and the Confederacy then pressed northwards on the offensive.

. Battle of Antietam (1862)

In the **Battle of Antietam**, also known as the Battle of Sharpsburg, in September, 1862, took place in Maryland. It was the single bloodiest day of the Civil War, with over 23,000 men killed or wounded. (These numbers represented 25% of the Union force and 31% of the Confederate force). While technically a tie, it became a loss for the South, because soon after, Lincoln announced the **Emancipation Proclamation**.

The emancipation proclamation, which went into effect on Jan. 1, 1863, declared the freedom of all slaves in Confederate territory not already under Union control. Its immediate impact was to free only some runaway slaves, but thousands more slaves were liberated as the Union armies

advanced. The great majority of 4 million slaves were freed through operation of the Emancipation Proclamation.

5. Battle of Fredericksburg (1862)

In the Battle of Fredericksburg, in December, 1862, The Confederacy won the battle, a battle that pitted Lee's Army of Virginia against General Ambrose Burnside. The significance of this battle is that it protected Richmond from a Union invasion.

6. Battle of Chancellorsville (1863)

In the battle of Chancellorsville, fought in May, 1863, in-between Richmond and Washington, D.C., Robert E. Lee's army faced a northern army more than double its size but won. Though a Confederate victory, 22% of the troops were killed or wounded, and more damaging was the loss of Stonewall Jackson, who was shot in the arm, lost the arm, and died from infection a few days later.

7. Battle of Gettysburg (1863)

In July, 1863, came the **Battle of Gettysburg**. General Lee had steadily invaded northward through the Shenandoah Valley with great success. In this battle, he hoped to strike an offensive punch at the North, one that would demoralize it. Union Major General George G. Meade's Army of the Potomac defeated attacks by Confederate General Robert E. Lee's Army of Northern Virginia, ending Lee's invasion of the North. ¼ of the Union troops at Gettysburg were either dead or wounded, and 1/3 of Lee's army was killed or wounded. Made famous in the movie *Gettysburg*, was **Pickett's Charge**, a brave act by Major General George Pickett that was a tremendous failure.

The Battle of Gettysburg marked a turning point (the "high water mark"), because the South would never again invade, and certainly wouldn't invade further, and the South was never able to recover the lost men and equipment.

By about the same time was the **Siege of Vicksburg**, (MS). Grant cornered the confederate army there in and around Vicksburg and bombarded the city. Finally, it surrendered in July, 1863, which gave the Union control of the Mississippi River. It had sealed off the south, and could now continue to choke off supplies. At this point, with the war in the west won, Grant became the commander of the Union Army, which provided decisive leadership and military expertise.

a. The Gettysburg Address

On November 19, 1863, Lincoln appeared at Gettysburg to dedicate a memorial to the fallen soldiers, and delivered a 272 word speech that became his most famous, perhaps one of the most famous speeches in American history.

This is known as the Gettysburg Address:

Four score and seven years ago, our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in Liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great civil war, testing whether that nation, or any nation, so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure. We are met on a great battle-field of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field, as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this.

But, in a larger sense, we can not dedicate—we can not consecrate—we can not hallow—this ground. The brave men, living and dead, who struggled here, have consecrated it, far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us — that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion — that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain — that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom — and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

This once again won public approval and stated publicly just how important the War was—it was a battle to prove that the Revolution had not been fought in vain, and to prove for the world that the United States could be a place of freedom and of democracy.

9. Battle of Spotsylvania (1864)

Most of 1864, which included battles in Virginia such as the Battle of Spotsylvania, were decisive Union victories. Grant relentlessly pursued the retreating Confederates in Virginia, and General Philip Sheridan raided farms along the Shenandoah Valley to deprive Lee's army of critical supplies.

10. Sherman's March (1864-1865)

To finally bring the south to its knees, Union General **William T. Sherman** led a brutal march from Atlanta to Savannah, burning everything in his path. He then passed north, and went through the city of Columbia, destroying almost everything but USC. While the soldiers fired their cannons on Columbia, they also destroyed a statue of George Washington at the State House. Sherman's army then continued to North Carolina, where it fought a few battles and ultimately forced the Confederate troops in Raleigh to surrender by April, 1865.

