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Text: Albion Ascendant: Colonization and Settlement (1585-1763)

[Photo of a recreated colonial ship]

Audio: I have titled this lecture Albion Ascendant, first of all because Albion is an old poetic name for Britain but also because with this terminology I'm eluding to the fact that the period covered in this lecture of nearly 100 years begins a golden age for England. When, eventually, by the 19th century, there will be a common expression that the sun never sets on the British Empire meaning that it was so far flung across the globe that there always had to be at least one spot somewhere in the world where the sun was still up where the British flag was flying. In any case, we're going to go back to the very beginning of this golden age. At a time when England will be trying to catch up to other European powers and a time when Elizabeth the first, one of the country's greatest monarchs, was still on the throne. So I will gradually take you through the development of the 13 colonies ending in the year 1763, which is the year that the French and Indian War, part of the larger Seven Years War came to an end. And relations between the 13 colonies and the mother country had become far more combative.
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Text: Spanish & Portuguese Dominance

[Map of Spanish and Portuguese colonies in North and South America]

Audio: As suggested by this map, by the late 16th century when the British are getting into the colonizing game in the western hemisphere, two other European countries have already had a major head start, namely Spain and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Portugal. As shown here on the map, much of what is today Brazil had already been colonized by the Portuguese, and the Spanish had a massive empire, including present-day Mexico, much of the present-day American Southwest, what is today Florida and pretty much the entire Gulf Coast, all of Central America, and significant portions of South America. In the process, certain Native American empires had been conquered by the Spanish, notably the Aztecs in what is today Central Mexico and the Incan empire down in what is today Peru, and these two Catholic countries had such an early monopoly on the colonization not only of the western hemisphere but of other parts of the globe that in 1494 the Pope actually divided colonial rights for the entire globe between those two countries. So you'll notice the line on the map there for the Treaty of Tordesillas, and the land allotted to Portugal included holdings in Africa and in East Asia as well. I'm just not showing those for the purposes of this lecture, but please understand the British, while they are increasingly well poised to engage in colonial efforts, they are really playing catch up ball to Spain and Portugal.

Slide 3
Text: Mystery of Roanoke (1585-1590)

Colonial map of the English Empire in America

Audio: The first British effort to establish a colony in North America will take place in 1585 and will be funded and staffed largely through private investment. And I'd like to make a larger point on that for just a second. When we look at the development of the entire 13 Colonies, it's important to note that the British Government was not heavily involved in terms of funding, in terms of providing military protection and while there were regulations issued from London as to how these early colonists were to lead their lives, by and large, they were not well enforced. So it's very important to keep in mind that these early colonists, long before they ever really started calling themselves Americans or thinking themselves, thinking of themselves of Americans, they were already accustomed to the British Government being a very vague and distance presence in their lives. And so that is going to create certain expectations that will be built into Colonial life and eventually, not really until the 1760s, but eventually the British Government will begin to change its management of the colonies and will try to play a more active role and that's one reason why there's going to be a collision leading to revolution because Colonists are going to feel like the rug has been pulled out from under them. But in these earliest years, it was really private investment that was driving British exploration. As a matter of fact, one of the earliest investment opportunities in the Western World was to buy shares in a joint stock company, such as the Virginia Company, which will be funding this first Colonial effort here at Roanoke Island. Now it was very risky venture but potentially you could earn dividends by investing in a company like the Virginia Company and it was a way to begin to make money in ways other than just owning land. Be that as it may, there was an expedition of about 100 strictly men, men and teenage boys, basically soldiers of fortune who ended up landing on an island they called Roanoke, it today is part of the Grand Banks area offshore of North Carolina, a region that is hit by very severe weather. As a matter of fact, here in the fall of 2011 or late summer of 2011, we've just recently had some very bad hurricane weather in that vicinity. Be that as it may, the reason why this rather inhospitable location was chosen for this space was that it was being created for the purposes of raiding Spanish shipping. There was a get rich quick fever behind this first British Colonial effort. Given the prevailing trade winds that would carry ships back to Europe from the New World, Spanish vessels in the Caribbean that might be loaded down with treasure would have to hug much of the Atlantic seaboard before being able to then head east back towards Europe. And so these British soldiers of fortune were authorized by their monarch, Elizabeth the First to be what the Spanish would call pirates, the British would see it a little bit differently but in other words, when you're sending over strictly men, you're obviously not looking to create a very durable community. There's not going to be any natural repopulation and there's really only one motive here. These were soldiers who were not trained to do a whole of anything else; they're not interested in learning how to live off the land or to survive in this area. They have one mission and one mission only. And things went very badly for them at Roanoke right from the start and as they had difficulty living off the land, they were very arrogant in
dealing with nearby Native Americans. As a matter of fact, there's one story that when a soldier discovered that there was a silver cup missing from his belongings, the immediate assumption is that one of the Native Americans must have taken it so a nearby village was burned to the ground because this British expedition felt that to do anything less would be a sign of weakness, it would be interpreted as some kind of an invitation for further impartations against these Colonists, if you will. This initial expedition did not work out very well and after about 10 months, it actually departed Roanoke Island, kind of giving up on this experiment. But in 1587, about 120 people came back to Roanoke and this time they did include some families, there was more of an effort the second time around to do things right, to try to create a more durable community. But we never really know for certain what happened to this second expedition because before a relief expedition could bring them supplies and more settlers, an important event in European history intervened. With Spain being England's primary enemy in Europe and the Spanish being still the dominant power in the world at that point in time, the Spanish had assembled a massive fleet or armada, the Spanish Armada, as the textbooks call it, to ultimately try to invade England and put an end to its pesky behavior once for all. And so the English were required to keep all of their ships close to home to do everything possible to defend against what initially looked like it was going to be a very daunting invasion force. Ultimately, the Spanish Armada was defeated and it became one of the greatest victories in the history of the English people but in the process that meant that a relief expedition did not get back to Roanoke Island until the year 1590. And when it arrived, it found a deserted settlement and there was not any immediate evidence that for example, these settlers had been massacred and as a matter of fact, there had been a special arrangement made for a certain symbol to be left behind if the colony had had to leave because of some sort of emergency and that signal was not to be found. There was one word carved into a tree near the settlement, the Croatan, referring to a nearby Native American settlement but the story basically ends there, they're just, to this day, historians, archeologists and so forth, don't really have a clear detailed explanation for what happened. I mean there would there be stories continuing on for years about these blue eyed blond hair Native Americans found in the wilderness or the New World, somewhat suggestive of the fact that whether it was forcibly or not, these settlers may have intermingled with Native American tribes but the, again, the exact outcome of the story just is not known. But the bottom line here for our purposes is that the first British experiment failed and there were obviously some tough lessons learned along the way. As far as Elizabeth the First's lifetime was concerned, this would be it. She died in 1603 and the next major British effort would not come until a few years later and it will be in a nearby area, soon to be called Virginia and that will be the subject covered in my next slide.

**Slide 4**

**Text:** Survival at Jamestown

[Photo of reenactment of Jamestown settlement]
Audio: In 1607 the Virginia Company made its second effort at establishing a colony in the New World. This time it would sail into what is today the Chesapeake Bay. And would land on the western shore of what is today Virginia. And the original settlement was named Jamestown after the king at the time. This was when the Stewart Catholic Monarchy was now running England. The Stewarts had come to power after the death of Elizabeth I. And so the Jamestown settlement would gradually and very painfully grow into the larger Virginia colony. Now, what you're seeing here, there's a major historical site today at Jamestown. And so there's a little village. Basically, the earliest settlers built palisades. Which is basically a series of fortress walls. Not terribly impressive. I mean really nothing fancier than the walls that you can see in the background of this picture. And they had a number of homes and a church inside of it. Very rudimentary settlement in its early years. The original expedition to Jamestown also consisted entirely of men and boys. About 104 in their first expedition in 1607. And once again, the initial mission embodied a sort of get-rich-quick fever. This time it wasn't going to be raiding Spanish shipping. But instead, hopefully, finding gold and silver. Search for precious metals would hopefully make this colonial experiment work. And early on, once again, there were no precious metals to be found. You had a bunch of city dwellers and artisans who did not know how to live off the land. And frankly, were not terribly willing to do the kind of back-breaking labor to really make this settlement durable to learn how to survive in this part of the world. And given the sort of climate that British-born people were used to, to live in what is now Virginia was basically tropical by comparison. And so the climate was definitely taking its toll on people. And as a matter of fact, this original expedition gave up. And had already started to sail back towards England when it happened to bump into a relief expedition. And so the original settlers did turn around. And the relief expedition did include women and families. But once again, I mean, the first few years here in Jamestown were very rough. As a matter of fact, they're referred to as the starving time. And to give you some idea of the severity of the situation, of the original roughly 400 settlers who landed at Jamestown, only 60 of them survived their first two years there. So a combination of malnutrition and disease was taking a very heavy toll. And it was not clear at all that this settlement was going to make it. One man who helped to keep the place afloat in its early year was John Smith. John Smith was actually the only commoner, the only nonaristocrat among the handful of men who were supposed to run this colony as it got started. But all the aristocrats died out. And I would like to stop for a moment and make a larger point about that. When you look at the British colonization of North America, you don't see many aristocrats coming over. And by the way, just so we're clear on terminology, an aristocrat is somebody who's -- who holds a title. And that title may have been bestowed to an ancestor farther back in the family tree. But it's someone who belongs to a family that has received a formal title from a monarch. And, you know, there's various levels of the aristocracy. I don't pretend to know all of its intricacies. But you have dukes, earls, barons. You have a whole elaborate hierarchy even within the ranks of the aristocracy. But you don't see many of these individuals coming to the New World. Because frankly, they've got plenty going for them back home. There isn't the same need to take the kind of risks associated with coming to a place like
Jamestown. But when you look at the settlement of North America to the extent that aristocrats did come over. Which again, was not great. They tended not to survive. Because aristocrats typically led very sedentary lifestyles. They were encouraged to do so by the culture of the time. So they didn't tend to be the heartiest sort to survive these experiments. So one thing that I think we've become kind of proud of as Americans is that, I won't say in all cases that it was the dregs of society that settled these early colonies. But it was certainly people who tended more towards the bottom of the social ladder. And those were the ones who really scratched and clawed their way into making these colonial experiments a success in the long run. And so I think that sort of feeds into how, as Americans, we always love the story of the underdog. And we love the story of a comeback. But be that as it may, John Smith eventually took over the Jamestown settlement, sort of by default. And he in initiated an austerity program. His policy was basically, he who does not work, shall not eat. So if you're going to refuse to do the, you know, sort of the bread and butter activities necessary to build a settlement. Then you're not getting any bread and butter. And it was his efforts that helped to keep the colony from completely going under. Unfortunately he had an accident and had to be sent back to England for medical treatment. And so the colony would continue to go through some rough times. And it really took several years for any reasonable sort of stability to settle in at Jamestown. And precious metals were never really found to be any kind of backbone for this economy. But what was gradually realized was that you could grow a very healthy strain of tobacco along inland rivers in Virginia. That the soil there was ideal for tobacco. Which could be a cash crop. Which could be a big money maker. And while it's going to take some time for things to stabilize in Virginia, tobacco will be its savior. It will be the cash crop that makes things work. And two more things I want to mention here about early Jamestown. The year 1619 will be significant in the history of Jamestown and the larger history of Virginia for two reasons. Number one, this was the year that the first colonial assembly in North America was created. In other words, the first institution of representative government. And this would be a sign of things to come. And as a matter of fact, to a fair extent, you know, Virginia would be leading the way in progressive political development in the 13 colonies. And of course, as many of you know, by the mid-18th century some of Virginia's political leaders would play a very prominent roll in the establishment of a U.S. republic through the Revolution and so forth. And we'll get to that story eventually in another lecture. But 1619 is also significant in the history of Jamestown. Because at least in terms of what historians can document, it was the first year that any slaves are noted as having arrived in Virginia. And they did not initially come in large numbers. So at first they were not by any means the backbone of the Virginia labor force. But as we move down the road, due to a variety of circumstance that's I'll be describing for you shortly. Slavery will be turned to as a primary source of labor to make the tobacco-based economy work. And the circumstances through which that decision was made are very important to understanding U.S. history.

