

Group 1

Bacon's Rebellion

Question 1: What was Governor Berkeley's background? What was Nathaniel Bacon's background?

Governor Berkeley was born into wealth and power. He then was able to become well educated through studying at universities like Oxford. From there he thrived to make something of himself and accomplished it by becoming the governor of Virginia. Nathaniel Bacon on the other hand, although born into wealth as well, was less focused on his education - he dropped out of Cambridge. Instead, Bacon was a people person and spoke very eloquently. However, both men moved to America from the London area and they were related to each other through marriage.

Question 2: How do Bacon and his followers portray Governor Berkeley?

At the time of the Rebellion, Nathaniel Bacon was a wealthy farmer. All of the farmers in the area were united in ridding the area of Native Americans. However, Governor Berkeley was set on setting up a strong defense system, which consisted mostly of strong forts in order to prevent any raids from the Native Americans. The wealthy farmers wanted to attack the Native Americans to eradicate any future threat of any group raiding and stealing livestock or killing the farmer's men. It is because of this disagreement that Bacon's men portrayed Berkeley as weak and ill fit as governor. To prove this to his followers as well as Berkeley's followers, Bacon set out to kill and imprison as many Native Americans as possible, which was against Berkeley's orders, primarily through trickery.

Question 3: What serious economic problems was the colony facing at the time of the rebellion?

At the time of the rebellion, the economy in Virginia was in a bad state. Through Sir Edmund Andros, England was enforcing certain navigation acts upon the colonies that caused the prices of tobacco to plummet. The heavily controlled English market and the fact that English manufactured goods' prices were so high took a toll on the people of America. That process is known as mercantilism.

Question 4: What dispute with the Indians preceded the rebellion?

In 1675 the Doegs Indians insisted on the repayment of a debt owed to them by a local planter who declined. The Doegs then ran off some of the planter's livestock before one of them was slain. They returned later and killed the planter. This set off a series of events that led to the killings of not only the Doegs responsible but also some Susquehannocks who were innocent of that particular dispute.

Question 5: How did Governor Berkeley attempt to deal with the Indian problems?

Governor Berkeley proposed to build a line of defensive forts above the fall line of the main rivers and then have the area between them patrolled by rangers. Berkeley was also concerned with keeping friendly relations with the other Indians in the area.

Question 6: Why was the Long Assembly accused of corruption? How did its actions contribute to the tensions leading to the rebellion?

William Berkeley called up the *Long Assembly* in March 1676 to declare war on all so called *bad* Indians and set up a defensive zone around Virginia. This assembly was widely accused of being corrupt, mostly because of the high taxes levied on the colonists to pay the army supporting this defensive zone. These *frontier settlers* were made up mostly of former servants, and could not gain any say in these assemblies or any type of majority because of voter restrictions. Unable to win a majority in the assembly or these ideological contests, the minority accused the governor and the assembly he controlled of corruption. These frontier colonialists, who became frustrated by low tobacco prices and the unavailability of land ownership, decided to wage war for profit against all Indians, even the non-hostile tribes. Berkeley further angered the frontier settlers by restricting the fur trade to his close associates; this caused more accusations of corruption on the part of Berkeley. Most colonists saw this as Berkeley paying favorites, giving more rights to his friends and close associates than other colonists. In addition to this, Berkeley had demanded the building of costly forts to protect the colony from the Dutch navy, but these forts proved ineffective and the Dutch mauled the tobacco fleet regardless of these forts. This was yet another factor in angering the frontier settlers, who had been convinced by Berkeley to build the forts initially.

This caused colonists to denounce the building of any further forts and demanded a campaign to plunder the Indians for financial gain. Many of these Frontier colonists found a leader in Nathaniel Bacon, who actually was a distant relative of Governor Berkeley. Bacon publicly accused Berkeley of corruption and playing favorites because Bacon was one of the traders adversely affected by the Long Assemblies policy of not selling or trading any weaponry to Indians. This policy negatively affected not only Bacon but many other *frontier settlers* because they too were surviving off of trade in

weapons and ammunitions to the Indians.

Question 7: What reforms were adopted by the next assembly?

The new assembly in 1677 repudiated the reforms made by Berkeley's *Long assembly in 1676*. The most important reform that was made was new regulations for who could vote in the colonies, allowing freemen the right to vote. After Bacons death from dysentery, control was re-established by Berkeley. Berkeley decided to hang 23 of Bacons rebels, disregarding royal orders to show clemency. The next assembly was not responsible for providing funding to the Governor due to the passing of the *Revenue Act* forced into place by the *Lords of Trade*.

Question 8: What were Bacon's demands on the governor?

After newly empowered Henrico voters elected Bacon to the assembly, Berkeley arrested him in Jamestown and demanded that he apologize to the governor and council on his knees. Bacon was then forgiven and allowed to slip away to Henrico while the burgesses were hard at work passing reform laws on courts, the tax system, and the vestries. Bacon then assembled his supporters and marched on Jamestown. He demanded, at gunpoint, that Berkeley commission Bacon as General of the volunteer army and convince the legislative body to authorize another violent strike on the Natives. Bacon also later demanded in his Declaration in the name of the People that Berkeley and a list of his allies surrender themselves to the rebels within four days of the declaration. In this declaration, Bacon blamed Berkeley for virtually all of the colony's problems and accused him of crimes against the crown.

Question 9: What was the result of Bacon's Rebellion?

The result of Bacon's rebellion was a Virginian civil war in which settlers set against one another due to bitterness between classes. It was the biggest internal conflict of the colonies before 1775, were settlers fought and pillaged not only each other, but the Natives as well. A general neglect of agriculture and husbandry during the fighting resulted in famine and poverty. The rebellion also resulted in Bacon Burning Jamestown down and, after Bacon's death, Berkeley's hanging of 23 rebels. Baconian rebels continued to be persecuted and plundered by the governor's men through the courts. Also, after the rebellion many "great planters" intentionally looked to African slaves for labor instead of indentured servants. Perhaps the biggest result, however, was the economic pressure that the rebellion put on England. During the upheaval Virginia did not produce very much tobacco, English customs revenue plummeted, and the king had to ask Parliament for more money. This economic pressure lead to political unrest in the mother country.

Question 10: How is the rebellion remembered a generation later?

A generation after the Virginia Rebellion, the majority could look at that as the last ties being cut with England. At the time of the rebellion, King Charles II was receiving very little money from the tobacco that Virginia was growing. As the Lords of Trade attempted to enforce the Navigation Acts in all of the royal colonies, they also insisted that each colony pay for the cost of its own government. This, at the time, was appointed by the Crown and the Privy Council. It was this insistence that led the colonies to dig in the heels for self-rule. It is important to note that at the time of the Lords of Trade coming down on their colonies that Virginia was the only North American based colony, all of the others were located in the islands. Knowing that the Crown could not enforce any of its policies, Virginia set out to gain its independence from the Crown. Bacon's Rebellion can be viewed a generation later as power struggle between two influential leaders and the need to reevaluate the current forms of government.

Group 2

Question 1. What was Governor Berkeley's background?What was Nathaniel Bacon's background?

Before Berkeley was Governor he was a soldier who fought in the first and second Bishop wars.Which in turn gave him knighthood. He later became Governor of Virginia.

Nathaniel Bacon was born in to wealth by his father and he didnt complete college when he went.When he was to get married Elizabeth Duke her father rejected him and disinherited the daughter.He soon after was making trouble with some people and his dad sent nathaniel to virginia

Question 2.

How do Bacon and his followers portray Governor Berkeley? The men of Bacon's militia portray Berkeley as a man and also as a whole army who can not figure out the correct tactics to use when trying to stop the violence of the "Susquehannock" indian tribe. Sir William Berkeley, the governor of of Virginia around 1675, first started gaining negative attention when men that were affiliated with Berkeley killed nearly thirty innocent indians whom he thought were part of the "Susquehannock" indian tribe. This group of indians ransacked and killed a local planter after stealing his livestock. When the militia went to avenge the planters death they killed innocent members of the "Doeg" tribe. Where Bacon comes in is where he and his followers ignore Berkeley's orders by actively trying to pursue,and kill, the "Susquehannock" tribe whom had been running wild and using extreme hostility with all the

other tribes. After years of them battling each other in court, which in one occasion Berkeley had Bacon arrested and "made him go down on his knees before governor and council and apologize for his disobedience" that disobedience being Bacon getting fairly elected into the assembly. Following these occurrences, Bacon took everything into his own hands and held Berkeley at gunpoint and eventually made Berkeley commission him as general of volunteers and convinced legislature to authorize Bacon's "militia" or "followers" on an expedition to pursue the Indians and ideally end the "Susquehannock's" killing sprees. After years of Bacon being successful and outnumbering Berkeley's army, Berkeley eventually dies before actually "winning" the "battle" between and Bacon. However, Berkeley did finally regain control and used London tobacco ships to control the remaining rebel controlled areas and also regained the prominent colony of Virginia.

Question 3. What serious economic problems was the colony facing at the time of the rebellion?

At the time of the rebellion the colony was facing some serious economic problems. One of the problems they were facing was that the burgesses were passing laws to reform the tax system, county courts and the vestries.

Question 4. What dispute with the Indians preceded the rebellion?

Before the start of the rebellion there was a dispute with Bacon and the Indians. Bacon and his men were in search of the Susquehannocks camp. They found a village of Occaneechees who helped them find the Susquehannocks and attack them. When they returned with susquehannock captives, Bacon and his men massacred the Occaneechees when they fell asleep.

Question 5: How did Governor Berkeley attempt to deal with the Indian problems? Because of fear that a war from the Indians would occur, Governor Berkeley tried to distinguish between friendly and hostile Indians and ignore Bacon's idea to lead an attack against all of them. Question 6: Why was the Long Assembly accused of corruption? How did its actions contribute to the tensions leading to the rebellion? The Long Assembly was accused of corruption because it monopolized trade with the Indians; only those on good terms with Governor Berkeley would be able to trade with them. Bacon was one of the traders excluded from the business. Not only did that inspire Bacon to strike back, but the Long Assembly also caused high taxes among the colony to be able to fund the wars against the "bad" Indians.

