

Lesson Author: Jessamy Senn
Grade Level: 5th and 6th Grade History
Time Allotted: 2-3 Days

Day 2:

Learning Objectives

Students will be able to:

- Compare and contrast the list of grievances in the Declaration of Independence
- Rank 7 of the grievances of the Declaration of Independence in order of importance
- Describe the basic facts of the events leading up to the writing of the Declaration of Independence and the American Revolution
- Argue the validity one of the grievances in the Declaration of Independence to determine if it should have been included in the Declaration of Independence...if the punishment fit the crime.

Historical Skills Used

- Chronological Thinking
- Historical Comprehension
- Historical Analysis and Interpretation
- Historical Research Capabilities
- Historical Issues-Analysis and Decision Making

Virginia Standards of Learning and/or National standards

Virginia Studies.1 The student will demonstrate skills for historical and geographical analysis including the ability to

- a) Identify and interpret artifacts and primary source documents to understand events in history;
- b) Determine cause and effect relationships;
- c) Compare and contrast historical events;
- d) Make connections between past and present;
- e) Sequence events in Virginia history
- f) Interpret ideas and events from different historical perspectives
- g) Evaluate and discuss issues orally and in writing;

- VS.5 The student will demonstrate knowledge of the role of Virginia in the American Revolution by
- a) Identifying the reasons why the colonies went to war with England as expressed in the Declaration of Independence
 - b) Identifying various roles played in the Revolutionary War with emphasis on George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and James Lafayette.

Assessment Tools:

- Grievance ranking worksheet (Document 2A)
- Primary source analysis sheet – Document (Document 2B)
- Primary source analysis sheet – Picture (Document 2C)
- Primary source analysis sheet – political cartoon (Document 2D)
- Primary source Chart and final verdict worksheet (Document 2E)

Materials/Resources

- Notebook
- Pencil
- Primary/Secondary Resources
 - o Group 1
 - [Declaration of Independence \(excerpt\)](#) (Grievance 1) (Document Group 1 A)
 - Quartering Act 1765 (Group 1 B)
 - Quartering Act 1775 (Group 1 C)
 - Myths and realities of the Quartering Act (Group 1 D)
 - Commentary of Quartering Act (Group 1 E)
 - o Group 2
 - [Declaration of Independence \(excerpt\)](#) (Grievance 2) (Group 2 A)
 - Administration of Justice (Group 2B)

- Accounts of the Boston Massacre (Group 2C)
- Boston Massacre Facts (Group 2D)
- o Group 3
 - [Declaration of Independence \(excerpt\)](#) (Grievance 3) (Group 3A)
 - Prohibitory Act (Group 3B)
 - Boston Port Act (Group 3C)
 - Boston Tea Party Facts (Group 3D)
 - Boston Tea Party accounts (Group 3E)
 - Political Cartoon (Group 3F)
- o Group 4
 - [Declaration of Independence \(excerpt\)](#) (Grievance 4) (Group 4A)
 - Stamp Act (Group 4B)
 - Townshend Act (Group 4C)
 - Tar and Feathering instructions (Group 4D)
 - Political Cartoon (Group 4E)
- o Group 5
 - [Declaration of Independence \(excerpt\)](#) (Grievance 5) (Group 5A)
 - Royal Charter of 1691 (Group 5B)
 - Massachusetts Government Act (Group 5C)
 - Boston Tea Party Accounts (Group 5D)
- o Group 6
 - [Declaration of Independence \(excerpt\)](#) (Grievance 6) (Group 6A)
 - Proclamation of 1763 (Group 6B)
 - Dunmore's Proclamation offering freedom to slaves (Group 6C)

Modifications, Differentiation, and Extensions

Differentiation:

- Use fewer sources thus less information to read and process
- Use more visually based sources

- Adapt some primary sources so that students better understand them.
- Group stronger students with weaker ones
- Do more modeling before allowing students to work as groups

Extensions:

- What effect did the Declaration of Independence have on other countries?
- What was the reaction to the Declaration of Independence in Europe?
- Have students research what movies have been made about the Revolutionary War. Have they seen any of these films? Lead a discussion on whether these films would be an accurate display of what happened.

Instructional Procedures

Starter:

Teacher will pass out a worksheet with 7 different grievances selected from the Declaration of Independence. Students will read these grievances and rank these grievances in order of importance, putting themselves in the shoes of a Patriot. Which grievance would be most important to a Patriot? Which do they feel had the most evidence to back it up? Students will use their prior knowledge of the events leading up to the American Revolution and assign a "1" to the grievance they believe has the strongest evidence to support it, and a "7" to the grievance they believe has the least amount of evidence to support it.