Slide 5

Text: Life in 17th Century Chesapeake
• High mortality rate for much of the century
• Plantation-based economy with tobacco as cash crop
• Indentured servitude system increasingly unpopular
• Widespread importation of slaves following Bacon’s Rebellion (1676)

Audio: Even with the development of tobacco as a cash crop in Virginia, most of the 17th century is going to be a very rough time in Virginia. And you'll notice that I'm titling this slide, Life in the 17th Century Chesapeake. The Chesapeake is often used as a catchall for a combination of both Virginia and Maryland. And I'm not really going to say much about Maryland in this lecture. Economically, what happens in Virginia is very similar to what happens in Maryland; so I'm lumping them together. The major difference between the two colonies is that the land grant that became Maryland was initially given to some Catholic nobles who had supported the British monarch. And Maryland was initially marketed as a place for -- of religious freedom for Catholics. To make a long story short, the 17th century was a pretty tumultuous time in England. There was a Civil War around the middle of the century between the forces of the King, which, to a large extent, included Catholics, and the forces of Parliament, which, to a large extent, what happened to be Protestant. And it was Parliament that eventually won that battle. As a matter of fact, there was a period of a number of years when the English monarchy didn't even actually rule the country. And so it was amidst those circumstances that Maryland was marketed as a place where British Catholics, who might not feel so comfortable with the changes in their mother country, you know, might wish to come to a place like Maryland. So I'm going to use the term "Virginia and Chesapeake" somewhat interchangeably. Just keep in mind that Chesapeake would include Maryland as well. Back to my point here. For much of the 17th century, even with tobacco being a cash crop, it was still very difficult for the Chesapeake region to look like a prosperous area. In large part, because many of the early settlers who were coming to this area were dying off. Again, a combination of malnutrition, disease, and you can add overworked to that as well, as they tried to hack out an existence on using the tobacco crop. And so the leaders of this colony were very desperate for new bodies and, frankly, to some extent, you'd have to say for new suckers. Because for most of the 17th century, the death rate was out-pacing the birth rate by a significant margin. So it was only through immigration that this colony could have any hope of really surviving. So as I said, it's a tobacco-based cash crop economy, therefore, you do see many people trying to become land -- excuse me -- large land holders trying to own pretty sizable plantations. So you're not going to see as many communities as in a place like, let's say, New England, which I'll be describing here in a moment, where land holding tended to be in smaller sizes and so, therefore, it was easier for people to kind of group together into villages and towns. The Chesapeake is going to be more spread out in terms of communities because you do have these larger tracts of land that are being gobbled up by settlers. Now, if you're going to make a go of it with tobacco, you do need a significant labor force because it's a very labor-intensive product, you know, to grow it, to get it out of the ground, to prepare it for market. And so again, there has to be -- somehow there has to be a large labor force in this colony. The original system that was set up by the leaders of Virginia and Maryland was to offer what was
called, a Headright. In another words, if you could pay your way over to one of these colonies, there was fifty free acres of land waiting for you. And if you happened to bring a family member with you, you got fifty acres for each of them as well. But frankly, in these early years, by and large, people were coming over single and unattached and, to a large extent, it was young males who were coming over and young women were in very short supply. As a matter fact, the quickest side but an important one. There was such desperation for women in the early decades here in the Chesapeake that there was actually a clandestine industry of kidnapping women from Britain to bring them over as laborers. The practice was referred to as trapanning, T-R-A-P-A-N-G. And as with any clandestine operation, it's hard for me to quantify exactly how often this happened. But it certainly contributed to the immigration stream, and it does cast this early experiment in a different light. But in any case, the original way to get a large labor force was the Headright System. The problem was that not enough people who could afford to pay their way over were willing to come over. There were tremendous risks despite the propaganda efforts. I mean, the story was getting back to England that things were pretty rough here in the Chesapeake region. So the Headright System had to be modified a bit. The next arrangement that went into place was that now if you could not pay your way over but you hooked up with somebody who was willing to pay your way over, you could come to the Chesapeake. But now you had to work off that bill, you know, work off the costs of your voyage to the New World by becoming what was called, an indentured servant. So here, you basically signed away a significant part of your freedom for anywhere from four to seven years, depending upon the kind of contract. I -- they -- some could also be as brief as three years. You know, you negotiated these terms with whoever, you know, your employer was going to be. But you basically signed away a significant part of your freedom for three to seven years. And you come into the Chesapeake and you now have to, you know, basically, work off the cost of your voyage. And once you do so, you now are eligible for the headright. You get that fifty free acres of land. So this arrangement ends up being very difficult because with the conditions, the prevailing conditions in the Chesapeake, many of these early indentured servants don't live through the experience to ever get their fifty free acres of land. Let's face it, you could be worked pretty hard, and there wasn't really much that you could do about it. I mean, there wasn't much of a system of legal protections. There was nobody to really complain to if you were being overworked. I'm not trying to suggest that this was slavery, but you could not come and go as you pleased. You certainly were an unfree citizen of the early Chesapeake if you came over as an indentured servant. And because many of these servants are dying off, it contributes to that high mortality rate, and it makes indentured servitude a pretty shaky foundation upon which to rest the labor problems of the Chesapeake. And so as we get into the second half of the 17th century, the indentured servitude system is increasingly unpopular. As a matter of fact, by the 1670's, there's a new problem. For those servants who have managed to survive those years of backbreaking labor and arbitrary conditions, you know, an arbitrary management by their superiors, they now discover that, in many cases, there's no land for them. Because the Virginia colony has reached certain boundaries that have been negotiated with Native American tribes, and much of the prime
real estate for growing tobacco has already been gobbled up. You know, again, ideally, you want areas near inland water waste, not only because the soil is moisture, but also because it makes it more convenient to put your products on a boat, you know, float it down to the Chesapeake to have it sent to Europe. So that prime real estate is pretty much gone by the 1670's. So now you have this frustrated landless class of ex-servants that have done everything expected of them but they're not seeing, you know, their end of the bargain met for them. They're becoming increasingly discontented. And it's through these conditions that there is about to be the first uprising against colonial authority anywhere in what becomes the 13 colonies. There's an event in 1676, very important, not only in Virginia history but also in the history of the South. In general, it's called, Bacon's Rebellion, and I will be describing that next.
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Text: Bacon’s Rebellion – catalyst in creation of permanent black underclass

Audio: By the year 1676, a variety of contentious circumstances were coming to a head in Colonial Virginia. I've already mentioned that you have this growing class of landless ex-servants who feel legitimately disgruntled because they're not getting what they were promised in the way of land, and they're frustrated not only with the Colonial government but also with Native American tribes nearby. And it's out of this that you begin to have some spontaneous attacks by Settlers on certain Native American tribes, and it's a complicated situation. I mean, some of these tribes had periodically been raiding into Virginia communities, but in one case, a tribe that had a a peace treaty with the British and had been behaving itself was also attacked, which of course encouraged retaliation. So it's a complex situation where you know, there are many shades of grey and, and nobody's hands end, end up being completely clean here. But it's amidst this chaos where you now begin to have attacks going back and forth on Virginia's frontier and you have agitated civilians. It's out of this chaos that one figure emerges to lead a kind of rebellion against the government of Virginia. And in many ways, the, the man who leads this rebellion was an unlikely rebel. His name was Nathaniel Bacon. He actually was a rather well to do man, came from a good family. He had been sitting on the Governor's Council, which was a very privileged place to be. As a matter of fact, it was the Governor and his council that were part of the reason why people were upset with Virginia in the first place, so let me step back and describe that. Virginia had an appointed royal governor, answerable ultimately only to the King. And in 1676, this governor was a gentleman named William Berkley, who was very set in his ways. He had been in the office for a while and was not terribly interested in considering reforms to how his colony was being managed. And people had been upset for a while that Berkley was able to appoint a council around him, basically of friends and cronies of his from England, and they could not only sit on this council, but they often got appointed to various offices around the colony like local sheriffs and judges and so forth. They would use their
positions to line their pockets, make some money in a fairly short amount of time, and then they'd head back to England. And so, to many native-born Virginians, and, and by that I mean native-born white Virginians, these office holders seemed like parasites who were basically robbing Virginia of its livelihood. And Virginia's representative body, the House of Burgesses, had very little actual power. The governor could pretty much control it and this situation had become increasingly frustrating. And the governor, as well as authorities back in London, was terribly interested in expanding the colony any time soon because expanding the colony would naturally mean tension with Native American tribes. And if those tensions reach the point of actual warfare, then the British government was going to have to send over troops, and that was expensive, and that interrupted commerce in Virginia. And again, keep in mind what I said; I think it was in the first or second slide. The British government is not heavily involved in managing these colonies, and although Britain is in the early stages of what will be a very productive period in its history. The British government is not in a great financial position to bankroll major colonial efforts. I mean, they are really hoping to do this on the cheap, so to speak. I mean, they are relying more on private investment. And so they don't like to make the kind of waves with Native Americans, for example, that could lead to major wars, and that, that could lead to greater expenses. So, both the governor of Virginia and the authorities back in London responsible for managing the colonies at this point, they're not in a hurry to grow Virginia. But for many of the native-born colonists and newcomers, they see it very differently. And so you do have the beginnings of some, spontaneous attacks on Native American tribes. And the man who comes to, to kind of take over this effort, is Nathaniel Bacon who comes from a privileged background, but nevertheless, he basically sees it as his personal mission to look out for the, for the common people of Virginia and, and so he basically takes over leadership of this rebellion. Many of the, the members of this uprising, they are these ex-indentured servants who are still looking for land. There are even a few slaves who get involved but I don't want to over-emphasize that because I have already told you there aren't a great many slaves in Virginia yet. As a matter of fact, by 1676, there's only a few thousand. So slaves are not a huge part of this but they are a part of it. And also there are small tobacco planters who get involved as well because they are trying to expand their operations and they feel frustrated by conditions in Virginia. So you have this collection of individuals who are certainly not at the top of society other than their leader, who basically rise up and not only are they raiding nearby Native American settlements, but eventually, they also march on the colonial capitol of Jamestown. And because this colony, like others, I mean, there's not really much of a law enforcement establishment and there, there are almost no British troops, anywhere in the colonies at this point. This rebellion is basically able to take over the capitol and they force the legislature, they force the governor to hold new elections for the legislature and they begin to make some reforms that are designed to make things a little easier for common citizens. For example, only landowners had been allowed to vote in Virginia but everybody had to pay taxes. So obviously if you're one of these landless ex-servants, you don't appreciate the fact that you know, you, you know, you don't have land so you can't vote but nevertheless you are still
expected to give up some of your income, so that was one of the reforms. And the governor was basically forced to give in because; Bacon had this force that he couldn't really deal with. But then, the rebellion's agenda changed. After having some initial successes in creating some political reforms, the overwhelming feeling among these rebels was that now they wanted to evict Native Americans from the entire vicinity of Virginia, so they now were going to take on a much more ambitious goal. And so they continued raiding Native American settlements and they went back to Jamestown again, to basically occupy the capitol and force their will upon the governor. And things got so bad the second time around that an expedition of British soldiers actually, was sent over from England to deal with this. But before they arrived, Bacon happened to die of disease and without his leadership, the movement pretty well fizzled out rather quickly afterwards, and there were some who were, were prosecuted for their crimes. Governor Berkley was reestablished in power in Virginia. But while Bacon's rebellion did fizzle out pretty quickly in 1676, it is the catalyst for some major changes in that colony and changes that are going to have an impact on the entire southern region of what becomes the thirteen colonies. So I would like to stick with this subject a little bit longer because it significant, it's significance is huge. Following Bacon's rebellion, for elites in Virginia, you know, for your larger landowners, for the governor and his supporters, there is a real fear that you could have another uprising like this in the future. And you know, any time that the lower classes are able to unite behind issues, it is incredibly threatening to, to elites, because obviously they are outnumbered. And they are always worried, you know, is my property going to be seized? Is there going to be blood in the streets? So Virginia's elites are making a calculation after Bacon's rebellion: How do we prevent something like this from happening again? Obviously the indentured servitude system is very unpopular. It's getting harder and harder to get new immigrants from England willing to do this and many who have already gone through it are, are obviously upset that, with their lot in life. And so there is an increasing feeling that indentured servitude is not going to work anymore as the backbone of this economy or as the backbone of its labor force. There has to be a replacement. And the decision is made that now African slaves are going to be that replacement. That instead of slaves being here in relatively small numbers, now there's going to be a huge emphasis on importing them into Virginia and they are going to, for the most part, replace indentured servants now at the bottom of this economy. I mean, you can still be an indentured servant in Virginia if you're willing to do it, but the numbers, take a very steep drop here after Bacon's rebellion. Conversely, the number of slaves coming into Virginia really explodes. Just to give you a little bit of a sense of scale, I told you in 1619 there were several dozen slaves, documented as reaching Virginia. By the 1650's, there were several thousand. By 1700, there were twenty thousand. By 1750, there were one hundred and twenty thousand. As a matter of fact, by 1750, at least a quarter, if not more like one third of Virginia's population consisted of slaves. So, obviously there is a major demographic shift at work here and Bacon's rebellion has been identified as the catalyst for it. And it's not just that slaves are replacing indentured servants as your main labor force to work your tobacco crop, it's also that slaves are to be a permanent underclass. In other words, that now the path to freedom for slaves is going to be much more
difficult to, to reach. In other words, before Bacon's rebellion, if a slave owner, for whatever reason, wanted to free any of his slaves, you know, maybe as a reward for doing good service or, as was not unheard of, back in the day, you know, there are instances where slaves who have able to earn some money on the side, which by the way they could. I mean it all depended on, on what your slaveholding household was willing to allow, but if you had certain skills and you had a work arrangement set up where there was at least a little bit of time to yourself, I mean, there were slaves, whether they were skilled artisans or that you know, they had something else going for them, you know, maybe it as sewing clothes, whatever the case may be, some slaves were able to generate a bit of income for themselves, and therefore it was not unheard of for a slave to have accumulated a certain sum of money, and to, and to go to his or her master and say 'Look, I would like to buy my freedom'. And if your master is amenable to that arrangement, then that was another way to gain your freedom. But what we see in colonial Virginia is that after Bacon's rebellion, there's a gradual crackdown on the availability of freedom on those who were slaves in the colony. We see more and more social pressures on slaveholders not to manumit or free their slaves. We also see, for example, there was a law passed in 1699 that said that a master could not be prosecuted for murdering a slave. So let, so let's say you're disciplining a slave who you think has, has committed some unruly act, and maybe it got a little bit out of hand and the slave died. You certainly could not be prosecuted for murder or manslaughter; you now have complete carte blanche. If you or an overseer somehow takes the life of a slave, the Virginia legal system is going to have no interest in coming after you. And, and by the way, there had been a free slave, or I should say, not free slave, but free black community on the eastern shore of Virginia that had flourished for a number of years. But it gradually fades out as more and more white Virginians don't like the idea of there being free black s in their colony because a free black, by his or her very existence, becomes a kind of symbol for what is possible for a slave. And especially after Bacon's rebellion, that's the kind of symbol or beacon that many powerful whites in the colony don't want. So in other words, creating a permanent black underclass of slaves, what you're doing on some level, is you're encouraging your poorer whites to feel a sense of racial solidarity with your wealthier whites. And you're hoping that that sense of racial solidarity will be powerful enough to overcome any class frustration, because obviously, to a large extent, Bacon's rebellion had been about class tension. It had been about social political grievances by one social class against another. And the elites of Virginia were trying to ensure that that formula doesn't ever play itself out again. So instead now, you know, if you are a poorer white resident of Virginia, I mean, you may still have some frustrations with life, but on some level, you can at least comfort yourself with knowing that you are not part of this permanent underclass. And research has shown that this idea of, of slavery as creating a permanent black underclass, is going to catch on in a number of other southern colonies like South Carolina and Georgia, where you also have major cash crops and you need the large labor force, and it is going to be slaves that provide the bulk of that labor. And I'd like to, to suggest that Bacon's rebellion and, and its consequences are significant in some other ways as well. If I can jump forward quite a bit in history for a moment, I'd like to go to the year 1860; the last full year before the civil war began in 1861. When we
look at those eleven southern states that gradually succeeded left the Union and formed the Southern Confederacy, and fought a war against what was left of the Union, to prevent being re, you know, brought back into the fold. The best research has shown that only about twenty five percent of white southern households actually own slaves in 1860. Only twenty five percent. So that means that the other seventy five percent of households were populated largely by individuals whose livelihood was not directly linked to whether or not slavery survived. And yet, individuals from those seventy five percent of, of households were willing to go to war to protect a system that certainly had as one of its main features, the maintenance of slavery. So how do we explain that? In other words, why did so many white southerners, including many poorer white southerners go to war for a system that defended slavery even though their own livelihood may not have been directly tied to it? Well, historians suggest that part of the reason for the answer, and I do emphasize that it's only part of the reason and you know, these are, causes of a war are always very complex, but part of the reason is that there was a kind of psychic satisfaction created by using slaves as a permanent underclass. And it did create a kind of racial solidarity that at times, could overcome class frustration and therefore cause many poorer whites to be willing to defend a system that was ultimately grounded in slavery. So, after 1676, there is a kind of stability that does settle into the Chesapeake region at last. But I have to put stability in quotes, or let's say in air quotes, as I'm delivering this lecture verbally; because of course the stability, to a large extent, is based upon a widespread importation of slaves. And so now some huge contradictions are being built in to portions of the colonial way of life. As we get closer and closer the Revolution, and then the Constitution afterwards this is going to be the greatest contradiction of what was otherwise a very progressive society. And I will be covering this in various ways as we move through future lectures. But you can really see Bacon's rebellion as a catalyst for a very long-standing feature, not only in Virginian life, but southern life in general.
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Text: Early New England