Question 7. What reforms were adopted by the next assembly?

The assemble passed laws to reform the county courts, the vestries, and the tax system.

Question 8. What were Bacon's demands on the governor?

At gunpoint Bacon forced Berkeley to commission him as general of volunteers and compelled the legislature to authorize another expedition against the Indians.

Group #3

Question 1: Who are the Pequots?

Before the Mohicans went with the puritan English and the Pequot with the Dutch, they were once a single tribe together migrated to eastern Connecticut from the upper Hudson River Valley in New York. They spoke Algonquin and were agricultural people who raised corn, beans, squash, and tobacco. There was an emphasis on hunting and fishing because of their coastal location. The Pequots develop trading relationships with European and Native neighbors in fur and wampum. Pequot's location in eastern Connecticut gave them an advantage over their rivals. They were closer to New Netherlands (New York), and they controlled the lower Connecticut River, the traditional native trade route to the beaver areas of the interior. Pequot tried to dominate the Connecticut Bay by monopolizing the fur trade.

Question 2: What are some of the reasons given for the Pequot War with the colonists?

Pequot War was an armed conflict in 1634-1638. Before the war's inception, efforts to control fur trade access resulted in a series of escalating incidents and attacks that increased tensions. The Pequot's develop trading relationships with European and Native neighbors in fur and wampum. As the colonists expanded westward, friction began to develop. Points of tension included unfair trading, the sale of alcohol, and the destruction of Pequot crops by colonial cattle and competition over hunting grounds. Tension also increased as Massachusetts Bay Colony began to manufacture wampum, the supply of which the Pequot had controlled up until 1633. In September 1636 the English burned a Pequot village along the Pequot River in retaliation for the murder of an Englishman and earlier conflicts; initiating hostilities that lead to the Pequot War.

Question 3: Why did some of the other Native Americans ally with the colonists?

The Pequot's had a schism in 1631 when their leader Wopigwoot died and two sub-sachems, Sassacus and his son-in-law Uncas, were waiting in the wings expecting power. The Pequot council chose Sassacus as leader and this caused a brutal rivalry between the two and splitting the tribe into pro-English and pro-Dutch factions. Uncas never accepted it, eventually leaving and starting his own tribe. When Uncas broke off into his own tribe he was followed by the Mattabesic and other Pequot's who favored the English. The Mattabesic were pro-English because they were forced to pay tribute and be submitted to harsh Pequot rule, and they saw an opportunity to get price for furs. Many tribes who had been under the Pequot's thumb shared the Mattabesic's feelings. Sassacus the Pequot's grand sachem was pro-Dutch because of the standing relationship the Pequot's had with the Dutch who allowed the Pequot's to monopolize trade and dominate other area tribes with no interference. When the Pequot war started in 1637 the Pequot tried to call upon allies and found that due to past action not many wanted to align with them including the Mohegan tribe (Uncas tribe) and the Narragansett. Native American groups seemed not to want to align themselves with the English because of the harsh rule they had been submitted to and tight grip the Pequot had on the area's fur trade.

Question 4: Why is the Pequot War a negative image in early American history?

The Pequot War is a negative event in early American history for a few reasons. It was the first official war between the English settlers in New England and the Native Americans also living there. Colonial victory in the Pequot War also shaped the way the colonist would deal with Native Americans in the future. The Massachusetts and Connecticut colonies decided to fight with Native Americans again forty years later in Metacom's War due in part to the easy victory they remembered achieving in the Pequot War. Another reason why the Pequot war is a negative event in early American history is the way the colonist waged war against the Pequots. Soldiers from the colonies killed Pequot women, children and elderly as well as the men as they waged their war of annihilation against the Pequots. One such incident occurred at what is now Mystic, Connecticut. Soldiers from New England decided to attack a fort occupied by Pequot women, children and elderly. The soldiers set fire to the wigwams and massacred anyone who tried to flee as their allies from the Narragansett tribe watch in horror appalled by what they were witnessing. The victims were mostly women and children. The Pequot war is a negative event in early American history for two reasons. The first reason is the way the colonist waged war against and brutally annihilated the Pequot people. The second reason why the Pequot war is a negative event is because it was the first official war between the colonist and the Native Americans. The Pequot war also helped to shape future conflicts between the colonists and the Native Americans.

Question 5: What was the long-term fate of the Pequot's? Where are they today?

The Pequot in 1620 was 6,000 members strong and endured perhaps one of the harsher series of torment and abuse throughout their existence. In the winter of 1633-34 the Pequot's population was threatened by the small pox epidemic, and by 1637 half of the Pequot died off through disease and warfare. After the Pequot War, the tribe was "absorbed by their hosts" (www.dickshovel.com/peq.html) through a carefully written Peace Treaty signed in Hartford in 1638. The "treaty" intended to dismember the Pequot and insure the inexistence of the tribe through execution, separation, and the slave trade in the West Indies. The dismemberment of the Pequot Natives naturally encouraged conflict. Those who were not executed or traded, approximately 1,000 natives, were placed under Uncas and Mohegan tribe's jurisdiction. This influx of members strengthened the Mohegan and led to victory against the Narragansett in 1644. The Mohegan became the most dominant tribe in southern New England. The Pequot, however, were treated as material possessions; they were separated into small groups and were forbidden to even refer to themselves by their tribe name. Torment, labor, and discrimination revolved around the segregated members, and to make conditions worse, the Pequot were forced to pay the Mohegan annually in wampum for the mercy shown to spare their lives. As every action has a reaction, the English were eventually forced to remove the Pequot from the Mohegan tribe in 1655, an act that was uncommon because the English generally overlooked intertribal conflict. The Mohegan and Pequot were divided between eastern and western Connecticut. In time, these became the Mashantucket (Western Pequot) reserve at Ledyard (1666), as well as, the Pawcatuck (Eastern Pequot) reservation at Lantern Hill (1683). In Connecticut, by 1666, the Pequot were only 140 people, and the decline reached a count of 66 by the 1910 census. (www.dickshovel.com/peq.html) Today there are thought to be approximately 1,000 Pequot, and although much has changed to the people's traditions, their separated reservations are federally recognized and still exist today.

Question 6: How is the Pequot fate a microcosm of Native American interaction with colonists?

The Pequot fate is a microcosm of Native American interactions with colonists. In that, it involved some of the most violent and drastic circumstances and outcomes; rapid decline of population from disease and war, misunderstanding and betrayals, plotting and surprise attacks, fear, the expansion of Europeans and finally the movement of Native Americans to a more "suitable" place. The Pequot fate is very much a microcosm or fore vision of things to come. The Pequot population decline did not belong entirely to war; disease also played a role in decline. "After a major smallpox epidemic during the winter of 1633-34 and the separation of the Mohegan, there were still about 3,000 Pequot in 1637. Less than half are believed to have survived the Pequot War of that year." (dickshovel.com) Here we see death from European diseases and the outbreak of war, both of which happen on a much larger scale throughout the exploration of the Americas. Betrayal (on both sides) was common with the European settlers and the Indians, maybe because of misunderstandings or because of greed. Peace was rarely upheld, and treaties were as worth as much as ice coffee on a

cold winter day. The relocation of Indians at this time in history was not as detrimental as it would be in the future. After the Pequot war the Pequot were put under neighboring factions' power. However "In 1650, the Pequot's at Nameag achieved their goal when Governor Winthrop freed them from Uncas's control and granted them land of their own at a place called Noank." (pequotmuseum.org) The Pequot fate through war, disease, treaties, power loss and power growth, and relocation is very much so a microcosm of Native American interactions with colonist.

Group 4

1) Who are the Pequots?

The Pequot were a tribe of Indians who resided in Eastern Connecticut at the time of the first contact with the Europeans. It appears that the Pequot and Mohegan tribes were once a single tribe whom migrated to eastern Connecticut from the upper Hudson River in New York, but the tribes seemed to split into two separate tribes in the early 16th century. The Pequot tribe members were a tremendously organized, aggressive and warlike tribe. Despite the fact that the Pequot were only a population of 3,000 people, their centralized government gave them huge military superiority over neighboring tribes, which led to dominating mostly all of Eastern Connecticut before 1637. As were their neighbors, the Pequot were agricultural people, during the summer months, the tribe would harvest corn, beans, squash, and tobacco. Since the Pequot were located along the coast, the hunters focused most of their attention on fish and seafood.

2) What are some of the reasons given for the Pequot War with the colonists?

The Pequot war was a result of many conflicting problems between the Indians and Colonists. The disputes were over damage to Indian crops, livestock, hunting, property expansion, and unfair trade. With the Colonists wanting more land, it threatened the neighboring Indians, primarily the Pequot Indians who controlled the fertile Thames River Valley in Eastern. "Richard Mather, in a sermon delivered in Boston, denounced the Pequot as the "accursed seeds of Canaan," in effect turning the confrontation in Connecticut into a "holy war" of the Puritans against the forces of darkness."

3) Why did some of the other Native Americans ally with the colonists?

Certain other tribes and groups of native americans allied with the Pequod for several reasons. Most of the reasons stemmed from the fact that the Pequod where one of, if not the, most prominent and powerful tribe of the region. This prominence in both military and by consequence economic realms made them an obvious target for other smaller tribes within the region that would profit from there downfall. in addition to this other groups likely hoped either replace the Pequod as the most important Native American tribe or faction within the reason or at least to end up on the "winning side" of the conflict. Lastly it is very possible that some of these smaller groups hoped to curry favor with English colonist by helping them in there wars or at least gain access to any possible spoils of war that might be accrued during the conflict.

4) Why is the Pequot War a negative image in early American history?