D. End of the War

1. Surrender

In April, 1865, the Union invaded Richmond, and just a few days later, Lee surrendered after 4 years of fighting at Appomattox Court House on April 9, 1865. This is considered the official end of the war. In other areas, Confederate troops surrendered, and the war was over.

2. Assassination

Just days later, on April 14, 1865, Lincoln went to see a comedy play at Ford's Theater in Washington. In the middle of the performance, **John Wilkes Booth**, an actor and confederate sympathizer, slipped into the presidential box and shot Lincoln. Carried across the street to a home, Lincoln died a few hours later of his injuries. With this, Lincoln's vice-president, Andrew Johnson, took over.

3. More surrender

On April 26th General Joseph Johnston surrendered to Major General W. T. Sherman near Durham, North Carolina (Bennett Place State Historical Park), on May 4th General Richard Taylor (son of Zachary Taylor 12th President of the United States) surrendered at Citronelle, Alabama, on June 2nd General Edmund Kirby Smith surrendered the Confederate Department of the Trans Mississippi to Major General Canby, and on June 23rd General Stand Watie surrendered Cherokee forces in Oklahoma.

4. More captures

President Davis was captured at Irwinville, Georgia on May 10 and the remaining Confederate armies surrendered by June 1865. The last Confederate flag was hauled down, on CSS *Shenandoah* on November 6, 1865.

5. Aftereffects

With the surrender of Robert E. Lee at Appomattox Court House, **Edmund Ruffin**, the determined fire-eater who had bribed a VMI cadet to sit in the front row at John Brown's execution, who had fired the first shot at Fort Sumter, was in a state of depression. He had watched his own life, fortune, and morale take a nose dive. Now, maybe he would be captured. His slaves gone, his finances and family life ruined, he opened his diary on June 17, 1865, and wrote the following words:

I here declare my unmitigated hatred to Yankee rule -- to all political, social and business connection with the Yankees and to the Yankee race. Would that I could impress these sentiments, in their full force, on every living Southerner and bequeath them to every one yet to be born! May such sentiments be held universally in the outraged and down-trodden South, though in silence and stillness, until the now far-distant day shall arrive for just retribution for Yankee usurpation, oppression and atrocious outrages, and for deliverance and vengeance for the now ruined, subjugated and enslaved Southern States!

...And now with my latest writing and utterance, and with what will be near my latest breath, I here repeat and would willingly proclaim my unmitigated hatred to Yankee rule-

-to all political, social and business connections with Yankees, and the perfidious, malignant and vile Yankee race.

Ruffin then took out a pistol and shot himself through the head. Ruffin today is seen as a hero by many of the "Confederate" worshippers.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #3: What were some of the major battles and campaigns of the war, and what were the results? Which answer is true?

- a. The Battle of First Bull Run was the single bloodiest day of the war.
- b. The Battle of Antietam was considered the turning point of the war.

- c. The Siege of Vicksburg gave access to the Mississippi to the North, completing the blockade of the South
- d. Sherman's March through Georgia and South Carolina ended with Lee's surrender to Sherman at Appomattox Court House.

IV. Lived Experience of War A.

Casualties

The War effected a tremendous loss of human life: The Union had 364,511 dead, and the Confederacy had at least 260,000 dead (about 10% of all men in the South died in the war); there were over 620,000 American men dead as a result of the war, more than all American wars to this day put together. (In Vietnam, 57,000 men died, in Korea, 33,700 died, in the Revolution, 25,000 died)

B. Camp Life

By the end of the war, 2 million men served in the Union Army and another million had served in the Confederacy. They were mostly young, about 40 percent 21 or younger, they were mainly poor farmers and laborers, or unskilled workers. The majority were native-born, though there were immigrants that fought.

Most soldiers were given salt pork or pickled (salted) beef, cornbread or hardtack, crackers about an inch thick that were difficult to bite through. Coffee was the other main food source, yet because of the Union blockade, the Confederacy was short on it. Hungry troops also invaded farms and fields to get additional food. The poorest soldiers served as cooks, often the "slow" or clumsy soldiers had this honor.

Camp life was unhealthy as soldiers faced the deadly risk of disease, food poisoning, sunstroke or sunburn, and in the Confederate case, lack of hospital supplies. Nurses and surgeons lacked an understanding of germs, so infections were highly likely. Many battlefield injuries resulted in amputations.

C. The War on the Northern Homefront

The war had some important effects on both the North and the South. In the North, those who opposed the war were called **Copperheads**.