[Map of New England]

Audio: Now I'd like to turn to another region of British settlement and that is New England. New England will also be funded in terms of its early expeditions by private investment, it was actually the Virginia Company that was initially involved but the driving force behind early New England was a reform movement in Britain known as Puritanism. And I'm going to have to describe that a little at the beginning, now I know many of you learned in high school that the first settlers to arrive in New England called themselves Pilgrims and they landed at Plymouth Rock in 1620 and that you can see here on this map, they formed their own colony. But the Pilgrims were really an offshoot of a broader reform movement that we call the Puritans. The basic difference between a Pilgrim and a Puritan is that the Pilgrims were separatists. Their original goal was to completely isolate themselves from the larger European world, whereas the
Puritans were not willing to take things quite that far. But both of these sets of settlers are part of this larger movement we call Puritanism. Puritans had been, for example, major participants in the political and military conflict of the Seventeenth Century in England, they had supported forces of parliament. The Puritans are Protestant so part of their frustration were the English Monarch for much of the Seventeenth Century had been that English Kings were Catholic. Puritans believed, among other things, they believed in a rather modest and sober way of leading your life and how you carried yourself. They are going to be more strict in their theology than many other churches of their time and I'm eventually going to be talking about religious life in New England. But we get our original Thanksgiving narrative and the place that Thanksgiving holds in our folklore, we get that from the Pilgrims, you know, landing in 1620 and forging pretty decent relations with the Native Americans that they found in their vicinity and of course having that initial Thanksgiving dinner to celebrate their presence in the New World. But eventually and this is not something to obsess with but eventually in the 1690s, the Plymouth Colony merges with the larger Massachusetts Bay Colony, settled by Puritans. So eventually, there is just one Massachusetts Colony. And I don't want you to get too hung up on all the details of the map, when you look, for example, at Connecticut and Rhode Island, they were settled by, also by Puritans but by Puritans that had some religious descent from the leaders of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. So while they're still generally part of that movement, they had certain differences in religious philosophy that had caused them to go their own ways. But I think for our purposes here, as long as you know that Puritanism was the driving force behind New England's settlement in general, and then I think you'll be fine. And so here we see religious motives being much more up front in the settlement of the New England region, versus let's say Virginia. And I'm not trying to suggest that early settlers to Virginia didn't care about their faith but they did not organize their lives quite so self-consciously around their religious life as you'll see in early New England. I mean for example, if you were going to be able to vote in these early New England towns, you had to be a full-fledged member of your Puritan church. And so there is clearly no separation of church and state, which eventually does become a principle of this land. You do not see any of that when you go back and you look at these early Puritan communities. So you have the Plymouth Colony being established initially in 1620 and as we get into the early 1630s, you see the Massachusetts Bay Colony being pretty well established. And so from this point onwards, I'm really going to stop talking about the Pilgrims and focus on this broader phenomenon of Puritanism.
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Text: Puritan “City Upon a Hill”

[Photo of statue of John Winthrop]

Audio: I'd like to take a few moments to talk about the central mission for the Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony because it has continued to resonate in our national experience going
all the way up to the present. Back in 1630, the governor of the Massachusetts Bay Colony was a
gentleman named John Winthrop, and he gave what is now a very famous sermon that was
centered upon this idea of the Puritans creating "a city upon a hill". And this has stuck with us
for a long time. As a matter of fact, back in the 1980's, President Ronald Reagan frequently liked
to refer to this entire country as "a shining city upon a hill". So let me give you the historical
basis from where he was coming from. The Puritans believed very strongly that they needed to
move away from Europe in able -- in order to be able to be completely free to create their version
of a Godly society. But they did hope that if they fulfilled what they saw as their special
covenant with God and they were able to create this ideal virtuous society, they hoped that it
would set this incredible example; that it would be this incredible "shining city upon a hill" so
that the rest of the European world, especially the mother country back home in England, you
know, would be so amazed by this that they would be encouraged to follow in the example of the
Puritans. And so what I'd like to do for a few moments here is to suggest that what we see here
with the Puritans' "city upon a hill" becomes part of a much broader phenomenon in US history.
And even if you have not heard the term that I'm about to introduce, I'd like to suggest that if
you've grown up in this country, this term and its underlining concepts have really been in the
proverbial water supply so to speak. I mean, you've been exposed to it whether or not anybody
actually said the words, American Exceptionalism. And that is what "city upon a hill" is all about
at the end of the day. What I'm trying to get at here is that whether you look at early Virginia
where there was a strong sense that these English colonists were going to do things better than
the Spanish before them, and they were going to replace the Spanish as the dominant European
force in this part of the world; or whether you look at the Puritans talking about creating their
"city upon a hill", these are just different variations of this idea of American Exceptionalism.
And to define it, let me say that, in general, it is the idea that the communities, the societies, that
are going to develop in this land, are somehow destined to be unique, to be special, to play some
kind of a great role; a role that will ultimately be on an international stage. Now I want to be very
clear, that, as you move through what becomes US history, while many individuals contribute to
this idea of American Exceptionalism, it does not mean exactly the same thing everywhere you
look. As I've already said, I mean, early Virginians had a somewhat different idea of it than let's
say the early Puritans of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. And others will have -- will put their
own particular spin on it. In some cases, it will be more religious based and others cases more
secular. Now let me just give you a couple of other examples. And I know in high school you've
learned about the ideology of Manifest Destiny that helped to propel this young republic across
the North American continent and westward to the Pacific with dreams of going beyond.
Manifest Destiny can be thought of as another version of American Exceptionalism. If any of
you have read essays by Tom Payne who, in 1776, produced both Common Sense and the
American Crisis as two very persuasive essays to help the patriot cause during some of the
toughest times during the America Revolution, he too had his version of it. When President
Thomas Jefferson, as the third chief executive of this country, made the Louisiana Purchase in
1803, much of his vision for America's new frontier and what it would mean for the country at
large also fit into an idea of American Exceptionalism. Certainly Ronald Reagan had his particular idea when he would celebrate the idea of "a city upon a hill". I mean, Reagan was not a Puritan. I mean, he certainly liked some of what the Puritans had to say, but, you know, he had his own particular version when he was trumpeting this in the 1980's. So American Exceptionalism, we see one of its earliest examples here with the Puritan idea of "a city upon a hill". And this is one reason why there was a real sense of urgency to what the Puritans were doing in New England. Because they had a very conscious sense that God was watching them and God was judging them. In fact, in the same sermon, that John Winthrop gave in 1630, he warned that God's disfavor could be brought upon the people of Massachusetts if they did not live up to their end of their special covenant. So his sermon does have some of the character of the carrot and the stick, you know, hinting at great things to come but also warning what happens if you fall off the path. Now, the last thing I want to say about American Exceptionalism -- and this is maybe a little more sophisticated than you need for a lecture like this, but I'm hoping that all of you will become savvy as scholars of history and other subjects. Let me say, that, especially since the Vietnam Era, when the United States suffered its first military defeat, especially since the Vietnam Era, American Exceptionalism has become a very loaded term, meaning, a very controversial one. And depending upon whom you talk to, it can mean some very different things these days. Generally speaking, today, whether you are liberal or conservative or progressive or conservative, whatever term you might use, you might have a very different outlook on American Exceptionalism. What you still see today on the political right, meaning, among conservatives, is that, for the most part, American Exceptionalism is still celebrated because it's associated with a traditional kind of patriotism with which the right is still comfortable. On the political left, however, among the liberals or progressives, you will see more negative reactions ranging from being a little reluctant, to use the term like, American Exceptionalism, or to celebrate it to being downright hostile to it. I'm going to try to take a very balanced approach here and say that, in my opinion, I think you can look at both the finest moments in US history, the most unselfish moments, but also look at the worst moments. And in both cases, you're going to see elements of American Exceptionalism. I think at times it gives this nation a tremendous sense of self-sacrifice and honor, but it also has contributed to a certain ethnocentrism, a certain feeling at times that the rules that we expect other countries to follow may not apply so much to ourselves. So I sort of likened it to nuclear power. I mean, if it's properly harnessed, it's incredibly efficient and productive. But of course, if handled irresponsibly, you know, you have horrible accidents. And that might be kind of a stupid analogy, but that's the one that I'm going to use here. So I think if you can show future instructors of yours that you can link the early Puritans to this idea of American Exceptionalism, although, they will probably be impressed.
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Text: Early New England Life
More immigration by entire family units than seen in Chesapeake
Settlers generally of at least modest means
Much less indentured servitude and slavery than in Chesapeake
No heavy resilience on cash crops
Puritanism allowed for economic prosperity as long as spiritual life was sound

Audio: So let me summarize life in New England for much of the 17th century, and in the process I'm going to do some compares and contrasts with the Chesapeake region. First of all, New England right from the beginning had more stability to it than what you would have seen in the Chesapeake in part because the climate was not such a radical departure from what people were used to back in England. Also relations with nearby Native Americans were relatively calmer, not perfect but certainly better. The Puritans, although they had their own assumptions as Europeans, they definitely were more tactful, at least in general terms, in how they dealt with Native American tribes. You also saw a more stable immigration stream right from the beginning. In New England they never sent over just men. You had entire family units by and large coming over. I mean you even had some settlers as late in life as in their 60s coming over as well. And so right from the beginning you had a real emphasis placed upon the family and repopulation and building up stable institutions and doing what was necessary to be able to live off the land. So you don't have the same kind of stubbornness about adapting that I mentioned in the early years in the Chesapeake. And what you also see is that because New England doesn't really have cash crops, you don't have the really desperate people coming over in large numbers as indentured servants. What you generally see with New England settlers, I mean, by and large they're certainly not wealthy, but by and large they're not poor either. I mean people are coming over with modest or some economic means, you know, they're stable. They're coming over for reasons for the most part other than economic opportunity, so they're not people who have nothing left to lose. And so because you don't have cash crops in New England, you don't see much in the way of indentured servitude or slavery. Now, slavery was legal for many years in New England, but there wasn't nearly the same economic demand for it, so it would have been much -- you would be much less likely to see a slave in your travels in early New England. Their economy was based, for example, certainly there was plenty of fishing to be had offshore of New England; it had very rich forests to create wood and other products for building naval vessels. People grew pretty much just what they needed to eat, again not really marketing a cash crop per se, but doing various forms of mixed agriculture. These were the main ways that you made a living off of the natural resources of the New England area. And one thing about the Puritans, as much as they do have a very strict, and, you know, sort of in-your-face religious life that I'm going to increasingly talk about here, the Puritans did believe that as long as your spiritual house was in order and you were living up to those expectations, there was nothing wrong with making money. So they had no problem with economic prosperity as long as it was clear that you were living by the spiritual standards expected of you. And so this is just a brief summary then of early New England life. And so for most of the 17th century New England was really a success
story compared to the Chesapeake. But I'm now going to turn to events in the 1690s that are going to give New England a very different character; events that are going to inject a great deal of instability into New England life. So I'm suggesting that in some ways the Chesapeake and New England are converging. The Chesapeake starts out in a very rough fashion but does stabilize even if in a bizarre sort of way thanks to Bacon's Rebellion and slavery. New England starts out as a success story and then has some major bumps in the road. So the development of these two regions ends up converging to a large extent.
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**Text:** Puritan “Family Values”

- Children being “broken in” through such practices as kneeling on sharpened sticks and being tied up and rolled in a ball
- “Bundling” as courtship ritual
- Bachelors being forced to move in with families
- Death penalty for sons 16+ who disobeyed parents