The Pequot War is a negative image in early American History because the soldiers who attacked the Pequots attacked the fort with women, children, and the elderly in it. The soldiers had the choice to attack the fort with the men in it, but they decided to attack the weaker of the two and consider it a victory.

5) What was the long term fate of the Pequots? Where are they today?

The war had turned its toll on the Pequots. Not being able to withstand the heavy resistance from the English, the tribe broke apart. Although many of the Pequots were able to vanish into surrounding woods and other villages, eventually they would meet their destiny. Under the leadership of John Mason, the Puritans combined forces with the Mohegan, and Narragansett tribes, burning the Pequot village down, killing a substantial amount of the Pequot population. Most of the Pequots who escaped were soon found and either killed, or given to the English as slaves. Following the war, all known survivors had been killed or enslaved, and the name Pequot was banned. The Mohgans then went on to become the strongest tribe in Southern New England after having defeated the Narragansett in 1644. Many of the Pequot migrated away from their small colonies in Connecticut, and by 1910 there were only 66 left. "Many things have changed for the Mashnatucket Connecticut sold off 600 acres of their reservation without permission in 1856, and a lawsuit filed in 1976 to recover this land resulted in a \$700,000 settlement. Federal recognition was received in 1983, and after a successful bingo operation, an incredibly profitable gambling casino was opened in 1992, which has made the Mashantucket Pequot the wealthiest group of Native Americans in the United States. After a 350-year truce, the Mashantucket may actually have won the Pequot War". (<http://www.dickshovel.com/peq.html>)

6) How is the Pequot fate a microcosm of Native American interaction with colonists?

The Pequot fate shows the interaction of Indians and colonists by saying the puritan army chose to attack the second fort, holding women, children, and the elderly. It seems to me that the colonists learned to attack the weaker fort, to get a better and easier victory. They remembered Saul and the Amalekites and connected with that, the horrified

Narragansett Indians looking on as normal allies of the settlers.

Group 5

Battle of Quebec

Links:

<http://www.britishbattles.com/battle-of-quebec.htm>
<http://www.louisbourg.ca/hero.htm>
<http://www.militaryheritage.com/montcalm.htm>
<http://www.militaryheritage.com/wolfe.htm>

Questions:

Question 1: How did Montcalm come to be the French commander in Canada? What had prepared him for this position?

Montcalm, from a young age was being promoted to higher ranks in the military. Sometimes it was bought for him such as the time his father bought him his capstan spot when he was 17, or when he was victorious and his superiors felt like he deserved it. D'Argenson sent Montcalm a letter telling him that the king had chosen him to command his troops in North America and that he was now rank of Major-General.

- At 9 years old, Montcalm was commissioned as an ensign in the regiment d'hainaut
- At age 17, he was promoted to captain in the same regiment
- In 1732, he began his active military service
- In 1744, he was made into a knight of Saint-Louis
- In 1756, due to Baron de Dieskau's capture, Montcalm was made Major-general receiving rank and pay to the equivalent of Dieskau's.
- In 1758, he was promoted to Lieutenant-General. Which is the 2nd highest rank in the French army.

Question 2: How did Wolfe come to be British commander in Canada? What had prepared him for this position?

After the surrender of Louisbourg, Wolfe's efficient handling of the battle was brought to the attention of the British government and people when Major-General Jeffery Amherst's journal was published. Wolfe returned to England in late 1758 at what he thought was the behest of the British army's commander-in-chief, Lord Ligonier. Wolfe also went because of the poor condition of his health. When he got to London, Wolfe found orders for him to remain in America. When Wolfe had his first interview with Ligonier, he expressed his desire to go up the river but not to be given a large role in the enterprise. It seems though that Ligonier and William Pitt had other ideas because they both recommended him to the king. On January 12, 1759 Wolfe was appointed Major-General and commander-in-chief of the land forces for the expedition against Quebec.

James Wolfe's Military Preparation:

- Served with distinction in the War of Austrian Succession as well as the Scottish campaign against the Jacobite insurrection.
- 1748 saw the end of the Austrian War of Succession and Wolfe appointed Major of the 20th foot. Wolfe was then stationed in Scotland.
- While stationed in Glasgow, Wolfe studied Latin and Math. When Edward Cornwallis was promoted to governor of Nova Scotia Wolfe was made acting Lieutenant Colonel and in-practice commander of the regiment.
- Confirmed as Lieutenant Colonel in 1750.
- In 1757, William Pitt the elder made Wolfe second in command under Major-General Jeffery Amherst, British commander-in-chief in North America for the expedition against Louisbourg.
- Wolfe led the landing in rough seas at Kennington Cove to begin the assault on Louisbourg.
- Wolfe quickly captured the batteries and silenced them, with the batteries gone Wolfe and his troops could now attack Louisbourg on three sides.
- Louisbourg surrendered under the pressure.
- Wolfe's outstanding work on the siege and capture of Louisbourg led to him being appointed Major-General and command of military and naval forces against Quebec.

Question 3: Compare the backgrounds and military careers of the two men.

-James Wolfe was most known for his courage and death in the victory on the Plains of Abraham which secured Canada for the British and marked the spot of the first British Empire. He served in many wars in Europe. Earned promotion to major general and the command of a military and naval expedition against Québec after the siege and capture of the French fortress of Louisbourg, NS. He was very successful in his campaigns.

-Marquis de Montcalm the commander for French forces in N. America was best known for making grave mistakes, underestimating his own forces and not seeing crucial strategic moves in battle that could have helped the French. In the battle of the Plains of Abraham, With the British close to defeat, Montcalm chose the one course of action that ensured the defeat of the French. He decided to attack prematurely with the few inexperienced men he had and ended up fleeing and being killed. Today most people blame Montcalm alone for being responsible for that defeat and the ensuing loss of the French colonial empire in North America.

Question 4: What was Wolfe's strategy at the Battle of Quebec? How did Montcalm try to counter this?

Wolfe set sail for the St. Lawrence river. Montcalm expected to be attacked from Lake Ontario and Lake Champlain. Wolfe and the British's plan was to cut off supplies to Quebec by river and they were successful. Wolfe determined to land on the steep banks of the St. Lawrence to the west of the city. The British climbed up the steep banks to the plains of Abraham. Montcalm had to ask the governor of Quebec for guns and he was only given three. The British only had one gun. The French fired first and at too great a distance. The British waited until the French advanced well within range. Two volleys destroyed the French line and they were driven from the field.

Question 5: Why was Quebec so important in the war?

Quebec was controlled by the French in 1759. In order for the American colonies to rely less on the British they needed to take control of Quebec. The winning of this battle resulted in the beginning of the end of French rule in Canada.

Question 6: What was the result of the battle both short term and long term?

Overall, there were heavy casualties on both sides, the Americans suffered a more vast number than the British. The British at the time was known for their navy and were trained soldiers. Those who were not killed were captured and taken as prisoners, some of them imprisoned for years and even died. Many on both sides died of the winter conditions and smallpox. Americans were beaten badly but overall came out on top.

Group 6: Battle of Quebec

What had prepared Montcalm for his position as French commander?

There was the threat of impending war of Europe, caused directly by increasing tensions between the French and the British in North America. Because of this none of the experienced general officers wanted to serve in the New World—it was too far away from Europe. Montcalm was given the job partly because no one else wanted it and partly because of his past military experience. Montcalm had been prepared for the post of major-general by years of military service. Montcalm served in the War of Polish Succession, in the war of Austrian Succession (after which he was granted the title of knight) and other skirmishes overall serving for more than thirty years in more than ten different campaigns (where he received five wounds).

What had prepared Wolfe for his position as British commander?

James Wolfe was raised in Westerham, England throughout the early years of his childhood. In 1738 the Wolfe family moved to Greenwich, London, which is where James finished the remainder of his education. James's father was a British army officer so it was no surprise when James, at the age of 14, volunteered for an expedition that his father was the commander of. Although he was denied then because of illness, the following year he would serve under his father, which would be the beginning of his military career. James distinctively served through the war of Australian succession and steadily climbed the military ranks to eventually serve as captain of his regiment. In 1748, following the end of the Australian succession, Wolfe, who at this point, served boldly through seven military campaigns, was appointed to major and stationed in Scotland. In 1757, a year after the seven-year war had broken out, Wolfe was assigned his first active duty in the war, which turned out to be a failure. Although his reputation did not suffer, as a result his regiment was converted and he was appointed to colonel. In 1758 Wolfe led his regiment in to a successful assault and takeover of the French fortress in Louisbourg, Wolfe returned a hero and was promoted to major and commander of the naval and military expedition against Quebec.

What were the similarities of the two commanders?

Wolfe and Montcalm had many similarities, they began their military careers very young, both became experienced leaders during the Australian succession and they were both established leaders for their kingdoms by the time the war had broken out. All of these virtues would prove to benefit both men until they met in the battle of Quebec, where Wolfe and Montcalm were killed.

What was Wolfe's strategy?

Wolfe's strategy was based upon his assessment of the relative strengths of his and Montcalm's forces. The French force

was composed of approximately 16,000 troops, mainly poorly or untrained militia, while the British force was composed of 8,000 troops, almost all highly trained regulars. Wolfe believed that his regulars could defeat the French force if he could engage it in the open were the poor training of the militia would render them ineffective. Montcalm knew this and so stayed in his fortified positions around Quebec where the French militia had the advantage. As long as the French stayed in their positions the British did not have the resources to defeat them. Wolfe tried various means to get the French out into the open such as a frontal attack, cutting the French supply lines, bombarding Quebec, and using American rangers to burn French settlements south of Quebec. Finally Wolfe landed 4,500 troops west of Quebec and assembled them on the Plains of Abraham which prompted Montcalm to march out to meet him with 5,000 troops. In the ensuing battle the French were defeated and both Wolfe and Montcalm were killed.

Why was Quebec important?