They frequently spoke out against Lincoln and criticized both the draft and the Emancipation Proclamation. They were sympathetic to the South. The most famous Copperhead was Clement Vallandigham whom Lincoln eventually banished to the south.

Not everyone in the North supported the war; there were draft riots in New York City in the summer of 1863. Workers in the Irish neighborhoods of New York City rose up, attacked draft officials and prominent Republicans, and lashed out on African American neighborhoods, whom they saw as responsible for the war. Over a four day period, over 100 people were killed. (This incident is shown in the end of the movie *Gangs of New York*). Indeed, as the war dragged on and was connected to slavery there were several racially-motivated riots in cities throughout the North.

The war did, however, help Northern industry because the millions of mobilized men required clothing, tents, and supplies, as a result new factories developed and government contracts helped industry continue to grow.

The Civil War provided new opportunities for northern reformers, especially women. The U.S. Sanitary Commission, a medical organization led by males, was staffed mainly by women. They collected and distributed medical supplies, clothing, and food, and advised on hospital conditions. Most nurses were women, including reformer Dorothea Dix, who headed up the Union's nursing corps and **Clara Barton**, who later founded the American Red Cross.

Some women used the war and the emphasis upon ending slavery to push for women's rights. Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony founded the Women's National Loyal League to draw attention to women's rights and to get attention for women's suffrage, but with no success. The war did nothing for women's rights, and women continued to be paid less.

D. Southern Life

Prices increased, the South experienced a shortage in food and basic items and was really desperate. Cotton production dropped dramatically, and food was scarce. With the military blockade, European manufactured goods couldn't reach the South, so the confederacy had to increase manufacturing and was able to provide guns and ammunition.

The Confederate draft produced an outcry; people could be required to serve in the war, but the rich could provide substitutes if they could pay the cost. The Confederacy eventually abolished this practice, but only towards the end of the war. Further, the draft exempted any white man from service if he owned 20 (or later, 15) slaves. More and more people complained that it was a rich man's war and a poor man's fight. As a result, many of the poorer white farmers, the non-slave owning yeomen, turned against the rich, and often times, refused to comply with the draft or after suffering massive casualties, deserted and returned home where they could then be tracked down and imprisoned, tortured, killed, or forced back to fight (this is shown in the movie *Cold Mountain*).

Women had new opportunities for both supervising the plantations in the place of their husbands, and working in manufacturing, which would have been unheard of if it wasn't for the war.

E. African Americans in the War 1. For the Union

Although Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation did not end slavery, it did allow African Americans to serve on the front lines of the Union Army. Before the Proclamation, slaves had been allowed to serve as ditch-diggers and other manual laborers but not as soldiers. Beginning in 1863 however, African Americans could serve as soldiers. Serving under white officers and earning less than white soldiers, they made up about 10% of the Union army. They made several important battlefield contributions.

In general, white soldiers and officers believed that black men lacked the courage to fight and fight well. A group of African American soldiers from Kansas won the respect of the Union in the Battle of Island Mound, Missouri in October 1862. By 1863, 14 African American Regiments were in the field and ready for service.

After a battle in Oklahoma against Confederate-supporting Indians, the 1st Kansas again fought with courage, and their commander, General James G. Blunt remarked, *"I never saw such fighting as was done by the Negro regiment.... The question that negroes will fight is settled; besides they make better solders in every respect than any troops I have ever had under my command."*

The most widely known battle fought by African Americans was the assault on Fort Wagner, South Carolina, which was on Morris Island near Charleston. The assault was done by the **54th Massachusetts** on July 18, 1863. The 54th volunteered to lead the assault on the strongly-fortified Confederate positions. The soldiers of the 54th scaled the fort's parapet, and were only driven back after brutal hand-to-hand combat. This is shown in the Movie *Glory*, starring Denzel Washington (it premiered in the early-1990s).

Although black soldiers proved themselves as reputable soldiers, discrimination in pay and other areas remained widespread. According to the Militia Act of 1862, soldiers of African descent were to receive \$10.00 a month, plus a clothing allowance of \$3.50. Many regiments struggled for equal pay, some refusing any money until June 15, 1864, when Congress granted equal pay for all black soldiers.