**Audio:** I'm hoping that you'll find the material for this next slide to be sort of fun. It certainly has elicited some chuckles from students that I've had over the years. I'd like to talk about what I'm loosely referring to as Puritan family values because the Puritans did put a particular degree of emphasis upon making sure that the family unit conformed to their expectations. I mean, they really saw the family as the foundation for anything else that you might hope to accomplish in their society. And in many ways, you know, their practices seem anachronistic today but I'm being totally serious that the features of Puritan life that I'm about to describe were embedded in their culture here during the Seventeenth Century. In no particular order, let me say to begin with, that Puritan parents really operated on the assumption that children needed to be broken in, and therefore they used the kind of disciplinary techniques that certainly would earn you a visit from social services and perhaps the police department if you tried to do any of this today. But for example, it was not uncommon for children, I mean let's say you had a problem with talking or whispering, you know, you were not living up to that adage about being seen rather than heard. You might have to put a wooden bit in your mouth for an extended period of time. You also might end up being punished by having to kneel on sharpened sticks or being tied up and rolled in a ball. Just a couple examples of how children were from a very early age, encouraged to see the authority of their parents as absolute. If I can jump down to the last bullet point that you see there on your slide, in 1648, there was a law passed in Massachusetts that allowed the death penalty for sons 16 years or older who disobeyed their parents. Now no one has ever found a documented case of someone actually being put to death for this but there are documented instances where sons were whipped, were publicly whipped for disobeying their parents. And some of these sons were adults. Some of them were into their 30s and 40s and still being punished for disobeying their parents. So you get a sense of how parental authority was
maintained. As you probably already have a sense of, if you've ever read the novel, the Scarlet Letter by Nathaniel Hawthorne, the Puritans were very big on public shaming. You know whether it's kind of instance where maybe you're wearing the scarlet A for adultery or you're put on display in some kind of public but open confinement, you know, maybe being in what they call stocks, where your arms and your head are put inside narrow apertures and then you're locked in place. And for some extended period of time, you're basically on display in your community. People were also dunked under water publicly for certain periods of time as punishment. And part of the reason why there's all this emphasis on public shaming is, keep in mind, in all of these colonies, in all of these 13 Colonies, you again, you do not have a large military or law enforcement presence. And so therefore, you know, whether you're looking at the Puritans or other societies, neighbors are encouraged to keep tabs on one another and public shaming is often used as a replacement for, you know, other forms of punishment and other forms of corrective behavior. And so privacy was a very precious commodity throughout Colonial America, but certainly the case here in New England. Let me turn to some other features of what we could loosely call Puritan family values. If you were a bachelor who was not perceived by your town elders as really moving steadily towards creating a family of your own, you could be forced to move in with a family. In other words, the whole bachelor's way of life, I mean bachelorhood in general was assumed to be a sinful existence and therefore you were not expected to be a bachelor for a lengthy period of time, you know, once you reached a certain age. The average age for males to marry was 26 so you weren't necessarily being forced to marry early but there would become for you as a man where, again, you have to be seen as at least making progress or else authorities might step in. For Puritans, church going was a very serious affair. For one thing, it was pretty much an all day affair on Sundays and could also frequently include on weeknight as well. And going to church wasn't just about singing songs and it wasn't just about listening to a sermon, although certainly both of those events were important. There were a number of other things going on, Puritans did believe that individuals should work hard towards interpreting the Bible on their own terms. You know, not just sort of having some minister or some other authority figure pronounce what the Bible should mean to you but instead that you should work with it as well. So Puritan church services, you know, could also include what we might loosely call Bible study sessions. Although Puritans certainly did not like the idea of women acting as preachers, it doesn't mean that a woman, you know, cannot express an opinion but for a woman to actually try to become religious leader in Puritan society was a major taboo. As a matter of fact, there was one woman named Anne Hutchinson who in 1637, ended up being expelled from Massachusetts because she was holding meetings in her home where she was acting as a kind of unofficial minister to people who were willing to listen. And that just -- that went too far in this patriarchal society. But back to church going in general, another important feature was that those who felt that they had sinned would ask their entire congregations for forgiveness. And if your sin seemed heinous enough to you, you might actually go to the trouble of putting yourself in sack cloth and ashes, which was a Biblical style of repentance and actually crawling to the front of your church to ask all of your parishioners for
forgiveness. So, you know, in other words, the idea was you really debased yourself to show how truly sinful but repentant that you were. And so the Puritans have helped us to give us some of our customs of public confession. I would say that even the habit now of disgraced politicians coming forward and asking for forgiveness is to some extent, also grounded in the Puritan experience as well. And the final family value that I'll mention with the Puritans, I want to be very clear from the start, other Colonies had their own version of this as well, so it's not strictly a Puritan thing. But if any of you have seen the Mel Gibson movie, the Patriot that came about 10 or 11 years ago, which in some ways, by the way, was incredibly inaccurate in describing the American Revolution and Colonial life. But in other ways, you know, it gives you little snippets that can be useful for learning history, there was one scene with the unfortunately now deceased Heath Ledger, where he was allowed to spend the night in the bed of a woman whom he was courting. And the woman's parents tied him up in a sack basically up to his neck, hopefully, you know, hoping that he would not be able to get out during the evening. But basically they left him with their daughter for the evening and if you watch the movie, you definitely had the impression the next morning that they had a found a way to get them out, that's not really the way it was supposed to happen. But what was being depicted there is what was called bundling and bundling could be done in a couple different ways but it was basically a courtship ritual. The idea was that parents, I mean let me be clear, Puritan parents wanted their children to marry out of love. They were not about arranged marriages. They wanted children to find that right life partner and so certain courtship rituals were designed as a compromise between parents and children. It gave parents enough control, enough ability to monitor things where they felt like their children weren't running amok but it also allowed for a certain degree of intimacy so that young people could explore their feelings and see if this particular partner was the right one. So the way that bundling might work is, yes, a young man might be tied up in a sack up to his neck so he's left alone with the woman in his life in bed, so I mean there's a degree of intimacy. But obviously there are some physical restrictions on what might take place. You also might be bundled back to back with a board in between you so that both of you are restrained. There was another form where a woman might have a sack tied from her waist down and, you know, everybody can just use their imagination with these various rituals. But it was not uncommon in Colonial America to have something like this take place. So there certainly is no dating in our modern sense of the term, or even, you know, let's say in our 1940's or 1950's sense of the term but there are courtship rituals that are designed to allow young people to explore their feelings and develop relationships with one another. So these are just some selected examples of Puritan family values.
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Text: Salem Witchcraft Trials (1692-1693)
Audio: It would be difficult to talk about Puritanism without covering its most infamous episode and that would be the Salem Witchcraft Trials. From 1692 to 1693 in the Massachusetts town of Salem, that's a bit north of Boston, there was the greatest concentration of witchcraft accusations and prosecutions that had ever been seen in such a short period of time in the Western world. And scholars to this day are still trying to figure out exactly what happened, and there's still a certain amount of debate over the precise explanation. But I'd like to give you at least the broad outlines of the story. Let me say, as a backdrop, to it, that the Puritans were not individuals who tended to believe that anything happened by accident. One of their predominant beliefs was that the status of your soul, whether or not your soul was going to heaven or hell, had already been determined. Some Puritans believed that it had been determined before you were even born. And so Puritans were very obsessed with trying to figure out whether they were one of the chosen or one of the elect, as the term was used. And so they were often looking around them at their physical world to try to get some indication of whether they were in God's favor or whether their souls were damned. To put it another way, they were also often looking at their physical world to try to figure out whether or not there were forces of evil acting upon them or not. And so as I said, Puritans tend not to believe that anything happens by accident. Now there are many diary entries, that researchers have found that, you know, will have stories like, you know, so and so looked at me funny, gave me the evil eye, and the next thing you know my barn roof caved in or there were some other kind of accident. So of course, you believe that somebody had used sorcery to effect your life, or there are diary accounts of doors and windows mysteriously opening and shutting or entire place settings at your table suddenly rising up into the air and spinning around for a period of time. Puritans used to study clouds to try to -- [inaudible] believing that their shapes carry divine messages. These are just a few examples to suggest that there was a kind of underlying anxiety. Perhaps you could go so far as to call it paranoia in Puritan society. And by the early 1690's, I mean, there had been recent struggles against Native Americans. Relations were not quite as well as they had been as the New England colonies expanded and so forth. There were a variety of things going on. By the 1690's, there's a much more diverse immigration stream into New England. You have more and more non-Puritans arriving. You also have more and more young Puritans who are not seeking to become full church members any longer. So let me step back and deal with that in a second. I had mentioned earlier that to be a voting member in a Puritan community you had to be a full-fledged church member. But in order to become a full-fledged church member, you had to have what was called, a conversion experience. You had -- and even more than just having the experience, you had to describe it to church elders and have them decide that what you had described was legitimate, was acceptable to them. So in other words, you had to describe this intensely personal experience, something going on in your heart and your soul, and basically, you had to be judged over it and only then could you become a church member. Well, by the second half of the 17th century, we know from various sources that church membership was dropping in Puritan communities. And the main reason it seemed to be dropping was that more and more young people were not reporting any conversion experiences. So of course, they weren't becoming
church members. And for older Puritans and anyone who's trying to keep that city upon a hill mission alive, this was obviously very disturbing. And so Puritan leaders end up having to retreat a bit from their original focus. In 1662, a practice was initiated called, the halfway covenant. In other words, what this basically said was that if you would have been baptized in a Puritan church and if your parents were members of a Puritan church, then you could become a member even if you had not had that conversion experience. So it was a way to try to keep the church membership up for these younger people. But obviously, to allow this halfway covenant, you were stepping away from some of the same intensity and sense of mission that you'd had in the earlier years of these New England colonies. So all of this is a backdrop to the Salem Witchcraft Trials. And let me just introduce one more term as a background. By the early 1690's, there was a widespread fear in Puritan communities that a process of declension, which just means decay, had set in. So you know, whether you're looking at the halfway covenant, you're looking at new immigration trends, you're looking at unrest on the frontier with Native Americans, whatever the case may be, there are a variety of factors that are making life more unstable. And for whatever combination of reasons, we end up seeing this bizarre episode unfolding in Salem, Massachusetts. What basically happens is that a collection of adolescent girls begin to behave very strangely. And there is an assumption early on that they're behaving this way because they've been effected by evil spirits, evil spirits perhaps harnessed by certain neighbors who are dabbling in witchcraft. And so as these girls continue to have these afflictions, there's an effort made to query them, to try to figure out where is this coming from. And basically, the girls begin to point fingers. They begin to suggest that certain individuals have stricken them through using the black arts, through using witchcraft. And what begins with a handful of accusations will snowball like nothing that's ever been seen in the Western world. Before it's all said and done, more than 150 New Englanders will be arrested and charged and investigated for witchcraft. Very quickly, this becomes too big of an operation for the town of Salem to handle. They have to convene a special tribunal, that includes leading ministers from around Massachusetts, like Cotton Mather and his father, Increase Mather, who were very leading Puritans of their time. And as I said, they hear over 150 cases. The jails get very full. And before it's all said and done, 20 people are executed as convicted witches; 19 of them are hanged and, in one case, an individual was slowly crushed to death by having stones placed on -- I believe this was a man in this case - by having stones placed on his back. This did not end until 1693 when, at one point, the wife of the governor of Massachusetts was suggested to be a witch. And it was finally at this juncture that authorities decided that things had perhaps gone too far and they put the investigation to a halt. Everybody who was still in prison was freed. But quite a bit of damage had been done along the way. I mean, 20 people executed, people's lives torn apart with suspicions and accusations. In the year 1711 -- which was obviously a bit further down the road - - in the year 1711, the Massachusetts legislator did authorize payments to those families who had lost loved ones. And so while that wasn't exactly an official apology, it was in effect a de facto apology or admission that things had gotten out of hand. So needless to say, historians have been fascinated with trying to figure out how do we explain this. And among other things, researchers
have tried to look at patterns. They've looked at who are the accusers and who were the accused and what sort of patterns can we identify. And I just want to mention a few of the theories that have tried to explain what happened. And again, this remains something of a mystery. I'm not really going to necessarily endorse one or another. One theory is that the town's grain supply may have been somehow poisoned. It may very well have been accidentally poisoned and that it made people somewhat loopy. Another explanation is that if you look at -- if you look for patterns between the accusers and the accused, it looks like the accusers, by and large, represented families that were part of the original Salem Village. So there were families that had been part of that original city upon a hill mission who may have been more committed to that traditional purpose; families who may have been suffering a bit economically by the 1690's who may have been disturbed by the growing trend of non-Puritan immigration. As a matter of fact, the newer Salem town, that had grown up around the original village, did include a fair number of non-Puritan's who were more commercially oriented and others who were more economically prosperous. So some scholars have attempted to argue that you really have to look at the differences between the original village and the more modern town to explain why these divisions were created and why these charges were made. Another theory is that the patterns and the accused and the accusers has more to do with gender relations. There is a theory that if you look at the women who were accused, they were often times women who, in certain ways, were breaking the mold of what was expected from Puritan women, and that the men who were accused were the men in the lives of these women who weren't controlling them properly enough. So you know, other scholars have tried to boil this down primarily to gender relations. Again, it's a very subjective thing. And the debate, to some extent, still goes on today. But one way or another, this has really captured the imagination of students of history ever since the 1690's, and it does cast Puritanism in a much more negative light. And I just want to mention briefly, that it didn't always have to be this way. There was an episode in the early 18th century in the Western Massachusetts town of North Hampton where there was once again, an adolescent girl who began to behave very strangely. She was claiming to have these visions, just as, you know, some of the Salem girls had been claiming, except instead of assuming witchcraft and going off on the classic witch hunt, the elders in North Hampton actually turned to this young woman for guidance, and her visions were treated very positively as a way to help steer the evolution of the community and nobody was prosecuted as a result. But let me go back to the Salem trials once more. Another reason why we tend to be fascinated and also repulsed with them is that the way that the legal system operated in these trials was very different than the sort of safeguards that we're accustomed to today. What makes these trials very bizarre when we look back on them is that spectral evidence was allowed in testimony. In other words, if you claimed that you literally had, had this dream or vision of, you know, let's say a demon coming into your room at night, et cetera, et cetera, if town elders were willing to accept that explanation, if the authorities were willing to accept that explanation without any corroborating evidence, except for maybe one of the other girls having a similar story, you know, that evidence could be considered sufficient to convict someone. In other words, we're a long way from, you know, CSI
forensic evidence and so forth. Testimony of this very abstract nature could be used ultimately to convict somebody of witchcraft. And so a very different set of standards than we'd like to operate with today.
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**Text:** Early New York

[Map of New Netherland and Surrounding Area]

**Audio:** Now that I've given you the quick and dirty on both the Chesapeake and New England, I'd like to turn to the Middle Colonies, or for the first slide here, more specifically, to what becomes New York. In terms of European settlement, New York was initially colonized by the Dutch. Despite being a small country in Europe, the Dutch did have a strong maritime tradition, and they did build a pretty respectable colonial empire, and one of their earliest possessions was what they called New Netherland, which included present-day New York City and a fair amount of territory up the Hudson River Valley. So the Dutch first settled it in 1624. The British would take over in 1664 as a result of a war with Holland. The Dutch briefly recaptured it in the 1670's when the British re-established their control. So to this day, you definitely see a Dutch cultural influence in certain parts of what is today lower state New York and certainly New York City itself. And economically, you do see as a head right system being used, but the Dutch had set up in such a way that you could only become a tenant farmer on what were called patroon [phonetic] ships, which were huge tracts of land owned by wealthy landlords. So in some ways, opportunities in what became early New York were even more limited than in the early Chesapeake. But in any case, I want to continue talking about New York by focusing on relations with Native Americans. Because one thing that the New York colony gives us is the, an example of the most powerful Indian political and military unit or alliance that existed anywhere in North America at this particular time.