Quebec was very important in the war. In September 1759, the French were ahead, they were in charge of Quebec and had 500 more troops than the British. But as we all know that did not stop General Wolfe from leading the British to victory. Quebec was located on the Canadian side of the St. Louis river. The French and British knew that who ever conquered Quebec would determine the fate of Canada and America.

What was the result of the war?

In 1763, Great Britain, France and Spain signed, what was later called, the peace of Paris, which brought an end to the war. Martinique as well as Guadeloupe were returned to France while a great deal of North America and the West Indian islands were surrendered to Great Britain. The British were overcome by pride, now they could develop the colonies and take advantage of the mass resources America had to offer. Although the British perceived that they had brought an end to warfare and were soon to be rewarded with abundant prosperity, the natives did not expect that the French had the power to surrender their land to the British. The confrontation seemed over and Britain was clearly the victor, but the Indians did not share the same enthusiasm and began to plan their own war.

GROUPS # 7 - The Great Awakening

Question 1: How did Jonathan Edwards describe the power of God? What did he believe was the nature of man?

Not only is God "sovereign, and has a sovereign right to dispose and order in that affair; and he not only might proceed in a sovereign way, if he would, and nobody could charge him with exceeding his right; but he actually does so; he exercises the right which he has."

Edwards believed the nature of man is "corrupt and evil," or to put it scholarly: the depravity of humankind.

"As all moral qualities, all principles, either of virtue or vice, lie in the disposition of the heart, I shall consider whether we have any evidence, that the heart of man is naturally of a corrupt and evil disposition."

Question 2: How did he describe the horrors of hell? What prevented evil people from being immediately plunged into hell?

1)"And the reason why they do not go down to hell at each moment, is not because God, in whose power they are, is not then very angry with them; as he is with many miserable creatures now tormented in hell, who there feel and bear the fierceness of his wrath. Yea, God is a great deal more angry with great numbers that are now on earth." One might stay out of Hell a while longer because according to the text, God is more angry with the grater numbers of people on earth.

2)"Your wickedness makes you as it were heavy as lead, and to tend downwards with great weight and pressure towards hell; and if God should let you go, you would immediately sink and swiftly descend and plunge into the bottomless gulf, and your healthy constitution, and your own care and prudence, and best contrivance, and all your righteousness, would have no more influence to uphold you and keep you out of hell, than a spider's web would have to stop a falling rock." so if one were to be strong in the faith then God wouldn't "let you go" then you wouldn't immediately go to hell. He would hold you up a while longer. horrors of hell include:

1) "The old serpent is gaping for them; hell opens its mouth wide to receive them; and if God should permit it, they would be hastily swallowed up and lost." Serpents waiting to swallow you;

2) "Flames of hell." Constant Flames;

3) "the devil is waiting for them, hell is gaping for them, the flames gather and flash about them, and would fain lay hold on them, and swallow them up;" the Devil himself;

4) "If God should only withdraw his hand from the flood-gate, it would immediately fly open, and the fiery floods of the fierceness and wrath of God, would rush forth with inconceivable fury, and would come upon you with omnipotent power; and if your strength were ten thousand times greater than is, yea, ten thousand times greater than the strength of the stoutest, sturdiest devil in hell, it would be nothing to withstand or endure it." floodgate of Gods Wrath rushing forth with inconceivable fury;

5) "it is a great furnace of wrath, a wide and bottomless pit, full of the fire of wrath, that you are held over in the hand of that God, whose wrath is provoked and incensed as much against you, as against many of the damned in hell." Great furnace of wrath, wide bottomless pit full of fire and wrath;

6) "There will be no end to this exquisite horrible misery. When you look forward, you shall see a long for ever, a boundless duration before you, which will swallow up your thoughts, and amaze your soul; and you will absolutely despair of ever having any deliverance, any end, any mitigation, any rest at all. You will know certainly that you must wear out long ages, millions of millions of ages, in wrestling and conflicting with this almighty merciless vengeance;" everlasting misery, absolute despair. No rest at all.

source: Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God, Jonathan Edwards (1703-1758) Enfield, Connecticut. July 8, 1741; <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/edwards/sermons.sinners.html>

Question 3: What language did he use to instill fear and a sense of urgency in his audience?

What language did he use to instill a sense of fear and urgency in his audience? In his sermon, Edwards used a dramatic tone that he did not often employ in his sermons. Usually, Edwards sermons were nothing dramatic but in this one he used what is often referred to as "fire and brimstone preaching" to get his point across to the masses. The reason for this was he was preaching to an audience who was sceptical to the ideas of the great awakening. Knowing he couldn't just preach like any normal sermon, John knew he needed to invoke passion and belief in his words to almost intimidate his audience into conforming to his ideals. ..

Question 4: According to Edwards, how could his listeners avoid the fate that he described so graphically?

Analyze the French loss in North America. The loss was big they lost many goods and family it was a big turn around for the French but they still began to move forward and be able to bounce back after awhile, God is more angry with the greater numbers of people on earth

Question 5: What was Edwards's response to the Enlightenment?

When Boston's Charles Chauncy (very much a man of the Enlightenment) attacked the revivals as frauds because of their emotional excesses, Edwards replied with *A treatise concerning Religious Affections* (1746), which displayed his own mastery of Enlightenment sources, including Newton and Locke. Although admitting that no emotional response, however intense, was proof by itself of the presence of God in a person's soul, he insisted that intense feeling must always accompany the reception of divine grace. That view upset people who believed that a rational God must have established a polite and genteel religion. For Edwards, an unemotional piety could never be the work of God. In effect, Edwards countered Chauncy's emotional defense of reason with his own rational defense of emotion.

Question 6: Why was Edwards dismissed from his church in Northampton?

In 1750, Edwards' church dismissed him from Northampton after he attempted to impose stricter qualifications for admission to the sacraments upon his congregation. Concerned that the "open admission" policies instituted by Stoddard allowed too many hypocrites and unbelievers into church membership, he became embroiled in a bitter controversy with his congregation, area ministers, and political leaders. His dismissal is often seen as a turning point in colonial American history because it marked the clear and final rejection of the old "New England Way" constructed by the Puritan settlers of New England. In her study of Northampton during Edwards' pastorate, Patricia Tracy described the social and political forces at work in the town as a reflection of larger economic, social and ideological forces then reshaping American culture. Ironically, then, the colonial theologian who best anticipated the intellectual shape of modern America also was its first victim.

Edward's dismissal from the Northampton congregation was, in the end, a multitude of things that ultimately became too much for the majority to handle. Opposition to his leadership was already present from the days of the revival, but most adhered to his words and teachings. Opposition to his leadership increased due to a pay dispute between, and then more so when Edward's uncovered that many children, some of prominent families, had been reading books on midwifery. Edward's publicly read out the names of those guilty, which a lot saw as the completely wrong thing to do. The factor that ultimately led to his dismissal however, was the decision announced in 1748 that only those who publicly confessed their conversion experience would be admitted to the Lord's Supper. This was a policy introduced by his own grandfather, and Edward's himself had been following it for 20 years. This proved too much for the congregation as a whole to handle, and thus his dismissal was forced. The church voted 200 to 23 against Edward's, and he preached his final sermon on the 1st of July, 1750.

Question 7: What was Edwards's contribution to the debate over free will versus determinism?

"A Careful and Strict Inquiry into the Modern Prevailing Notions of that Freedom of Will..." (1754), in which he attempted to prove that the will was determined by the inclination of either sin or grace in the soul. This book, one of the most important works in modern western thought, set the parameters for philosophical debate on freedom and determinism for the next century and a half.

Question 8: What has been Edwards's legacy?

Jonathan Edwards' legacy is one that is still felt strongly to this day, and will be for years to come. He has been proven to be one of the most influential and revolutionary religious thinkers in United States history. Through his work, he inspired the first indigenous school of theology in the US, and through his disciples his work was able to be spread far and wide. His teachings began to spread, through his disciples, to areas as far as Africa and Asia.

During his studies at Yale, Edwards wrote almost exclusively on natural philosophy and metaphysics. Simultaneous with and yet distinct from the great English idealist George Berkeley, Edwards formulated a metaphysical system that was idealistic, designed to challenge Aristotelianism. Edwards refuted both the speculations of Hobbes and Descartes concerning the nature of reality and substance in ways that anticipated theoretical physics. His metaphysics also had a singularly aesthetic component to it; for Edwards, beauty was an essential aspect of an entity, which subsisted in the harmony or agreement of its parts. This approach continues to inform modern ethics.

In 1734-1735, Edwards oversaw some of the initial stirrings of the First Great Awakening. He gained international fame as a revivalist and "theologian of the heart" after publishing *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God* (1738), which described the awakening in his church and served as an empirical model for American and British revivalists alike.

The widespread revivals of the 1730's and 1740's stimulated one of the two most fruitful periods for Edwards' writings. In this period, Edwards became very well known as a revivalist preacher who subscribed to an experiential interpretation of Reformed theology that emphasized the sovereignty of God, the depravity of humankind, the reality of hell, and the necessity of a "New Birth" conversion. While critics assailed the convictions of many supposed converts as illusory and even the work of the devil, Edwards became a brilliant apologist for the revivals. In *The Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God* (1741), *Some Thoughts Concerning the Present Revival* (1742), *A Treatise Concerning Religious Affections* (1746), and *The Life of David Brainerd* (1749), he sought to isolate the signs of true sainthood from false belief. The intellectual framework for revivalism he constructed in these works pioneered a new psychology and philosophy of affections, later invoked by William James in his classic *Varieties of Religious Experience* (1902).

Through the Second Great Awakening, his teachings were further pushed out to the masses by the work of Yale's Nathaniel William Taylor. Later works of both fiction and history would feature influences of Edward's teachings and beliefs. In 1737, John Wesley, a Methodist from Oxford University, was so deeply moved by Edwards' *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God* (1737) that he abandoned his High Church pieties as he found his life's mission, the conversion of sinners, and it launched him on an extraordinary preaching career in England. George Whitefield, another influential revivalist and a contemporary of John Wesley, met Edwards in 1740 as he swept across the colonies with a tour of sermons that attracted tens of thousands people.