As the war continued, African American soldiers participated in every major campaign of 1864-1865 except Sherman's invasion of Georgia. In the **Battle of Fort Pillow**, in Tennessee, critics accused Confederate General Nathan Bedford Forrest of intentionally targeting and massacring African American Union troops. African Americans also served with distinction in the Shenandoah Valley in 1864.

In actual numbers, African American soldiers comprised 10% of the entire Union Army. Losses among African Americans were high, and from all reported casualties, approximately one-third of all African Americans enrolled in the military lost their lives during the Civil War.

At the end of the U.S. Civil War, many of these African American veterans served in the West. The army reorganized and formed two regiments of cavalry and two of infantry, commanded mainly by white officers, but by a few African American officers for the first time. These regiments served in the Great Plains and in the Indian Wars, and were known as "**Buffalo Soldiers**."

2. African Americans for the Confederacy

The lack of surviving records makes it difficult, but one estimate states that about 60,000-90,000 blacks, both slave and free, served in the confederate military in some capacity, however the majority of these were cooks, porters, musicians, and hospital attendants.¹

For most of the war, the Confederate Government prohibited the enlistment of African Americans as armed soldiers, however, black musicians could be paid. Some individual states allowed free blacks to enlist; Tennessee and Louisiana are examples.

¹ See Kevin M. Levin, "The 'Loyal Slave' Photo That Explains the Northam Scandal," *The Atlantic* (February 13, 2019), <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2019/02/ralph-northam-and-myth-loyal-slave/582619/>

In 1864, CSA General Patrick Cleburne and several other officers in Tennessee recommended offering slaves their freedom if they fought and survived, but President Davis refused to consider it. In the latter stages of the war, General Lee urged the CSA Congress to allow this, and only on March 23, 1865 did the law go into effect, by that time, the war was two weeks from being over, and the war ended. One of the units accompanied General Lee's retreat toward Appomattox and fought in a minor battle just two days before Lee's surrender.

For most plantation blacks, though some ran away to find their families, or because they were starving on the most fertile land in the world during the war, many waited to be liberated by Union troops. At this point, many stayed with their families to wait and see what would happen and to try to figure out where to go from there. Many remained on the plantation, but simply no longer worked.

F. Why did the North win and the South lose?

1. Why did the North Win?

Obviously the superior economic advantages, population and transportation superiority, and higher industrial output helped the South, but there were other factors as well. Lincoln's leadership was more effective than Davis's, and he kept the Border States in the Union. Further, Great Britain and France never jumped in to help the Confederacy. Lincoln defined the reasons of the war for the North as a matter of national pride; in the Gettysburg Address, as a way of preserving the republican experiment, and showing that the Revolution had not been fought in vain. Northern morale and support was high. In terms of military strategy, the Union's was solid, and it had far more troops.

2. Why did the Confederacy lose?

The Confederacy was forced to create a new government and military structure while at war from one that didn't already exist. They were unprepared and did not have the industry or the transportation, they faced the threat of internal dividedness especially between rich and poor whites, and desertions from the Army. Further, the South was choked off with the blockade on the East coast and along the Mississippi River, and was hemmed in by the Anaconda Plan.

3. Reconstruction

Thus with the war over, the South defeated, a debate would ensue in the Congress and in the North more broadly, about how to deal with the Confederacy, its leaders, its soldiers, and its victims. Eventually the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution would be ratified (outlawing slavery, guaranteeing citizenship, and outlawing voting rights discrimination based on race).

Despite the apparent turn toward guaranteeing racial equality, Reconstruction would end after 1877 and institutionalized racial discrimination would return, cloaked in the abolition of slavery but barely hiding the brutality of lynching, poverty, and inequality. Decades later, the myth of the Lost Cause would erase slavery from the history of the war while it planted memorials and statues praising the nobility of Southern sacrifice and the cause of states' rights. Although it lost the war, the South slowly won the battle for Americans' memory of the war, which might reveal more about American history than the war itself.

Pause for 60-second Quiz #4: What were some of the problems or disadvantages that caused the South to lose the war? Which answer is not true?

- a. The South was short of food and could not import much
- b. Southerners were apathetic about the war and saw no point in fighting

- c. The South was reluctant to arm and deploy African-American soldiers
- d. Southern men were resistant to a draft that privileged the wealthy

Key for 60-second Quizzes:

- 1. a.
- 2. d.
- 3. c.
- 4. b