**Slide 13**

**Text:** Iroquois Confederacy

[Map of the Iroquois Confederacy, 1500]

**Audio:** Because everybody knows the general outcome of the story of European contact with Native Americans, namely that Native Americans are going to be pushed aside and end up as shadows of their former selves, there's a tendency to assume that from the very beginning Europeans were always able to deal from a position of strength and superiority when they came upon Native American tribes. The reality is that in many cases that was not true. In perhaps the most classic case is what happened in what is today upstate New York. There, early Dutch settlers and the British who came after them were forced to confront the reality that there was a
very powerful Indian alliance or confederacy known as the Iroquois League or Confederacy. Basically Iroquois refers to a language group, and they were initially five tribes, as shown here on the map, that had banded together to form a very powerful economic network that had tendrils extending all the way down into the present-day Southeast. And so if you wanted to, for example, to trade in animal pelts on the Atlantic seaboard, you pretty much could not do serious business in that area without having to deal with the Iroquois League. And it was a powerful military force. I mean, at its height, there were more than 50,000 warriors that could be amassed together if need be to support their political and economic goals. And so you see here the five original tribes of the Iroquois League, the Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga, and Seneca, and then later in the early 18th century a southern tribe known as the Tuscarora will also be added to this Confederation, and they were a very powerful force. And so what I'd like to do because they give us one of our more dramatic examples of Native American power during this period of history, what I'd like to do is just spend a little bit of time talking about their idea of warfare because it was very different than what Europeans were accustomed to. So in my next slide, I'm going to proceed to talk about the Iroquois concept of mourning war. Mourning, of course, not referring to a time of day, but to mourning as grief.

**Slide 14**

**Text:** Iroquois “Mourning” War

- Combat designed primarily to replenish population and grieve for lost loved ones
- Consequently a reliance on small unit hit-and-run raids
- Some prisoners ritually tortured and executed
- Unable to maintain practice as European wars came to dominate the continent

**Audio:** When we look at Iroquois culture, we find that their main reason for going to war was actually to replenish their population and, in the process, to grieve for lost loved ones. Now, sure, secondarily, as you often see in tribal cultures, a certain degree of warfare also helped to train young warriors and bring them to a kind of maturity so that they could be full-fledged defenders of their tribe. But the main purpose is what I've got here in my first bullet point. And I bring this up because it's going to have a real impact on the tactics that the Iroquois tribes used. Because they're trying to replenish their population, it obviously makes a certain amount of sense that they're going to choose military tactics that minimize their own casualties, otherwise, you would get yourself in a vicious cycle where you'd be constantly leading new expeditions because you're suffering heavy casualties from the last ones. So because their goal is to replenish population, basically threw kidnapping, and not just kidnapping Europeans but also individuals from rival tribes. So if your goal is to kidnap and bring these individuals back and forcibly acculturate them into your community, then you're probably going to avoid, you know, major set piece battles that could turn into blood baths. Instead, you're going to use basically what we call today "guerrilla tactics". You're going to use small unit hit-and-run raids. You're going to try to hit your enemy
unexpectedly, take as many individuals as you can. They're generally going to be women and children because the feeling is that they are more malleable to your goals. So they're not going to resist you quite as much. And then you basically try to melt away and bring these individuals back to your communities. Now I want to be very clear because we often have a degree of political correctness when we look back at Native American cultures. Because as Americans today, we tend to be a little embarrassed that what happened to them. But I mean, just to be clear, while I certainly don't condone much of the ways in which Native Americans were treated, we also have to be up front about the fact that these were very brutal societies in certain respects. And so part of the grieving process, if you were practicing this mourning war, was that some of your kidnappees would be ritually tortured and executed. They might be skinned alive. They might have their still beating heart removed from their body. There are all kinds of very gruesome practices that were used by the Iroquois and others if they wanted to torture and take someone's life in a dramatic fashion. So this is part of the story. But I want to fit it into the larger context here of this concept of morning war. And perhaps it will seem more significant if I can also describe for a few moments what the typical European style of battle was so you can appreciate how different that was from the way that the Iroquois fought. In the 17th and 18th centuries, if you were to look at the major wars that were fought on the European continent, there was a real emphasis upon trying to fight in a gentlemanly fashion, upon trying to impose a certain degree of etiquette and propriety over what is obviously, at the end of the day, a very brutal act, and that is the act of taking other lives on the battlefield. But because your officer corps in European armies were not only aristocrats but tended to be really the crème de la crème, even of the aristocracy, there was a real feeling that you couldn't trust common citizens as foot soldiers. And so you had to keep them under very strict control, very strict discipline. And also, quite frankly, the technology of the time dictated that. Because muskets, when you fired a ball from inside a musket, by the time it left the other end of the barrel it had rattled around along the way such that there wasn't much of a guarantee that where you were aiming the musket was where the ball was actually going to go. I mean, it was almost so bad that you might hit somebody 90 degrees off from your position or off from where you were aiming. It was that bad. So this is getting a little convoluted. So let me try to step back. European battles tended to be very organized set piece affairs. They were often fought on open plains where two armies would be largely in full sight of one another. They would come out in very densely packed formations in full view of one another. Typically, before a battle, several senior officers would hold a parlay, not entirely unlike I suppose a coin flip before a football game, and they would actually agree on which side would volley first. Now a volley is a simultaneous firing by either all of your troops or maybe selected components of your Army. And the reason why there was an emphasis on volleying or firing at once was that, A; again, you don't have a lot of confidence in your common soldiers in terms of being able to use good judgment and initiative. So you like to try to control how they do things as much as possible. So you like to keep them close to your officers, and you like them coordinating their actions. But also, again, you also volley because it comes back to the technology. Because these muskets can be very inaccurate, you feel like you have to bunch men
together and have them fire simultaneously so you can at least guarantee some concentration of fire. It's not going to be perfect, by a long shot, but it's another way that you manage your battlefield. So obviously, you know, we have the expression "Cannon Fodder". I'm referring to soldiers who fought this way because you are very exposed, and it's a kind of system that can produce heavy casualties. So what is supposed to happen in a set piece European battle is that both sides begin to trade volleys. The reality is that after a couple of these volleys there's so much smoke and so much noise, so much confusion, that things basically degenerate into more of a disorganized fight after the first few volleys. And generally, one line will break and that will lead to victory for the other side. But that is my quick and dirty on how European battles of the 17th and 18th centuries were fought. And as one famous military historian put it, it was almost better to lose well than to win badly. I'll say that again. It was almost better to lose well than to win badly. Meaning, that if you conformed to all those principles of etiquette and honor but ended up losing the battle, that could just about be more important than if you would violated some of those principles but actually won. So it was a comment made by the historian ingest. I mean, it was a tongue-in-cheek comment. But there was an element of truth to it as well. So I just want you to appreciate the total disconnect between that European style of battle and what I just described as the Iroquois practice of morning war. So not surprisingly, Europeans confronted with these raids and the kidnappings did tend to see them as particularly savage and cowardly. And I'm not saying that you can't appreciate those elements of it, but I just want you to understand the Iroquois practice from within the context of its own culture. And we do have some documented cases where Europeans who had been kidnapped and had spent many years within Indian tribes and it had families within those tribes. They didn't always want to go back when they were rescued and had the opportunity to make that choice. So it's a complex set of relationships that we're developing here. But in any case, I'm just trying to use the Iroquois as a general example of how Native Americans fought very differently and viewed warfare quite differently.
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Text: William Penn & Quakerism

[Photo of colonists with tribe members]

Audio: Although I've moved on to a slide that's going to deal with Pennsylvania and Quakerism, I just realized I'd like to throw in a few more comments about what happens to the Iroquois League because it's important to our overall colonial story here. As you're going to see in other maps, especially by the early 18th century, the French have a very powerful presence in North America, much of what is today, Eastern Canada was in their hands. They've also led the way in colonizing down the Mississippi River Valley. So the 13 colonies are bounded to their West and to their North by French possessions and to their South by Spanish Florida. And the Spanish and the French have Catholic dynasties in power that have generally been hostile to the British
monarchy. So periodically, during both the 17th and 18th centuries, there were wars that tend to begin in Europe but naturally spill over into the colonies that put the English and English colonists against the French and the Spanish and any Indian tribes that the French and Spanish may have been able to partner up with against the English. And I bring all of this up because it puts the Iroquois League in an increasingly difficult position. In the earliest stages of its contact with Europeans, because the Iroquois League was in the superior position, it could often play off different Europeans against each other, and it could stay neutral in conflicts if it wanted to. But as there's greater European, greater European presence in the New World, as there's greater European demand for economic goods and as European firearms begin to change the military balance of power, the Iroquois tribes find it increasingly difficult to remain neutral and increasingly difficult to stick to just the morning war type of operation. And so their casualties are going to mount. And as their casualties mount, their need for future military operations mount as well, if they're going to replenish their population. So they do get caught in something of a vicious cycle. And just to finish up the story, although this is also covered a bit in a future lecture of mine, as the American Revolution breaks out in the 1770's, the Iroquois tribes have to decide how to handle this because they have rebellious colonists in their midst, but they also have continued contact with the British Empire. Most of the Iroquois tribes decide to remain loyal to the crown and to continue with the agreements they already had with London. And their main reason for doing so is that they're promised by British authorities that if this rebellion is crushed, there will be no more westward expansion and no more encroachments on their territory by settlers. And so most of Iroquois tribes that go with the British Empire. So of course, they end up being defeated in the war. In fact, many of their settlements are burned to the ground. They suffer heavy casualties. And these Iroquois tribes are never anything near their stage of greatness again. They truly do end up as a pale shadow of their former selves. And so they end up - most of them end up on the losing side in this revolution. So that being said, I'd like to turn now to the other middle colonies. I'm going to talk primarily now about Pennsylvania. No offense to anyone who may be from Delaware or New Jersey. Those stories are a bit less dramatic. Delaware was originally settled by the Swedes in then 1638, then in the 1650's the Dutch briefly took over that colony, and then the British in the 1660's. And economically, what I'm going to describe for Pennsylvania is going to pretty well hold true for Delaware. Also economically, what I'm about to describe for Pennsylvania will pretty well hold true for New Jersey. So I'm really going to concentrate on Pennsylvania here. In the case of Pennsylvania, there was one man who was really given the ability to take his own personal vision and put it into practice, put it into reality. That man was William Penn. His family had been supporters of the Stuart Monarchy and so, therefore, they were given a huge land grant what ultimately became Pennsylvania. And William Penn himself, as this colony was settled in the 1680's, I'd like to talk a little bit about his vision. Number One, this was a man who was genuinely concerned about how Native Americans were being treated and, therefore, he did make a true effort to try to market Pennsylvania as a place where Native Americans could live in peace and could trust Europeans. For example, he did make it very clear that the practice of negotiating with Native Americans -- after he had gotten
them drunk on alcohol, because they didn't really have resistance to it -- that, that practice of bamboozling Indians was not going to happen in Pennsylvania and certainly while William Penn was alive. That was true. Once his sons came to power after him, there were some - there was some funny business that took place. But Pennsylvania was marketed to Native Americans. It was also marketed to Europeans, especially, of course, to citizens of England, as a place where you could get 50 acres of land for free. And for very low costs, you could get larger plots of land. And Pennsylvania, along with the other middle colonies, to a large extent, it becomes the breadbasket for the 13 colonies and a very important place for producing the food supply. And it really does become a land of relative prosperity right from the beginning. And the city of Philadelphia was -- the early city of Philadelphia was mapped out to a large extent by William Penn himself. It was a very planned city. Unlike Boston, which sprang up more haphazardly. And some of that design is still evident today if you travel to the city. Philadelphia has a very different character. And we can thank William Penn for that. So he has a policy of religious freedom, fair treatment of Indians, no selling Indians alcohol, 50 free acres of land. And what I'm about to turn to in a moment was the primary religious movement in Pennsylvania, by the way, also the primary movement in early New Jersey. And not to get too deep in the weeds, but New Jersey for a time was actually two different colonies; a North and south Jersey. And then in the early 1700's they were combined into one unit. But the dominant religion in both New Jersey and Pennsylvania in these early decades was Quakerism. And there aren't a whole lot of Quakers around anymore today. But in colonial times this was the third largest religion among European settlers behind Puritanism and what Puritanism involved into and also behind Anglicanism. I should have mentioned it by now, but the Anglican Church was the official Church of England. And in certain colonies, such as Virginia, the Anglican Church was the dominant faith. And again, it's still the official Church of England today. If you've recently seen, for example, Prince William marrying Kate Middleton, that was an Anglican ceremony, also when Princess Di married Prince Charles back in the 1980's. So in any case, what I'd like to do now is to talk about Quakerism, and I'll probably do a little bit of comparison contrast with Puritanism.