His early disciples, led by the Revs. Samuel Hopkins (1721-1803) and Joseph Bellamy (1719-90), spread his views far and wide by means of their storied "schools of the prophets" (ministerial training grounds that preceded modern seminaries), ecclesiastical reforms (most importantly, their reversal of New England's "Half-Way Covenant"), publications, concerts of prayer and frequent revivals. Edwards's distinction between the sinner's "natural ability" (i.e. constitutional capacity) and "moral inability" (i.e. ineradicable unwillingness) to repent and believe the gospel, and his related, universal appeal for "immediate repentance," were especially influential in shaping his legacy. By the end of the eighteenth century, his disciples, with these doctrines, had begun to lead the modern Protestant missions movement--both from England and the U.S.--exporting Edwardsian evangelicalism to far-flung posts in Africa, south Asia, and to west of the America's Appalachian Mountains (i.e. the "western frontier").

Edwards' views contributed to the ministry of Charles Grandison Finney (1792-1875); they were contested during a rupture of Connecticut Congregationalists in the early 1830s (the notorious "Taylorite-Tylerite" split); they shaped the doctrines of the New School Presbyterians, north and south, yielding a Presbyterian schism beginning in 1837; and they informed the views of Baptists, both in England and America, from William Carey (1761-1834) and Andrew Fuller (1754-1815) to Isaac Backus (1724-1806), Jonathan Maxcy (1768-1820) and even William Bullein Johnson (1782-1862), the leading founder of the Southern Baptist Convention.

By the antebellum period, Edwards's thought and reputation had made their way into the leaves of American literary culture. His typology resurfaced in the work of Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-82). His doctrines shaped the "woman's fiction" of authors like Susan Warner (1819-85). His reputation, as well as those of some of his New Divinity followers, infused historical novels by writers like Harriet Beecher Stowe (1811-96).

The New England Theology proper died with Edwards Amasa Park (1808-1900), dubbed "the last of the consistent Calvinists," who defended Edwards's views for many years at Andover Seminary. But since the end of the Civil War, Edwards's legacy has expanded through the lives of many who used his work selectively. Groups as diverse as the Old Princetonians (e.g., Charles Hodge and B. B. Warfield), the progressive New Theologians (e.g., Theodore Munger and Frank Hugh Foster), American Pragmatists (e.g., William James and John Dewey), neo-orthodox (e.g., Joseph Haroutunian and Richard Niebuhr) and evangelical thinkers (e.g., R. C. Sproul and John Piper) have continued to make Edwards known to modern audiences.

Edwards was the most able apologists for revivals in Britain or America and probably the most profound theologian that North America has yet produced. During his lifetime his teachings were available in several different countries. Today, they are available still in 13 different languages.

Group Eight

Question 1: How did Jonathan Edwards describe the power of God? What did he believe was the nature of man?

Jonathan Edwards believed in God's absolute and infinite power over people, but along with this power also came an everlasting love. In his sermon "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God" Edwards spoke of God's ability to easily cast man into hell, and that man had no power to resist or fight. This sermon, directed at the "unbelieving Israelites," showed Edward's respect, admiration, and fear of God. Jonathan Edwards viewed God as the absolute highest power, and that power is only restricted by God's will. He compared God's power to that of dammed waters. Just as the water keeps

filling up, so does God's anger at man – and when the power is unleashed it is unforgiving and relentless. Edwards believed that man was sinful by nature. In the same sermon quoted above, Edwards spoke of man's wicked nature and the "hellish" things man did. Because man was sinful by nature he was bound for hell, and it was just a matter of time before God brought down upon him this fate. Man had not followed God's laws, and therefore only one end was possible – forever damnation in hell at the will of God.

Question 2: How did he describe the horrors of hell? What prevented evil people from being immediately plunged into hell?

Edwards describes Hell as a pit, one with slippery slopes for men to be cast in forever. Hell is a place where the Devil will take man from God, only after God decides it is time. Hell is a place where the serpents swallow a person up and there is no hope of returning to God. Hell is an everlasting fire, and one will spend eternity pondering the ills of their life on Earth according to Edwards.

Edwards said it was the mere pleasure of God that kept men from immediately going to hell. Jonathan Edwards believed in God's sovereignty, and because of this, God was the highest power – the only power. Edwards said it was solely up to God as to when a man would be cast into the damnation of Hell. Man could not change this fate, as it was just a question of when God was going to send a person to Hell – not if God was sending them to Hell.

Question 3: What language did he use to instill fear and a sense of urgency in his audience?

Edwards used a fierce tongue in his sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God." This was because when he was speaking this particular sermon it was to a church that was not following the norm of the time and The Great Awakening which was occurring across the eastern seaboard. This term of speech could be referred to as "fire and brimstone" that would be the fate of those who did not see the errors of their ways. His language made the depths of hell vivid and used a lot of imagery to get his point to his audience. This was a form of fear that he tried to instill that people would try and improve themselves in hopes of saving their souls in the afterlife.

Question 4: According to Edwards, how could his listeners avoid the fate that he described so graphically?

Edwards preached that God was the way for salvation. He preached God's mercy was what would determine if one would spend eternity in Heaven or Hell. Edwards' use of preaching about the depths of Hell were a warning he sent to those who would listen. He explained hell as somewhere that must be avoided at all costs. The only true salvation was the mercy of God and that the individual needed to seek the salvation of God.

Question 5: What was Edwards's response to the Enlightenment?

Jonathan Edwards was at the forefront of The First Great Awakening. With his 1738 writings, "A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God," Edwards lit a fire under many in his Church – and it was used by both American and British revivalists as well. The above quoted publication led to more writings in the 1740s and Edwards became world famous for his views and as a theologian. Many followed in Jonathan Edwards' footsteps, but because of his writings and leadership, he is perhaps the most famous theologian in the history of the New World. He held his own against opposition in the Colonies against his preachings, and all accusations that the emotional outbursts of his revivalist flock were fraudulent, even accusations by prominent pro-Enlightenment Bostonians. Edwards held that such outbursts were the only signs that a soul had truly converted.

Question 6: Why was Edwards dismissed from his church in Northampton?

Edwards was dismissed from his church in 1750 because he felt it was too simple and easy for parishioners to be a member of the church without following the word of God. This "Open Admission" policy was not in line with Edwards' beliefs, and something had to be done so the Church would survive. These people just thought by showing up they would be saved, even though in Edwards' mind they were not living a "Christian Life." He fought the Church on their open door policy and lost, but history has taught us Edwards was right in his approach, as his reputation and clout won over many converts in the years after his removal.

Question 7: What was Edwards's contribution to the debate over free will versus determinism?

Edwards' debate or view on free will vs. determinism is that man is free to do what he chooses, wants and desires. With determinism it can be viewed religiously or with politics, God has been known through religious studies that he determines the will of man. But the argument is that all humankind has the free will to choose? The choices we make can determine our actions with God. "Sin and corruption of humanity, no one is towards God but God is in charge of our freedom." (Edwards). Edwards believes that to have determinism shouldn't there should be someone that is of greater power aka religion to be the "determiner." Being the determiner is being able to decide what happens when we use our free will to make choices that lead to sin and corruption. I have known that free agency is granted to all, that we are

held accountable for the choices we make. This greater figure that has been known to be god, has granted us the ability to have free will; because he already knows are consequences. That doesn't mean live in fear of the greater one that holds our will, just means take risks knowing you'll be held responsible for them. I believe Edwards didn't find closure to this debate because these two topics go good together and people could argue this for days. He came to the conclusion we are free to choose, we have the power of free will. Determinism is defined in theology as not the exercise of free will, but that human action is caused by previous events. Edwards addresses determinism in "Freedom of the Will." Jonathan Edwards believed that God made a decision at one's birth as to whether or not that person would enter heaven. Nothing a person did in their life could change God's decision.

Question 8: What has been Edwards's legacy?

Edward's legacy has been known to leave an historical imprint on the American history and religion of today. His followers in his time were early disciples also those that were the New Light Calvinist ministers in the New England area. His writings and studied beliefs opened a new light to missionaries of today, his ideas, influences, beliefs are known very well in colleges(Yale)(Princeton) even those that have different religious backgrounds. He was the namesake of Jonathan Edwards college one of the twelve colleges in Yale. Edward was a teacher/missionary by the Evangelical Lutheran church in America on March 22nd..that being present time? He has influenced historical novel writers and influential religious thinkers in American history. His work is well known in the modern protestant missions movement in England and the U.S., Edwardism Evangelicalism is practiced in Africa, South Asia and all the Western frontier. Edwards legacy didnt just appeal to men, he influenced "Women's fiction" author Susan Warner(1819-85) his writings are familiar with the American literary works with Ralph Waldo Emerson. I guess you could say his legacy has been through his influential historical/religious writing..and the theology of the Great Awakening and the writings of God and mankind. His legacy is known to all those that find the time to seek out his great works.

Trial of John Peter Zenger - GROUP 9

William Cosby became Governor of New York Province in August of 1731. Cosby was a greedy, quick tempered, violent man. Within a year of arriving in America, he picked a fight with 71 year old Rip Van Dam. Van Dam was a senior member of New York's provincial council. Between the time of Cosby's appointment as Governor and his arrival in New York, Van Dam served as acting Governor. Cosby wanted Rip Van Dam to turn over half the salary that he had earned as acting Governor. Rip Van Dam was a hard headed man, he agreed, provided that Cosby give half of his earnings to Van Dam. Rip Van Dams calculated it to be in his favor to do it this way, and agreed. In August of 1732, Cosby answered by filing a suit to his share of Van Dam's salary.

Cosby arranged for the suit to be heard by the provincial Supreme Court. He preferred the suit to be decided by Judge instead of by a jury. He designated this court as "Court of Exchequer" (without a jury). Van Dam believed that Cosby's manipulations of the court were not legal because they bypassed the colony's established jury system. Van Dam lawyers challenged Cosby's actions to the same provincial Supreme Court.

In April 1733, the three-member Supreme Court voted 2 to 1 to uphold Cosby's action. Cosby wrote a letter to Chief Justice Lewis Morris demanding an explanation of Morris's dissenting vote. Cosby was very upset to find out that Morris provided his explanation through a pamphlet printed by John Peter Zenger. Cosby removed Morris from the court and replaced him with royalist James Delancey.

Cosby's firing of Morris galvanized opposition to his administration. Rip Van Dam, Lewis Morris and James Alexander organized this opposition into a serious threat to Cosby's ability to govern. This opposition became known as the "Popular Party". Cosby attempted to marginalize the opposition by controlling the press. He installed a supporter, Francis Harison, to censor and edit the only New York newspaper. Harison's New York Gazette only defended and flattered Cosby.

James Alexander convinced a religious pamphlet printer, John Peter Zenger, to establish an independent political newspaper. Zenger published the first issue of the New York Weekly Journal in November of 1733. This first weekly celebrated the Lewis Morris-Popular Party election victory for Westchester assemblyman. It also contained James Alexander's scathing rebuke of Cosby's attempt to control the election. Following issues of this weekly Journal printed critical editorial of other Cosby actions and promoted a free press.

Cosby endured these attacks for two months before attempting to silence the Journal. Twice (first in January 1734 then, with a different jury, in October 1734) new Chief Justice James Delancey attempted to have Grand Juries return indictments of Zenger's Journal for seditious libel. Both attempts failed, partly because the jurors claimed that the authors of the libels could not be determined. Cosby responded by offering a reward for these authors names and by ordering that copies of the Journal be burned.

Finally, using a legal maneuver to bypass the Grand Jury, Cosby had his attorney general Richard Bradley issue "an information" to Justices Delancey and Philispe. The justices issued a warrant and John Peter Zenger was arrested on November 17, 1734 for printing and publishing seditious libel in the New York Weekly Journal.

Zenger spent eight months in New York Old City Jail. He continued, with his wife's help, to publish the Journal. His exorbitant bail and his "letters" from prison developed into strong public sympathy. Jury selection for Zenger's trial began on July 29, 1735. Cosby attempted to pack the jury with supporters by limiting the potential jury pool. These efforts failed. Ironically, Cosby's hand picked justices recognized this departure from procedure as a ruse. Twelve jurors were selected. Zenger's trial opened on August 4, 1735.

Attorney General Bradley opened the trial by telling jurors Zenger was, "... a seditious person and a frequent printer and publisher of false news and seditious libels". Alexander Hamilton, speaking in Zenger's defense, stunned the court by stipulating that Zenger had indeed printed and published the material. At the time, the law only required the prosecution prove Zenger was the publisher; a fact he was now admitting. Bradley argued, based on this admission, that the jury must return a verdict for the crown.

Hamilton argued, " ... the law should not prohibit the just complaints of a number of men who suffered under a bad administration." He argued that the libel laws of New York should differ from the libel laws of England.

Chief Justice Delancey ruled that the jury could not consider the truthfulness of statements printed in Zenger's Journal. He ruled that it was the courts responsibility, not the jurors, to decide whether the printed material was libelous. Hamilton's eloquent response to this ruling shows the true nature of the defense: the jury should nullify this unjust law.

Jury nullification is a verdict of "Not Guilty" despite the belief that the defendant is guilty of the crime he/she was accused of. The jury can nullify a law that they believe is immoral or wrongly applied to the defendant on stand at the time.

This was practiced throughout history as early as the 1700s. Perhaps the most famous is the trial of John Peter Zenger, our journalist in New York city. Zenger clearly printed these libels. The court ruled the jury could not decide the truth or falsity of his publications. The jury then returned with a "Surprising" verdict of not guilty. Jury nullification also appeared many times throughout the 1800s when the government tried to pass morally repugnant or unpopular laws. It was practiced mostly during the early 1800s with cases brought under the alien sedition act. And even in the 1930's prohibition era, nullification was practiced.

Juries obviously and very clearly have the power to nullify a case, though, whether they have the right is a different question entirely. If a jury gives a verdict of "Not Guilty" it cannot be questioned by any court, and the "Double Jeopardy" clause of the constitution prohibits this on the same charge. However, in the late 1800s, the acceptance of jury nullification was beginning to fade. In 1895 the supreme court voted (7 to 2) to keep a conviction in a case in which the judge refused the attorney's demand to let the jury know of their power of nullification.

Today, jurors have to learn themselves of their nullification power from extra legal sources such as documents or articles etc. Some juries know that they have this power to nullify, while others are often misled by the judge to think that this power is void and unavailable to them, and that they have to apply the law exactly how it is given to them. Many people find it unfair that a defendant's case relies on whether or not the jury knows of his power to nullify. Judges fear that if jurors are told, then they will let their personal feelings get in the way.

Throughout the entire trial, Richard Bradley, who was the lawyer for the plaintiffs side, seemed to dominate the most experienced and best lawyer of his time, Andrew Hamilton. Hamilton was the lawyer for the defendants side. With all of Bradley's valid points which were all backed up by laws and other good sources. It also helped the plaintiffs side of things that Andrew Hamilton did not have any laws or other sources that backed up his points. It seemed all over for Peter Zenger, but, with the amazing last speech that Andrew Hamilton gave, Bradley never thought what the jury was about to do. The jury deliberated and came out shortly after leaving and gave the verdict of the trial, which was "Not Guilty".

After the trial there was no law put into place that changed seditious libel, but, terms were added that could not be confused and the terms hinted that the public was against the prosecutions. With that in place prosecutions became unlikely because of the worry of jury nullification. The trial ultimately made it so we had and still have our freedom of speech.

Trial of John Peter Zenger (Group 10)

Question 1: Who was William Cosby and how does he figure into the case?

William Cosby was the new governor of New York Province he became known as the "rouge governor" and as any other new governor he was greedy, high temper and full of himself. Rip Van Dam was the favorite member of the New York provincial council. Cosby decided to have him give him half of his salary that he made when he was governor. Cosby went to file suit from Van Dams share but lost due to Van Dam's lawyers winning the judges vote. John Peter Zenger,

James Alexander and William Bradford came up with the idea to print out a newspaper that would include a weekly printout and call it **THE NEW YORK WEEKLY JOURNAL**. The journal would highlight all the loosings Cosby had encountered, including the trial he encountered with Van Dam. Cosby had grown tired of the attacks and tried to shut the paper down with no success.

Question 2: What did Zenger print that was so controversial and for what was he tried?

John Peter Zenger's *The New York Weekly Journal* was considered controversial because of its independent political views, views that differed from the other popular newspapers that were, in effect, edited by Francis Harison and William Cosby. Zenger was tried for seditious libel for having printed various accounts of corruption by Cosby, including in the first edition of the journal accounts of Cosby's rigging of an election the week prior to the journal's inception.

Question 3: What defense did Zenger's lawyer use?

Andrew Hamilton's main defense for Zenger was the fact that the article that Zenger had written was the truth. Although Zenger's account of what took place between Cosby and Van Dam was harsh, the fact that it was true is what kept Hamilton's defense going, and would eventually win the case. Zenger's harsh comments towards Cosby caused quite a stir because it was unheard of to speak that way of a governor, but the fact still remained that Cosby was corrupt. Hamilton's defense was an early example of the "Freedom of the Press" which would eventually occur in America.

Question 4: What is Jury nullification?

Jury nullification is when a jury actually believes the accused is guilty but, the verdict is not guilty. They bend the rules (nullify the law) so that the accused will not be charged, they usually do this when they feel the law is misapplied. One of the most popular jury nullification's is the case of John Peter Zenger. Zenger was charged with printing libel about Governor William Cosby. Even though it was clear that Zenger printed the libelous story the jury still decided he was "Not Guilty." However the comments that John Peter Zenger had printed were in fact true, though did not shed the best light on the Governor. This case was hailed as one of the first true victories for freedom of the press.

Question 5: What was the outcome of the trial? What effects did it have?

At first, John Peter Zenger was found guilty. Then, Andrew Hamilton wrote the jury in such an eloquent way that Chief Justice Delancey had a hard time knowing how to react to it. The jury reconsidered and after a short deliberation, came to the verdict of not guilty. The crowd was so pleased, giving "shouts of joy" even after Delancey threatened to arrest and imprison them if they did not resume order. After the trial, a dinner was held for Andrew Hamilton. The dinner was to celebrate and congratulate him on the victorious win. The next day a "grand salute of cannon was fired in his honor. Although no new law was passed because of the Zenger Trial, it was the pathway to many new freedoms, including press freedom in America. Years later, Governor Morris would write that it was the start of what revolutionized America. The trial even effected the way press is written today.

Group 11

When and where was the First Continental Congress held?

Carpenter's Hall in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, was the site of the First Continental Congress. On September 5th through October 26th in 1774, twelve of the thirteen colonies sent representatives for the first time to discuss their current economic and political situation with Britain. Georgia, preferring to remain neutral due to its need for British soldiers did not participate. The attendees of the first Continental Congress came from varied backgrounds and included among the 55 delegates John Adams, George Washington, Patrick Henry and Samuel Adams.

What was the purpose of their meeting?

The purpose of first meeting of the Continental Congress was a determined effort to show Great Britain that its colonies were important and deserved a greater voice in their governing. However, not all delegates had the same views or even reasoning. For example, New York and Pennsylvania had, in fact sent their representatives with specific directions to seek resolution with England.