**Slide 16**

**Text:** Quakerism – Society of Friends

[Image of Quakers in a meetinghouse with Native Americans standing in the doorway]

**Audio:** So by 1750, the Quakers, as known as the Society of Friends, were the third largest church in Colonial America, although I use the term church somewhat loosely, they were very nonhierarchical and very informal in their religious arrangements. So they were more likely to call the place where they gathered a meetinghouse than a church. They didn't really have ministers the way we would think of that term today. They addressed each other as brother and sister, rather than using more formal titles like Mr. or Mrs. But they really caught on in the Middle Colonies and you would find Quakers in places like New England as well, which does
bring us to an irony of the Puritans. Although the Puritans were seeking religious freedom in coming to the New World, they weren't terribly tolerant about other faiths, at least in terms of extending full political citizenship to members of other faiths during their early years. So a Quaker in New England, especially early New England would not have been terrible welcome. Be that as it may, let me focus now on Quakerism. Members of this religious movement believed that God spoke directly to the human soul and therefore, I mean they didn't really have ministers or priests. And although they certainly read the Bible and studied the Bible, they felt that groups like the Puritans were too bookish, were too focused on the scriptures. As a matter of fact, Quakers referred to Puritans derisively as professors, again, suggesting they were too intellectual, they were too stuffy. Quakers really believed that it was through human relationships that you connected with God and ultimately achieved salvation, their term for it was the holy conversation. And so what you do find with Quakers is that while, you know, they're certainly part of a broader Protestant tradition, they're more likely to emphasize the passages in the Bible that showed a kind, gentle, forgiving God, whereas the Puritans -- and I'm speaking in huge generalities here but the Puritans were more likely to emphasize portions of the Bible that showed a severe, punishing God. And so there is a definite difference in tone. Now don't get me wrong, the Quakers had very strong beliefs and for example, if you were unwilling to marry from within the ranks of this religious movement, then you would be asked to leave. And so I'm not trying to suggest that the Quakers were in any way wishy-washy, they had strongly held views but there was, again, just a different overall tone to how they conducted themselves. So they were very nonhierarchical, at least compared to let's say the Puritans, although the Puritans were very nonhierarchical compared to the Catholics and the Anglicans so everything is relative. And we'll get back to religious life a bit when I describe the first great awakening of the 1730s and 1740s. But just to finish up Quakerism for now, some other things that they contributed to Colonial life, they did tend to be passivists so they rejected the use of violence. And also let me say in Colonial times, while the was certainly no antislavery movement per se, I mean we're a long way from talking about abolitionists as an active group, adjudicating for change, to the extend that we do begin to see a conscience about slavery and a questioning as to whether or not a Christian land could really allow slavery and still be legitimately Christian, to the extent that there is a conscience, it is largely Quakers who are beginning to ask the tough questions about slavery. And eventually when we do see the first antislavery societies in the United States, Quakers will be very prominent among them, this by the early 1790s. But obviously we're not there yet but just wanted to give you a little more of a sense of where they were coming from and how they contribute.
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**Text:** Lower South Colonies (Carolinas & GA)

[Map of the Settlement of the English Colonies]
Audio: So, I've gone back to a map here to introduce the last region of the 13 colonies that we're going to cover. And that's the lower south or Deep South that eventually consists of the two Carolinas and Georgia. So, let me summarize their early development. And of course, keep in mind what I've said a few slides back about there basically being a collision of three European empires in this part the world. You've got the French along the St. Lawrence River in what is today, Canada. Also coming down the Mississippi River Valley, you have the Spanish, in what is today Florida. And by the middle of the 18th Century, the French are crossing the great lakes and they're encroaching upon, for example Pennsylvania and Virginia. And we'll talk about some of the incidents that grow out of this rivalry. Let’s focus now on the lower south, the land grant that eventually turns into both North and South Carolina was given to a fairly small number of landlords or landholders, and the territory that becomes North Carolina was originally marketed to a large extent as a place for Virginians who were swamped with debt to go. In other words, if you did racked up major financial commitments in Virginia, and it was clear you just weren't getting out from under them any time soon, North Carolina was sort of that place to escape and get a fresh start. And I should use this dimension of one reality of life in the 13 colonies. Each of these colonies was in some respect like it's own universe. So, if you crossed a border into a new colony, to a large extent, you could escape whatever you left behind, including all sort of crimes. I mean there wasn't any high degree of cooperation between neighboring colonies when it came to a whole lot of anything, quite frankly. So, it was possible to get a fresh start and to get away from all kinds of problems by moving to a different colony. But, in any case, North Carolina develops without really much of a cash crop, because you can't really grow tobacco most successfully in most of North Carolina. Its forests do contribute to various naval related industries. But, North Carolina ends up not really having the cash crop and therefore not having a great deal of wealth. You don't see much of an upper class emerging in North Carolina, as in other places and also because you don't really have a big cash crop. While you'll see more slaves in North Carolina, then lets say Massachusetts, relative to the other southern colonies, you don't see as many slaves in North Carolina. South Carolina is in some ways perhaps a more interesting story. Many of the large landholders originally in South Carolina came from families that had made their money off of the sugar crop. In the Caribbean, as a matter of fact, I should mention that by the 18th century, the biggest money maker anywhere in the new world were basically these rather small Caribbean islands, where you could grow sugar. And that was one reason it was the worst place to be as a slave, because there was a greatest effort, method made to produce and extract production out of those individuals. Therefore, there was the worst measure of discipline. Some of the worst slave rebellions in the Western Hemisphere that took place on these Caribbean islands. But, anyway, these islands obviously only have so much real estate. So, for many of the younger sons of these wealthy sugar families, they're only way to have their only operations was to try to set-up somewhere. There just wasn't enough land for them in the Caribbean. So, they came to what became South Carolina and originally hope they can grow sugar on their plantations. But they gradually discover that sugar doesn't really take in this part of the world, and they also die from malaria and other diseases in alarming numbers in the low
country of South Carolina near the coast. And, so, this is another example of those who were aristocrats or quasi-aristocrats. They don't always survive very well. It becomes these 14 colonies. And it takes early South Carolinians a bit of time to figure out that it's best to build your homes at least somewhat removed from the swamps of the South Carolina low country or at least to spend the malarial season in a place like Charleston, which develops as it's major city, rather than staying on your plantation. But in any case, because of the dominant families that came to South Carolina in it's early years, South Carolina does have more of an upper class and more of a feel of an aristocracy about it than you’d see almost anywhere else. I would say if I had to pick the two colonies that had the most pronounced sense of an upper class, what they would call a gentry class, in colonial America, then I would say those are South Carolina and Virginia. So, just bear that in mind. So, South Carolinians do eventually find a cash crop to make their economy grow. It's not going to be sugar; instead it's going to be rice. And to some extent, secondarily, they're going to grow indigo which was a blue dye that would contribute to the textile industry. And, so, South Carolina will end up with a plantation-based society. It just wouldn't be with sugar. So, plantations and cash crops mean that you need a large labor force, and South Carolina will right from the beginning rely heavily upon slaves. And this, as a matter of fact, this colony will end up with the highest ratio of slaves to free citizens of roughly 4 to 1. So, this is the colony where you see the greatest concentration of slaves to free citizens, and that in general. This is a place where whites were going to be the most sensitive to any prospect of slave resistance, especially the ultimate act of resistance rising from a rebellion. And this is within reason why that patriot movie was so ridiculous, because it was suppose to be set in South Carolina, and it did give you the impression that slave-holding whites and their workforce just lived in this perfect harmony with one another, and it just does not capture the kind of paranoia that actually existed among whites in that part of world has. It was just ridiculous to be quite honest about it. But I did need to describe South Carolina in order to make better sense out of what happens in Georgia, because the particular character of South Carolina society is going to vary, directly spill over into to the design of Georgia. Georgia will be the last of the 13 colonies to be settled. Actually, not until the early 18th century. And Georgia like Pennsylvania, its land will be pretty much administered early on by one individual. A one individual who again will have that ability to take a personal vision and basically put it into effect. And this was a man named James Oglethorpe and when we look at early Georgia, it was basically part social experiment and part buffer zone. I'll say that again. It was partially a social experiment and partially a buffer zone. So let me cover each of those facets. It was a social experiment in the sense that Oglethorpe was concerned about a rising population of young people. Mostly men in England cities, who were hopelessly impoverished, were never going to own land and who might end up with wasted violent lives. And so he markets Georgia as a place where you can get 50 free acres of land, and you don't have to be an indentured servant to get it. You come to Georgia, you get 50 free acres of land and it's marketed to this desperate population back in England. There are a few conditions: Number one; you're not supposed to sell that land at any time soon. Because he didn't want land speculators coming along and gobbling up huge chunks of real
estate and turning Georgia into a plantation economy. He wanted there to be many small 50-acre farms dotting the landscape rather than just a few plantations. So, you couldn't sell your land right away. There was initially a ban on consumption of alcohol in Georgia, because there was a concern that this leads to a degenerate lifestyle, and there was also initially a ban on slavery. Now, that ban on slavery has more to do with Georgia being a buffer zone, because anybody that had progressive views on race. So, let me bring you back to South Carolina for a moment. As I've told you, South Carolina is the most sensitive colony about slavery, because you've got the greatest concentration of slaves, and there's no way you can keep track of them 24/7. There's no way you could hire to large enough supervisory workforce and still make money. So, this is where in South Carolina there's the greatest paranoia. Meanwhile, the Spanish down in what is today Florida, have figured out a way to destabilize life in the southern colonies. They have actually established free black communities along their border with these British colonies. In other words, in northern Florida you have a number of free black communities where Spanish authorities have made it very clear if you as an English slave can escape to Florida, you can live as a free citizens with no questions asked, as to whatever you left behind in a place like South Carolina. And the Spanish did this quite self-consciously, because they're trying to compete with the British. It's not always a good idea to go to open warfare with England. But a policy like this can really weaken the British economy and keep them paranoid. So, back to Georgia now, if you think about it if slavery is banned in Georgia lets be blunt, you’re not going to see a lot of black faces in that colony, because while you certainly can live in any of the 13 colonies as a free black citizen, you didn't have complete rights, you were often looked upon with suspicion. You had to carry identification and especially in southern colonies, free blacks were a resented population. So, sure there were some free blacks in Georgia, but not in huge numbers. So, if you were an English slave from South Carolina trying to make your way to Florida to take advantage of this offer from the Spanish, to be blunt, you're going to stick out like a sore thumb in Georgia. So, part of the reason there was a ban on slavery was to support the South Carolina effort to maintain control over its slave population. So, as I said, Georgia is part buffer zone. Some of the key features of Georgia life are designed to take into account the fact that you have hostile Spanish to the south. Not only in the sense that slavery is banned so that escaped slaves there stand out, but also if you've created all these 50 acre farms that are inhabited by free citizens. That also means that in time of crisis, all of those able-bodied men can contribute to defending the colony if you’re going to war with Spain. I haven't mentioned this yet, but I think some of you probably know that especially where there aren't many British troops in these colonies, if there is some sort of a crisis, every community has a collection of able-body men when where part of its local militia and though periodically trained. Although, they certainly don't tend to be professional soldiers, but they will do some training together. And obviously they've got some proficient efficiency with firearms, and they're the ones that you call up as an immediate reaction to a crisis. So, Georgia is also a buffer zone, because you've got a potentially large collection of men who can fill your militias in the event there's trouble with the Spanish or with the French or with the Native Americans for that matter. So, I should mention that the ban on slavery and the ban on
alcohol in Georgia don't last very long. They're economic pressure for slaves, and there is social pressure for alcohol to be freely consumed. But at least in its early stages, there was an attempt to keep both slavery and alcohol out of Georgia. Economically, Georgia is pretty close to South Carolina in terms of the types of crops and products that are made. But, Georgia does not have as much of a plantation field to it, because there was that original 50-acre arrangement. So, Georgia will have an upper class more so than in North Carolina, but certainly not the same kind of pronounced upper class that you would see in South Carolina. So, there's a brief summary of life in the lower south. And I'm now going to turn to a slave rebellion in South Carolina that is going to set the tone for southern life for decades to come.
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**Text:** Stono Rebellion (1739)

[Image of slaves attacking and killing whites]

**Audio:** I mentioned a few moments ago that white South Carolinians tend to be the most anxious, the most insecure, the most paranoid, and sensitive about aspects of race relations because they are outnumbered roughly four to one by their slave population. And in September of 1739 not too far from Charleston in an area along the Stono River there will be a slave uprising that is going to leave Southerners continuing to be paranoid for generations. On a Saturday night a collection of slaves, mostly from Angola, had finished their plans to try to seize some weapons and start a major slave revolt in South Carolina. And they finished up their plans on a Saturday night because Sunday was generally the one day of the week where the duties of slaves were greatly reduced. It was for the most part a day of rest, and typically whites would be off at church. So there was actually a law passed in South Carolina that whites had to bring firearms with them to church because there was fear that if there was going to be some kind of a slave revolt, this would be the day that it would happen and you didn't want to be all cooped up in one place vulnerable to a possible attack. So be that as it may, this rebellion got under way by slaves attacking a store and beheading the storeowner in order to get their hands on some weapons, on some firearms. And what made this incident particularly troubling for whites is that usually if slaves tried to escape, they did so by themselves or in very small groups. In other words, the mentality was basically save my own skin and nothing more. But what these slaves did near the Stono River was that as they initially rose up and got their hands on some weapons, they tried to rally and free other slaves to their cause. They tried to go plantation to plantation and to create a sort of ragtag army by liberating other slaves. And so this was a very collective action and that was ominous. And while they did ultimately want to escape, again, they were trying to take plenty of others with them and their goal was to get to Florida. So this is another piece of evidence that the Spanish policy was obviously having some impact in British colonies. These slaves were trying to make their way south to Florida. So as I said, they rose up, they gathered weapons, they attacked a number of plantations, it's estimated that they killed up 60
whites. Again, I don't condone this, but I'm not saying I don't understand it either. I mean there was tremendous anger; these people had been treated horribly. By the way, if you tried to escape as a slave, punishments would be severe; you could be branded, you could be castrated if you tried to escape several times. And so you can imagine the pent up rage by these individuals, so yes, they took out some of their frustration on the whites that they came across. And not every slave who had a chance to go with them decided to go; some were afraid of retribution. But gradually a force of slaves began heading south and they might very well have been able to get out of South Carolina and potentially make their way to Florida, but the alarm was raised soon enough that South Carolina militiamen were able to organize themselves and go after this ragtag army. They eventually surrounded them, there was an engagement, most of the slaves were captured and executed pretty much right on the spot. Obviously there was a feeling that there had to be a message sent to any other slaves that might be thinking about rebelling. So the Stono Rebellion failed, but it does remind us, and plenty of good research has been done to suggest, that slaves did not take their condition lying down. And as we continue on into the 19th century there will be a number of slave rebellions in the antebellum South that will continue to rock that society. And so there was always that underlying fear especially in places like South Carolina and Virginia where your slave population was relatively high; always that fear of repeats of what was seen here along the Stono River. And let me just mention briefly that slaves found other ways to resist short of rising up in an outright rebellion; you know, breaking tools, slowing down the pace of work, burning down barns, you know, a slave who was skilled in the use of herbs might gradually poison individuals in a slave holding family. There were other techniques as well; forms of psychological warfare being waged back and forth on both sides. So there's a very rich literature out there to suggest that plenty of slaves contested their condition while trying to forge their own culture and survive with as much dignity as possible. So this is a much bigger story than I'm talk about here with these slides.
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**Text:** Colonial Social Hierarchy

- Gentry/Commoners/Slaves
- Vertically Integrated Society
- Rituals and symbols built into day-to-day life to reinforce the pecking order
- Gentry had responsibilities of spending and loaning money to support local economy
- No single path guaranteed access to gentry class

**Audio:** Now that I've introduced each of the major regions of the 13 colonies, I'd like to step back and talk about things more generally. I'd like to talk about the colonial social hierarchy or another way to refer to it is the colonial class system that to a large extent defined people's lives. That class system had three general levels. At the very top and comprising of only about ten percent of the total population, was its unofficial aristocracy, known as the gentry class. I am
going to talk more about how this class operated. Suffice it to say for now, that by British standards, by European standards, this was not a powerful group. I mean, the gentry over in Europe would have just have been the very lowest level of a much broader and more powerful range of aristocrats. But of course, these families in America that had risen to the top, you didn't have to go too far back in their family trees to find people who had been struggling. So, obviously, they have not built up the same resources and influence, as you would see in the European aristocracy. But here in America, men like Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, John Hancock, they are part of this gentry class. Keep in mind, even a plantation like Washington's Mt. Vernon in Virginia, would not have been such a big deal. You know, it would not have made the proverbial Better Homes and Gardens over in England. But, anyway, the gentry are at the top. The vast majority of the rest of the population were referred to as commoners. And this is again, a very vast group. It can include skilled artisans; it can include rather poor members of society. It can actually include rather wealthy members as well, who for various reasons have not been accepted yet into the upper class. So, it is a very vast amalgam of colonial Americans. And finally there are slaves, and keep in mind again that especially in places like Virginia and South Carolina. It's not just that they're just slaves, it's that they're permanent underclass. While slavery was legal everywhere in colonial America, you were certainly going to find far more slaves in some places than others. For example, besides Virginia and South Carolina you would see a fair number of slaves in New York City, kind of left over from Dutch practices and Dutch influence. You would not have seen many in New England. You would not have seen a great many in Pennsylvania. So, it varies. But, slaves are at the bottom. Let me also say, though, that there were plenty of colonial Americans who knew what it was like to be unfree. And there were plenty of commoners who to a significant extent were unfree. Now, this is not to make light of slavery, but it's just to suggest that a slave would not have stood out quite as much as our modern sensibilities might have us think. For example, obviously, if you'd ever been an indentured servant, you would have been unfree. If you were an apprentice, and these were generally adolescent boys who were signed over by their parents to learn a skilled trade. And so, you generally lived under an artisan's roof. And this also could be about a three to seven year arrangement while you learned a skill. You definitely gave up some of your freedom if you entered into that arrangement. Women in general had no independent legal identity in Colonial America. While you were growing up, you were considered basically -- your father spoke for you legally. Once you were married, that was your husband. If you happened to be a widow, and you had assets left over from your first marriage and then you remarried, your second husband promptly took over those assets. So, in a very dramatic way all colonial women knew what it was like to be unfree to one degree or another. So, I just would like you to keep that in the back of your mind, as we move through this material. So, when you look at these three social classes, also keep in mind that this is what we call a vertically integrated society. Now, what does that mean? That means that everybody is very conscious of who is above them, and who is below them in the grand pecking order. You know again, a real sensitivity to who's above you and who's below you. And this was also important, because all kinds of everyday practices, rituals,
symbols that you would across in your communities, were designed to remind you of where you sat in the pecking order. And so everybody was very particular about what kind of courtesy. Am I supposed to pay to those who were above me? And what kind of respect and deference can I expect from those who were below me? Let me give you a very basic example: Students at Harvard University, the first university in the 13 colonies, were actually expected to worry about at what distance they would doff their caps. Sort of like a salute in military culture and what distance they would doff their caps when they came across superiors. So, for example let's say you're out on Harvard yard and you see your professor coming your way. Were you supposed to remember at what distance was appropriate to take off your cap as a gesture of respect? And then let's say you continued walking, and you came upon the dean of your college. He would go even from a greater distance. Would you doff your cap for him? And if you would happen to see the president of your university, then he gets an even greater show of respect. So, people really obsessed about things like this, as bizarre as that sounds. But one reason why all this focus on courtesy and deference and etiquette is that this is a very fragile society socially. I mean we like to celebrate American upward mobility and certainly there was that, but there was also downward mobility. And in this economy and in this society, one's reputation, one's sense of honor were very important in getting things done. And it's these rituals and symbols that help to reinforce whatever reputation, whatever status that you have. In many ways you could think of reputation as a kind of currency or grease or lubricant if you will, that allows you to get things done or perhaps limits your opportunities. Let me put it another way. Research has tended to bear out the reality that most colonial Americans never traveled more than 30 miles from where they were born. So, the communities that you were born into that you were grown up with, were communities were you tended to stay, and therefore whatever reputation you developed in life, you really did tend to be saddled with it. And so people were very sensitive about the kind of respect and prestige, or lack thereof, that goes with your reputation. So, people were status conscious in a way that would probably seem odd to us today. And especially if you were in the gentry class, you were really expected to flaunt your status. Now again in some places, there were more of an emphasis on it then others. Places like Virginia and South Carolina. You had a much more self conscious Gentry class than in, let’s say New England, because that Puritan tradition in New England did stress modesty and also in Pennsylvania where the Quaker tradition was strong. But in Virginia, there was an expression that the Virginia gentleman would walk five miles just to be able to find a horse to ride one mile. In other words, you'd rather show up at an event on a fine horse looking very regal, you'd rather walk five miles to get to that horse, just to be able to ride it one mile and make that grand impression. Just trying to throw in a few anecdotes here to make things colorful. Now, the gentry were at the top of the society. And obviously it's good to be the king as they say, but I would like to stress that there were plenty of expectations that went with being in this upper class as well. In the gentry we're operating with the model of the ideal English gentlemen. But just keep in mind, the American gentry and the colonial gentry have nowhere near the resources of your typical British gentleman, so their trying to live up to an ideal where in certain respects it's beyond they're reach. But I wanted to give you
a couple of examples of expectations of this gentry class. You were supposed to spend money as though it was going out of style. As though you didn't have to worry about where your income was coming from. So -- and the idea was even further that you were supposed to spend your money in ways that supported your local economy. So you know, having a nice carriage built that would keep certain local artisans employed. Throwing lavish parties that to some extent had to be catered and supported by others in the local economy. Just a couple of examples here how you spent your money. Also, if somebody in your community was obviously seeing you as a kind of parental figure. If somebody comes to you with a story about having fallen on hard times and needing a loan, again there were cultural pressures that you as a gentleman we're suppose to be loaning that money, and not to gouge somebody with the interest rate and not to be too picky or too demanding about how quickly they pay it back. And so it's often an untold story that some members of this gentry class ended up collapsing under the burden of these responsibilities. There were some who even committed suicide out of a sense of dishonor, because they can no longer live up to these expectations and their finances were actually collapsing. Even Thomas Jefferson at the time of his death, his household was ridiculously riddled with debt. As a matter of fact, his plantation in Charlottesville, Virginia, Monticello actually ended up having to be sold out of the family after his death to pay off debts. And Americans are very fortunate that eventually the Monticello site was able to be turned into an historic landmark, so that everybody could enjoy it, because Thomas Jefferson did not manage his finances very well in his lifetime. A couple of more things I'll say for right now. Becoming a member of the gentry class is sort of a complicated process that is difficult for me to summarize, because it really depended upon what the pre-existing gentry in your community what -- it depended on whether or not they were willing to accept you and what standards they set. So, what I'm trying to say, there is no set formula. That no matter where you were in colonial America allowed you to reach this society. It was not strictly about money. Why? Because there was a real concern that there was a proper way to make money. In other words, you were not supposed to be seen as somebody who was deeply involved in investing in financial markets, because that was seen as too grasping, too commercial too plebeian. So you might become very wealthy by being, lets say -- being a merchant, or somehow very deeply involved in the workings of capitalism, as it existed back then. But in order to become a gentleman, you often times had to step away from that and make it look like you now lived more of a life of leisure. For example collecting rents as a landlord that was a great way to be seen as making money. And a very dignified genteel way of making money. So, for example, you look at someone like Ben Franklin who was born into modest means and gradually made something of him. He wasn't really accepted as a gentleman until he had made enough money that he could step back from the marketplace, if you will. And then that helped to ease his acclimation into the gentry class. So, it wasn't strictly about money, it wasn't strictly about social connections, but that could certainly help. It wasn't strictly about your profession. But, for example if you were a medical doctor that certainly was a line of work that had a growing prestige attached to it. So, that might help. You wouldn't necessarily have to be a wealthy medical doctor in order to become accepted as a gentleman. But again, it's kind of a
tricky thing. The gentleman was also not supposed to get his hands dirty. So let’s say you were a tobacco planter, like a George Washington or Thomas Jefferson. There was cultural pressure that you'd better not be out in your fields every day working up a sweat and having to really labor. Which is a matter of fact both of these men did quite a bit, if only because they were trying to perfect their tobacco crop. So, there was always kind of a charade that many gentlemen were putting on, because the reality was they often did have to sweat in one form or another. But you were supposed to act as though you didn't. It may sound a little bit silly, but this is -- these are some of the essential features of the colonial social hierarchy or class system.
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**Text:** First Great Awakening (1730s-1740s)

[Image of preacher delivering sermon to a crowd]

**Audio:** I am turning now to my last major event to wrap up this lecture, and you can think of it as a religious revolution, but by the time I finish covering its details, I'd like you to appreciate that it was a religious revolution with a profound impact upon the Colonial class system or hierarchy and also a profound impact upon Colonial politics. And in some ways this religious revolution that we call the First Great Awakening is going to help the enable the American Revolution that's coming down the pike in the 1770s and will be the subject of a future lecture. So to step back and try to discuss it in broad terms, you can think of the Great Awakening as a series of religious revivals that swept across the 13 colonies. In some cases, this message was spread by rather established ministers, but in many cases the message was spread by wandering preachers often called "itinerants," just referring to the fact that therapy a mobile or transient population. And they would basically set up shop wherever they possibly could. I mean, you have a picture here of someone speaking outdoors. This is actually George Whitefield who ends up becoming the most famous of these Great Awakening preachers and I'm going to talk more about him in a little bit. But it is basically a revolutionary religious message, and it's called the First Great Awakening because there will be another wave of revivalism in the early nineteenth century, the Second Great Awakening. But here in the 1730s and '40s, this message will be spread. And what I'm going to try to do is to break it down into the supporters of this religious revolution and its opponents, those who looked upon it with a certain degree of anxiety, and hopefully in the process, this will all come together in a sensible way. But please keep in mind that the message for the most part was spread very informally. You might be hearing it in a barn, outdoors, in very unique settings. People who were used to getting their religion in very formal and potentially stuffy environments are now going to be getting something very different.
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**Text:** Great Awakening Supporters
• Included “New Light” Congregationalists (Puritans), “New Side” Presbyterians, Baptists, and Methodists
• Believed in “born again” experience
• Concerned that religious life was more about form and ritual than substance
• Spread a dire message, but informal style of delivery encouraged notion that all souls mattered equally to God
• George Whitefield as first anticolonial hero