The objectives of all of the delegates were not entirely clear and seeing how the majorities who wanted separation and those who wanted parity was about equal, a strong leadership was elected. Payton Randolph, sent from Virginia, was elected as the president of the Continental Congress. Under his leadership, it was agreed upon that the British Parliament and the king must acknowledge the colonies' grievances.

The first considered matter was put forward by Pennsylvania's Joseph Galloway. His plan included a "Grand Council", elected popularly and equivalent to that of a parliament. This idea was attractive to most members and was called the Plan of Union. Another popular idea was that of a "President General" selected by the king to maintain authority in America. As time drew near for voting on the Plan of Union, news of the conflict in and around Boston and the later arrival of the Suffolk Resolves caused the Plan of Union to be discarded, but only by a small margin.

The Resolves, along with the Declaration of Rights and Grievances were accepted as the direction for congress on October 14th along with the agreement that congress would meet again the same time the following year, had England not resolved their grievances.

What were the Suffolk Resolves? Were they adopted?

American Patriots in Boston and other Suffolk County towns met in opposition to Lord North's Restraining Acts in September of 1774. Known locally as the Intolerable Acts, the Restraining Acts included the Boston Port Act, The Quartering Act, The Administration of Justice Act and the Massachusetts Government Act. The Restraining Acts were a British retaliation for the Boston Tea Party and the overall colonists' movement towards independence.

The Suffolk Resolves were significant political and economic proclamations urging independence for Massachusetts and its citizens. The Resolves stated that the Intolerable Acts were unconstitutional and the people attempting enforcement of the acts were to resign from their position. Until the Intolerable Acts were repealed, Massachusetts should be declared a free state, in control of its own tax collections and should take the initial steps to create a state militia. Especially dangerous in British eyes, was the resolution that Massachusetts citizens owe no loyalty to the crown.

The Suffolk Resolves were penned by Dr. Joseph Warren, a patriot who gave his life to the cause of freedom. He died during the Battle of Bunker Hill. The unanimously-passed Suffolk Resolves were carried by Paul Revere to the first Continental Congress in Philadelphia. The Continental Congress endorsed the Resolves on September 17, 1774.

What did they hope to accomplish with the Association?

The creation of the Association was in direct response to the colonies unhappiness with British rule. Although each colony entered the Association with different goals, all wanted to create an American form of government and freedom from Britain. Most wanted the new legislature to work along side of the English parliament, but some wanted a complete separation.

The main reason for the Continental Association were the merchant laws imposed by England on the colonies. The colonists believed that if the "new" world was ever going to become a more powerful economic player it would have to have freedom to trade and become wealthy. England, the colonies perceived wanted a monopoly on all overseas trading.

What did the colonists list as grievances in their declaration to the king? Why were some members unhappy with the declaration?

At the time of the first Continental Congress the colonies had many grievances with Great Britain. Almost all of these related to the Restraining Acts, known in the colonies as the Coercive or "Intolerable" Acts. These acts, passed by parliament, were designed to benefit Great Britain with little consideration to the consequences on the colonies. After weeks of debate, the first Continental Congress decided on the verbiage they would use in the declaration to the king. One phrase that could encompass all of the colonies grievances was "no legislation without consent."

With delegates from all of the colonies except Georgia it was inevitable that the final draft could not conform to each colonies expectations. Each colony had to make concessions. Some wanted complete independence while others believed the differences with Britain could be resolved. Ultimately the declaration was a "middle ground" on which the delegates could agree.

For being the first of its kind, the Continental Congress was recognized as a success. It laid the foundation for future meetings with the colonies as they moved forward toward formal independence and the great American political experiment.

Group #12-

First Continental Congress

The First Continental Congress was held in Philadelphia's standing state congress center the Carpenter's Hall on September 5, through October 26, 1774. Benjamin Franklin brought the continental congress meeting to attention to somehow bring the colonies together as one instead of fighting and competing. Franklin's intentions were not entirely clear resulting in not getting enough recognition until the Boston tea party closed the port of Boston. Twelve of the thirteen colonies decided to send in delegates, excluding Georgia because it was at war and was needing help from the British army. For the first time all of the twelve colonies, that sent in delegates, had an opportunity to start relying on themselves. It created the opportunity for the colonies to start thinking of themselves as a whole and start separating them from the mother country of Britain. They debated on imported and exported goods, and how they could, and would increase their revenue. They were keeping in mind that what the colonies bought and sold was a concern of the mother country. For what the colonies exported to their king or queen, helped pay off British debts.

One of the delegates for Pennsylvania Joseph Galloway, thought to bring up the idea of imperial union that would affect the colonies by creating a law system that would allow laws to be passed by going through Parliament and the new "intercolonial congress". Just after the idea was introduced the Suffolk Resolves rode into town introduced by a man carrying the document by the name of Paul Revere. This threw congress into a pause and but eventually the majority of colonist voted to indorse the Resolves, with a standing of 6 to 5. On Oct. 14 this and the Declaration created the path for the new found congress. For about another 4 or 5 weeks other ideas where thrown around until they finally affirmed the new principle of no registration without consent.

Then the Association was created so there could be citizen committees in every community, and because the trade sanctions against Britain needed to be enforced. Many towns and counties loved the idea, and there were around 7000 men who joined the committees in 1774 to 1775 in the winter season. In hope of creating a central government, they approved the Association for the sake of the United Colonies.

The Congresses grievances included many things. These were submitted to King George III instead of Parliament because an overwhelming majority did not see Parliament as a fit governing body any longer. Their grievances included Repealing the Quebec, Coercive, and all revenue acts. Also they agreed that the Boston Harbor would need to be reopened. Until this happened the colonists unanimously agreed on non importation and a majority agreed on non exportation, an idea far more economically radical.

Questions:

Question 1: When and where was the First Continental Congress held?

Question 2: What was the purpose of their meeting?

Question 3: What were the Suffolk Resolves? Were they adopted?

Question 4: What did they hope to accomplish with the Association?

Question 5: What did the colonists list as grievances in their declaration to the king? Why were some members unhappy with the declaration?

Group 13

Topic: The Stamp Act (Chapter 5)

Question 1: What did the Stamp Act do?

Question 2: How did it affect relations between the colonists and Britain?

Question 3: How did the colonists react to it?

Question 4: How do the colonists portray the Stamp Act?

Question 5: What position does former Prime Minister William Pitt take on the matter?

George Grenville, Britain's first lord of treasury believed that the British government had to act immediately in order to establish authority over the swiftly populating colonies and gather funding that was seen necessary as the need for Britain's military presence was imperative. After encouraging parliament to pass a sugar tax, he later announced that a tax on legal documents and publications in the form of a stamp would also be necessary. This tax came to be known the Stamp Act. **To the colonist the stamp tax was a form of taxation without representation and they were afraid that Britain might try to rule them without consulting their assemblies.** Grenville set out to persuade the people of the colonies that the Stamp Act would not violate their right of taxation with representation. **Although the colonists were still leary of this new act, they saw a glimmer of a chance when Grenville said he would allow anyone with a idea of a better revenue plan time to state their claim. A petition was drafted from all thirteen colonial assemblies attacking both the Stamp Act and the Sugar Act only to be rejected by parliament in London.** If a contribution to their own defense was necessary, the colonies preferred the Crown to simply ask for a lump sum and allow them to come up with the funds on their own. **When the Stamp Act became law, all contracts, licenses, commissions, newspapers, pamphlets and most other legal documents would not be accepted unless they were written or printed on officially stamped paper. A tax was also be applied to playing cards and dice.** More specifically, for every skin or piece of vellum or parchment, or sheet or piece of paper on which shall be enbossed, written or printed, there would be a stamp duty or set charge. Courts would not approve of any document that lacked the proper stamp. **Colonists, at first glance, strongly disapproved of a British tax without representation to support the British military presence in North America. William Pitt, Former Prime Minister and Grenville's brother in law believed in Parliament's power to legislate he also believed that through the Stamp Act, America was being controlled by the English with improper taxing.** For now though, the colonies had no choice but to

accept this violation of their rights.

The Stamp Act of 1765 was simply seen as an attack on the rights and liberties of the British colonies. The Massachusetts House of Rep. said, "... must necessarily bring many burdens upon the inhabitants of these colonies and plantations." Many colonial leaders saw the Stamp Act as out of their control and resigned their will to amend it. Americans, according to Pitt, had become slaves to the English. The bounty of America, grown by the labor of Americans, had been taken and taxed, stealing money straight from the colonist's pockets. Patrick Henry, a newcomer to the Virginia House of Burgess, introduced a wave of resistance with his five resolutions which were printed in the *Newport Mercury*, and *Maryland Gazette*. This portrayed to the other colonies that Virginia had taken a radical stance so they followed the lead. Eight colonial legislatures passed new resolutions condemning the Stamp Act and nine colonies sent delegates to the Stamp Act Congress. Daniel Dulany says it best, "It appears to me, that there is a clear and necessary distinction between an act imposing a tax for the *single purpose of revenue*, and those acts which have been made for the *regulation of trade*." Nearly all colonial spokesmen agreed that because of the distance and huge expense involved, colonial representation in parliament was impractical and therefore the Stamp Act was unconstitutional and had to be repealed.