Audio: Generally speaking, those who came to embrace the Great Awakening believed that many colonists had lost the appropriate focus and the priorities in their spiritual life. They believed that too many people were sort of going through the motions; that they might attend church regularly, they might practice the sacraments of their faith regularly, but that there wasn't, you know, much fire in the belly, there wasn't much faith, there wasn't much spirit behind what they were doing. And so they're going to try to issue their version of a wakeup call to colonial Americans. Very central to the Great Awakening message was to use a modern term, the need to be born-again. So I want to stress that this is an evangelical, religious movement, no question about it. And, and if you weren't willing to have that kind of born-again experience, if you did not think that was necessary, it was very unlikely that this movement was going to appeal to you. And so, because of the focus on being born-again, as you might begin to figure out therefore, there was a real concern among supporters of the Great Awakening that the, that the fate of their souls were in danger. And those who spread this message, the content of that message tended to be very grim and very dire. For example, one famous minister promoting the Great Awakening was a New England figure named Jonathan Edwards, who operated in the Connecticut River Valley. And he eventually became so prominent that they started referring to him as Pope, which of course for Protestants, that’s not what they want to be called because there is a real resentment of the Catholic Church and it's, it's hierarchical structure. But in any case, Jonathan Edwards had one sermon called "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God". And I've often used that sermon as a great example of where supporters of the Great Awakening were coming from. And Jonathan Edwards was known for giving this kind of fire and brimstone sermons, or the fancy word for it is a Jeremiad, which is a sermon that is very much designed as a moral rebuke, as a wakeup call, as something that is designed to instill a great deal of fear for the fate of your soul. And there was at least one parishioner of Edwards' who ended up slitting his own throat after listening to this minister. And it wasn't too long after this that his congregation, voted to remove him and he ended up becoming a missionary with Native Americans. So it was possible to go too far with a message like this, but this gives you some sense of the content of where supporters of the Great Awakening were coming from. But there is a real irony in their message. As much as the content might be telling you that Heaven and salvation were more difficult to achieve than you might have thought, their style of delivery, which as I've said, it's informal, it's catering more to the public because it's often taking place outdoors and it's, it's in venues where you wouldn't expect it. The informal style of delivery actually had, to some extent, the opposite impact of the content.
of the message. Even if you, you know, even if listening carefully to one of these sermons would make you fear for the fate of your soul, the way that that message was being delivered to you encouraged the notion that all mattered equally to God. And that has very powerful implications, when you look at colonial life. You know, I just told you that this is a vertically integrated society; people are very status-conscious. But if aspects of your religious life are beginning to tell you that hierarchy doesn't matter, then you can imagine how that really eats away at much of the foundation of colonial life. And you can also appreciate how this might lead to a political movement that's going to reject the kind of hierarchy embedded in the British Empire. So it's no coincidence that an event like this is happening not terribly long before the American Revolution. So what I'd like to do is to talk about in, in more detail, some of the individuals who supported this. Now let me say, in some cases, new churches sprang up to a large extent because of the Great Awakening. In other cases, churches split over it. So if you look at my examples of supporters. Two relatively new churches that are merged, especially in southern colonies, were the Baptists and the Methodists so they are, by en large again, two new creations we associate with the Great Awakening, but other churches split. By the early eighteen century, you don't really speak of Puritan Churches anymore, they call themselves Congregationalists. But they split and those who supported the Great Awakening, refer to themselves as New Lights. The Presbyterians also split and there are, there are congregations that embrace the Great Awakening and call themselves New Sides. I'm just giving you a few examples here of the players. And I want to mention for a few moments, the most famous of the Great Awakenings supporters. He's a man who's very important in the grand scope of colonial history. He was a minister by the name of George Whitfield from England. And I should mention the Great Awakening actually began in England so it was having a real impact in the mother country as well. But George Whitfield came to America and ended up crisscrossing the colonies with his very eloquent speaking voice and unique style of delivery, and he really became a kind of celebrity or hero to many colonial Americans. Now, his background was a little bit unique for being a supporter of the Great Awakening. He was actually an Anglican minister, and as I am about to talk about when I get the Opponents of the Great Awakening, the Anglican Church tended to be hostile to these religious changes. And so normally its ministers would not be found in the ranks of the supporters. But George Whitfield, much like Nathaniel Bacon, was unique. He was a rebel from the more privileged group, the more established group, if you will. And not only was he already and ordained minister in the Anglican Church, but he'd also had some training for the stage while he was a young man. So, he was not a career actor but he did have some acting experience, and he brought that with him to the proverbial pulpit. In other words, what he would do among other things, would be to act out some of the more dramatic episodes from the Bible, and by all accounts, was very good at doing this. And so he was traveling through the colonies and if he was lucky, sure, sometimes he'd speak in a church. In many cases though, he would have to take his message outdoors, as with the slide that I showed a moment ago. And wandering preachers like him were really treated in many cases, like rock stars. I mean, people would flock to them; there would be this kind of mob atmosphere. Frankly, sometimes it got dangerous, just as it does
sometimes with rock concerts. There are some stories of buildings collapsing and people losing their lives because, of this sense of fervor over their spiritual salvation, things just got out of hand. And certainly at times, George Whitfield met hostile audiences as well. He had rocks thrown at him, and so forth. And sure, I mean, some people said that he was just a charlatan, that he was just trying to steal your money because you know, sure the hat got passed around whenever he would come and speak. His efforts did help to fund an orphanage in Georgia, for example, but there were people who wondered if his was just here to line his own pockets. I will say, one sign that Whitfield was a good speaker was that Benjamin Franklin, who was one of the most intelligent and skeptical individuals in the Colonial population, skeptical when it came to religion, he actually contributed some money after listening to George Whitfield speak. So, one of the toughest sells you could imagine in colonial America, he at least found something positive in what Whitfield had to say. So, research has, by the way, shown some correlation, and I don't want to overstate this, but has shown some correlation between individuals who supported the Great Awakening and those who eventually became patriots, as relations between the colonies and the mother country deteriorated and we moved towards war. Now, it's not a perfect correlation, and it's a very complicated thing to study. You know, why did colonists make the choices that they did with their loyalties, either to stay with the crown or to become part of this independence movement? So you can't boil it all down to how you reacted to the Great Awakening. Not to mention that, you know, enough years passed that of course, some people were too young to have really been directly impacted by the Great Awakening by the time the war breaks out. But there is at least some correlation there because at least the Great Awakening, with the way that it was changing life in America, it was striking down this notion of hierarchy; this notion that your place in life was relatively set and you, you know, you couldn't do a whole lot about it. And so you can imagine how that would have political implications. And the Great Awakening also made political life more competitive because, in colonial times, it was not uncommon, I mean, if there was a dominant church in your particular community, then everybody was expected to pay taxes to that church, whether they were members or not, whether they particularly believed in that church's values or not, whether they particularly wanted to or not. And back when communities were more homogeneous, it was easier to get away with that sort of thing because those who were not supportive of that church were, tended to be in a small enough number, that it just wouldn't make that much of a difference. But as the Great Awakening makes religious life more pluralistic and leads to a greater diversity of beliefs, it also creates more frustrated citizens who don't want to have to pay taxes to an established church that they might not believe in. And so therefore, they get more involved in colonial politics, to try to change that policy, and so it does lead to a greater competition for office, it does make life in general more contentious. But if I could come back to George Whitfield for just a moment, he is often referred to as the first intercolonial hero and here's what I mean that: I've already mentioned that these colonies were like their own separate universes, and what that meant was that there was a tendency for people to know more about what was going on back in the mother country of England, than to know what was going on in their neighboring colonies. Well,
George Whitfield helps to change that. As he goes up and down the Atlantic seaboard spreading his message, what he's also doing is he's giving more and more colonies a common experience. Many people have either listened to this man or they've read his sermons and so, in his own way, he is helping to contribute to a distinctly American experience and therefore to a distinctly American identity. By the mid eighteenth century, more and more now, you see the term American being used to refer to these colonies. Now don't get me wrong, even people who were calling themselves American were still very proud to be of British decent and very proud to be part of the British Empire. And it's going to be a gradual, tortuous process, through which many of them decide for independence. But nevertheless, the Great Awakening is seen as a keep step in the process of the creation of a more distinctly American identity, and so it's important to note this as one milestone in that process.
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Text: Great Awakening Opponents

- Included “Old Light” Congregationalists (Puritans), “Old Side” Presbyterians, Anglicans, Quakers, and Catholics
- Concerned with itinerant preachers often uneducated and not ordained
- Research has found some correlation between opponents and loyalism while supports of Awakening tended towards patriots

Audio: Before I get into opponents of the Great Awakening, I'd like to give you a little more background as to why some people felt the need for this religious revolution in the first place. As you may have learned in a western civilization class, the 18th century and to some extent the late 17th century were considered to be what textbooks call the Age of reason or the European Enlightenment. It was a time of tremendous intellectual progress, where philosophers tried to take the scientific method that had produced good results in the world of the hard sciences and tried to apply it now to the social sciences. And there was really a feeling that if mankind can figure out the physical laws that govern our universe, can we also now perhaps try to figure out the social laws that govern or ought to govern our universe. And there was a real optimism that mankind could perfect its human societies, especially in terms of politics, that you could really create ideal societies, there was a real celebration of the rule of law, it helps to encourage the writing of constitutions. There's a wide variety of development. So if you ever heard about, for example, the French novelist and philosopher Voltaire, or other Frenchmen like Montesquieu, or Jean Jacques Cousteau, or if you heard about John Locke, Denis Diderot, these are all examples of enlightenment philosophers. Certainly Thomas Jefferson is an example of an American philosopher, because colonists are influenced by these events beginning in Europe. But among other things, you know, as the enlightenment, of course, puts mankind at the center of the quest for knowledge. It increasingly makes mankind the authority in all human endeavors. So naturally, churches and the general idea of taking things on faith, those are being weakened by
the growth and the spread of the European enlightenment. And so one reason why certain individuals will feel a sense of spiritual crisis and will support the Great Awakening is that they do feel there's a kind of secularization that is spreading across the western world, thanks to the enlightenment. And in defense of enlightenment philosophers, many of them did feel as though they were good Christians, and that their efforts were not undermining religious value and religious -- the prevalence of religion in western life. But sure, there was a degree of agnosticism and a degree of atheism that was directly or indirectly being encouraged by these developments. And with that in mind, I did want to mention one belief system -- I can't really call it a religion -- but one belief system that develops out of the enlightenment was what was called Deism. D-E-I-S-M. And Deism was basically the belief that yes, there was some kind of all-powerful creator out there, the details on this creator tended to be very fuzzy. So if you were a devout Christian, devout Jew, devout Muslim, this creator was not going to conform to your interpretation of God. But Deists would at least say yes, there's some kind of all-powerful creator out there. But the sort of analogy they would use, it would be sort of God is the cosmic watchmaker, because if you do put together a watch properly, once you set it in motion you don't have to tinker with it any longer. And Deists basically posited a universe where yes, it was created by a kind of a divine force, but that that divine force may not intervene once it has set the universe in motion. In other words, it's going to be human agency that ultimately dictates how mankind evolves. And so you can think about some of the implications of Deism. It might suggest that praying isn't particular necessary, because there may not be anyone to respond to those prayers and intervene in human affairs. Maybe the sacraments of your church aren't terribly relevant either. So Deism is certainly an intellectual step towards agnosticism and towards atheism. So for supporters of the Great Awakening, the European enlightenment could often be seen as contributing to that sense of crisis and the need for the wake up call. Don't get me wrong; features of the enlightenment and things like Deism could also upset opponents of the Great Awakening. They may not feel quite the same sense of crisis, but they too were not necessarily thrilled with that either. But I just wanted to give you a little bit more of a background. So let's turn now to those who did not embrace the Great Awakening, and try to get a sense of where they were manage from. A big part of the problem if you were an opponent of the Great Awakening is that as I said, most of this revolution's message was being spread by wandering preachers. And the vast majority of them were not well educated, like a George Whitfield, they were not ordained like a George Whitfield, they had not gone to divinity school. In fact, some of them were not even literate, believe it or not. So if you had, you know, punched all the very tickets to become let's say an Anglican minister, and you now had, you know, these people blowing into town and stirring up all kinds of emotion and then leaving shortly there after, you know, people who did not have the necessary education, at least what you saw as the necessary education, and probably didn't have much social status in most cases. As far as you were concerned, these people were upstarts; these people don't know what they're talking about. So please keep in mind that much of the antagonism comes from kind of a class resentment and a feeling that obviously if people start to see religious leaders as basically anybody can become a religious leader, maybe you don't even
have to read, and you can now become an authority on religious life, then obviously that's threatening to established figures in these more established churches. So when we look at the opponents, again in some cases they're the by-products of churches that have divided. So you have old life Congregationalists, again the evolution from Puritan New England. You have old side Presbyterians. You also have very established churches like the Anglicans, who are particularly powerful in places like South Carolina and Virginia. You also have the Quakers who don't generally get on board with this. Again, they don't really have a church, per se. And also Catholics. Now I do want to be clear, the vast bulk of the immigration to the 13 colonies is protestant. So Catholics are not here in huge numbers yet. In the early 19th century that will begin to change, but to the extent that Catholics are in the 13 colonies they do not tend to be found among the supporters of the Great Awakening. So I'm just trying to give you a little bit of a line up here in terms of who the major players were and how they felt about these changes. So I've tried to suggest that this religious event does have profound social and political implications as well.
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**Text:** Thirteen Colonies in 1750s

[Map of Colonial America in 1754]

**Audio:** So we're reaching the end of this lecture now. I bring us back to a map, 13 colonies in the 1750s and it's during this decade that there is going to be the most significant of several colonial wars that British settlers had to be a part of because of the collision of these three empires. Again, you've got the Spanish, the French, and the English with competing interests in this part of the world not to mention Europe and other places. In 1754, thanks to an incident or series of incidents in which, of all people, George Washington will play a very central role. There will be a conflict that breaks out in North America called the French and Indian War. And that will help to set off a broader conflict, really a global war that was called the Seven Years War. And the way to which it was fought and it results are going to have a profound effect on leading the 13 colonies towards revolution with England. Now I've chosen to let my next lecture, I give you most of the details on what that French and Indian War and Seven Years War are going to look like but I just want to allude to it right now. So by the 1750s, the 13 colonies are on the eve of a major conflict against France, to a lesser extent Spain, and then also Native American tribes that have allied themselves with the French and the Spanish. So you have a sense here of the boundaries of the early colonies. Obviously if you compare them to a map of the original 13 states, you'll see that many of these colonies have not reached their full sizes as we know them today especially places like Pennsylvania and New York but this gives you a little bit of a sense of where the major cities are. By the way a wonderful historical site, I mean if there's one place, if you can only go to one place to learn about colonial America, probably the best spot would be Williamsburg, Virginia. There is a very large recreation of colonial Williamsburg. Frankly you
could spend an entire week in there and not necessarily see everything of value. I've spent some
time there. It is wonderful. They do all kinds of reenactments. They have people living there in
color. I don't mean to sound too goofy about that but they will -- you know they're in colonial
dress. They've been trained in various colonial occupations. They'll answer your questions and
pretty much speak to you as though they are living in that time period. So this basically wraps up
most of the colonial period. Now my focus, in the next lecture, will be on building you towards
the American Revolution and the early challenges of the United States.
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Text: Useful Primary Sources

- “A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia” by Thomas Hariot (1588)
- Mayflower Compact (1620)
- “City Upon a Hill” sermon by John Winthrop (1630)
- Nathaniel Bacon’s Declaration in the Name of the People (1676)
- “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God” sermon by Jonathan Edwards (1741)