The English had so much control over the capital of America, that England was receiving about two million dollars a year and was able to fund a war. Americans became enraged over the unfair taxation brought on by the English. Violence led by men referring to themselves as Sons of Liberty was the next act of defiance within the colonies. In Boston Andrew Oliver, the stamp distributor, resigned after the colonists threatened to kill him during an invasion of his home. A tree would later be called the Liberty Tree and represent enemies of the people who deserved to hang from it's branches after an effigy of Oliver was found hanging from it. Even the sheriff admitted fear of removing it. The effigy was later be-headed and burned. A Building which was to be called the Stamp Office was demolished. Only after a mansion belonging to Lt. Governor Thomas Hutchinson was destroyed did the militia finally start policing the streets and trying to arrest those responsible. No one was held responsible for the riots or the damage done. The violent hostility against the Stamp Act worked, and got the colonists much farther than with any resolution. The American colonists and the English were one people, which Pitt pointed out, and yet they continued to argue amongst themselves and harm one another. England had become dependent on America, so why fight between one another and destroy the opportunity of long-term benefits, when if America fell then England would fall? During all the resolutions and petitions and even acts of defiance the colonists still affirmed their loyalty to the king and the parliament. With the crisis escalating stamp masters everywhere except Georgia were forced to step down, leaving the job of distributing stamps undone. With no one to distribute the stamps, the law could not be carried out. Non-importation agreements were imposed by merchants as a way of getting Britain to repeal. Business was halted until the following season when certain courts and ports began to operate without stamps. There is a lot wrong between the two countries and much to be amended, and Pitt suggested that to start this amendment the Stamp Act must be repealed. The unfair taxation must stop but the trade may still continue. Parliament shall still rule over the colonies, but only as long as they continue to abide by the common principles of both countries. They shall bind each other in trade but not cheat one another. Almost a year after the resistance began the Stamp Act was nullified. After the Sugar Act was repealed Pitt called the stamp Act an "unhappy act".

The Stamp Act, March 22, 1765

Pitt's speech on the Stamp Act

Resolutions of the Stamp Act Congress

Group 14

1. What did the Stamp Act do? - The stamp act was where America had to pay a tax on paper and stamps, so the British could finance the Indian France wars.
2. How did it reflect relations between the colonists and Britain?
3. How did the colonists react to it? - The colonists reacted in protest to the stamp act saying that at first it was "Taxation without representation." When that didn't work, they urged the British government to instead ask a colony for a specific amount of money, and the colony would raise enough money, in their own methods, to pay off the amount. When that failed, Patrick Henry of the Virginia House of Burgesses issued seven resolutions to the stamp act. Unfortunately, these were waved and ignored much like their other attempts. After that had failed, the colonists soon turned to violence, to attempt to force out the stamp act.
4. How do the colonists portray the Stamp Act? - The colonists were outraged by the Stamp Act. The Act made them feel as though some of their freedom was being robbed.
5. What position does former Prime Minister William Pitt take on the matter? - Former Prime Minister William Pitt was opposed to the enactment of the Stamp Act of 1765. He stated his opinion on the act at the conclusion of his speech, stating, "the Stamp Act should be repealed absolutely, totally, and immediately." Pitt felt it was unjust to take money from the pockets of colonists without their consent.

Group # 15

The Boston Massacre

Question 1 & 2 (both asked the same question): To what degree do the accounts give the same facts?

I would say that the accounts give the same facts to a moderate degree. Many facts were disputed over but the two most apparent facts are as follows. The action itself in which civilians died and the warrant on John Preston and the other eight soldiers. The specific order that challenged this was, the order that the muskets were charged but not to be fired upon any of the colonists. This account given by the Captain as he was speaking to a soldier said that the soldier received a blow from one of the colonists and accidentally stepped to one side and fired without orders from the Captain in turn eight of the soldiers started firing without orders on the colonists. The other fact that supports this was the warrant enacted by three of the sitting judges to apprehend Captain John Preston and the eight soldiers that fired upon the colonists and bring them to the court for their trials. Which gave Captain Preston reason to think of running back to England to give his version of the event to the queen and to escape the persecution he was about to face for his unspeakable act.

Question 3: In your mind, are any of the disputed facts important in evaluating the "justness" of the soldiers' actions in the Boston Massacre?

Yes. Here are some of the following: Who was responsible for creating existing hostility between the two groups? Preston's account says: as soon as the commissioners arrived the inhabitants were hostile, resentful and contentious...provoking conflict with them right away. The anonymous accounts says: The commissioners were becoming part of political schemes and because as a result the towns people were "neglecting" them. The commissioners were supposed to represent the towns people in a poor light, and in order to do this most effectively they should pick fights with the towns people and then essentially blame it on the towns people. Who started the fight at Grey's Rope Walk? Preston's account says: "The rope-makers insultingly asked them if they would empty a vault." Starting the fight. The anonymous accounts say: "...the soldier challenged the ropemakers to a boxing match." Why did the towns people ring the bells? Preston's account says: "In order to carry matters to the utmost length" they started to ring the bells. And later he was informed that they were ringing them to call more people to attack the soldiers. The anonymous account says: "The outrageous behavior and the threats of the said party occasioned the ringing of the meeting house bell." So in order to defend them selves from the soldiers. Were the boys or group of civilians armed or not? Preston's account says: They immediatly surrounded the sentry posted there...and with clubs and other weapons threatened to execute their revenge." Anonymous Account: Samuel Drown says: "most of which (civilians) were without so much as a stick to defend themselves." Were the towns people provoking the soldiers just before the shooting occurred? And if so how? Preston says: The people were attacking them with "heavy clubs and snowballs" and challenging them by using abusive language and yelling "damn your bloods, why don't you fire?" Anonymous account says: "This occasioned some snowballs to be thrown at them which seems to have been the only provocation that was given." They both agree on the snowballs. These disputed facts the seem to have some importance in evaluating the "justness" of the soldiers actions in the Boston massacre. Because defending their troops from an attack could be justifiable if in fact this was the case and it was not they who were doing the attacking. In any case, which ever party is to blame for starting the whole ordeal, their actions ceased to be justifiable as soon as the troops opened fire on the civilians. Although both groups were in need of some kind of intervention to end the upheaval that had begun.

Question 4: Does either account seem more sympathetic to the colonists?

The anonymous account would seem more sympathetic to the the colonists because taxes inacted by the King like the Stamp Act, bear evidence of the attempted centralized control of crown on the colonies. These taxations clearly showed the measures that the colonists had to go through just to bring revenue to England and keep some money for themselves. According to the anonymous accounts the arrival of the troops in the colonies was not to protect them but implimented mostly as a reason for the crown to further tax the colonists for the "benefit" the colonists would receive from the presence of an army. This of course angered most colonists leading to an uprising no to metion the fact that with the military being there to inforce the rules of the crown had lead to a rocky relationship between England and the colonies.

Question 5: Which account do you find more credible?

Despite being anonymous, the account favoring the colonists seems more credible for a number of reasons. One main reason is due to the many accounts from different sources. The anonymous account compiles the accounts of a number of witnesses to provide a larger perspective on the incident and the fact that several people were giving similar reports on what happened that night seems indicate more credibility than one person's account of the event. Also, the anonymous accounts of the colonists could be viewed as more creditable due to the fact that they were not employed by the British government but were simply local people dscribing a horrible account that had taken place. Lastly, As the told by the account of Benjamin Frizell, before and at the time of the soldiers firing their guns, the first discharge was of only one gun, the next of two guns upon which the deponent thinks he saw a man stumble, Leading to three, then four guns firing. This occurance was not disputed by either account. The fact that John Preston did not give the order to fire proves conclusive evidence to the colonists accounts and their stories. This leads us to believe that the anonymous accounts are

more credible, then the accounts given by Captian John Preston.

Group # 16:

The Boston Massacre

Question 1: To what degree do the accounts give the same facts?

Question 1: Both accounts are talking about the same shooting that happened between a group of civilians, and a group of English soldiers. they are from two different accounts, and describe the situation in very different detail, but conclude the same thing, that the shooting from the soldiers started by a misunderstanding. "Captain Preston is said to have ordered them to fire, and to have repeated that order." -Anonymous Account of the Boston Massacre, and "On which some well behaved persons asked me if the guns were charged. I replied yes. They then asked me if I intended to order the men to fire. I answered no, by no means, observing to them that I was advanced before the muzzles of the men's pieces, and must fall a sacrifice if they fired; that the soldiers were upon the half cock and charged bayonets, and my giving the word fire under those circumstances would prove me to be no officer." -Captain Thomas Preston's Account of the Boston Massacre

Question 3: In your mind, are any of the disputed facts important in evaluating the "justness" of the soldiers' actions in the Boston Massacre?

Question 3: Personally in my opinion the soldiers displayed no justness in their actions despite the facts presented. The soldiers were hurled insults from the mob and it is said that the soldiers retaliated with insults back. Another fact that the soldiers state is that their commanding officer gave the word fire, that being true or not he denied that he gave that order. Also it was thought that the mob had the intention of murdering the sentry and plundering the kings chest, this plainly seen as a threat could in my mind possibly justify the soldiers actions , but in my mind accidental murder or intentional murder never is just.

Question 4: Does either account seem more sympathetic to the colonists?

Question 4: Captain Thomas Preston's account of the boston massacre seems to be more sympathetic to himself and the english. His account its from his opinion. he defends the solders and why they shot. he explains that they didnt mean to kill the towns people who sadly lost their lives be cause the mob caused alot of confusion. The anonymous account of the boston massacre seems to be more from many peoples opinions then just one person. I seems to me like it was written by a journalist. Ive noticed it gives opinions of the people from both side of the massacre.

Question 5: Which account do you find more credible?

Question 5: The Account of the Prestons account of the boston massacre and the anonymous account are both great articles describing in great detail what happened. They both share the same misunderstanding about how and why the first shot was fired. The anonymous account states that Benjamin Frizell thinks he saw some soldiers fall and therefore fired there weapons. And he states this on two accounts. This is to me is hard to believe, I do not believe that so many soldiers would fall and miss fire. I would think that falling and having the gun go off would reulst in a possible gun shot wound to that soldier. The account by Cap. Thomas Preston states that a number of people heard the cap. ordering them to fire and later go on oath to say that. This to me is the leading factor why I believe that account by the captain is more credible.

The articles it talks about are here

[Captain Thomas Preston's Account of the Boston Massacre](#)

[Anonymous Account of the Boston Massacre](#)

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

You are logged in as [Joe Escobar](#) ([Logout](#))

HST 201 F09 (Escobar META 21498 21499)