Lesson:

- Go over the starter by discussing the students' rankings of the grievances and why they ranked them the way they did. Take a quick poll by reading each

grievance and finding out which grievance each student decided was most important. Record information on the board. What do we notice about the results? Is there one that most students chose? If so, why do we think?

- Remind students of their mission, to be a jury that will look at the validity of a specific grievance, and asking themselves, does this grievance belong in the Declaration of Independence? In order to do this, students will examine primary and secondary sources to determine the legitimacy of the grievance given to their group. They will be coming up with a verdict deciding whether or not the colonists had the right to include it in the Declaration.
- Remind students of the steps modeled yesterday with the lost grievance. Post steps on the board: (also included on their grievance worksheet)
 - o Read and interpret grievance. (What is this grievance accusing the king of?)
 - o Read each source and determine what information it is telling you.
 - o Determine whether the source supports the British or the Patriots and why
 - o Analyze all data collectively and determine whether the grievance had merit and whether it should be allowed to stay in the Declaration of Independence, or if the British had a stronger case, thus should be kicked out of the Declaration.
- Walk around room while students are working to monitor progress and to answer any questions that may come up. Depending on the progress of the groups, students may have to finish this step the next day.
- Early finishers may begin practicing how they will present their evidence and verdict to the class.

Day 2 Starter

Role: You are a Patriot living in the Colonies during the 1770's. You have just read a copy of the Declaration of Independence the Patriots just sent to the king and are discussing it with friends.

Task: Use your prior knowledge of the events leading up to the writing of the Declaration of Independence to rank the grievances in order of importance to you and your fellow patriots.

Hint: when considering importance, keep in mind those that are the most important to you as a colonist, but ALSO those grievances that have plenty of evidence to back it up!

- He has kept among us, in times of Peace, Standing Armies, without the consent of our Legislatures.
- For quartering large Bodies of Armed Troops among us
- For protecting [the bodies of armed troops] by mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these states.
- For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world
- For imposing taxes on us without our consent
- For abolishing the free system of English laws in a neighboring province, establishing therein an arbitrary government and enlarging its boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these colonies.
- For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments
- He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages and conditions.
- He has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating & carrying them into slavery in

another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of INFIDEL Powers, is the warfare of the CHRISTIAN king of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where MEN should be bought & sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished die, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms among us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them, by murdering the people on whom he also obtruded them: thus paying off former crimes committed against the LIBERTIES of one people, with crimes which he urges them to commit against the LIVES of another.

Document 2B

Primary Source Analysis Questions:

1. What type of document is this?
2. What is the date(s) of this document?
3. Who is the author or creator of this document?
4. For what audience was the document written?
5. List 3 things the author said that you think are important.
6. Why do you think the document was written?
7. What evidence in the document helps you know why it was written? Use quotes from the document.
8. List two things the document tells you about life in the colonies at the time it was written?
9. Is this document supporting the idea in the grievance why or why not?

Document 2C

Picture Analysis Questions:

1. Use the chart below to list people, objects, and activities in the picture

People	Objects	Activities

2. Based on the observation of the picture, list 3 things you might infer from the picture.

3. What questions does this photograph raise in your mind?

4. Where could you find the answers?

5. Does this picture support the idea behind the grievance? Why or why not?

Document 2D

Political cartoon analysis

- What are the event(s) or issue(s) that inspired the cartoon?
- Are there any real people in the cartoon? Who are these people?
- Are there symbols in the cartoon? What are they and what do they represent?
- What is the cartoonist's opinion about the topic portrayed in the cartoon?
- Do you agree or disagree with the cartoonist's opinion? Why?
- Which side does this cartoon support?

Document 2E

Primary and Secondary Source Analysis Chart

Grievance on Trial:

Source	Summary of Source: What is it? What does it say?	Which side does the source seem to support? Use evidence from your source.

Record which ideas support each side:

Patriots	English

Final Verdict: This grievance is _____ (guilty or not guilty)
of being falsely added to the Declaration of Independence.
The reasons the verdict was given was because: (list all
the evidence that supports your verdict.)

Directions for Jury #1:

- Read your grievance. Decide as a group what it is accusing the King of and record that information on your Evidence Worksheet.
- Read each of your primary and secondary sources. Complete the Primary Source Analyzing Sheet that goes with it and then record which side it seems to support on your Evidence Worksheet. This will go quicker if your jury divides the sources and then shares the information gathered as a group.
- Share all collected information and discuss which side is MORE supported by the evidence given.
- On your evidence Worksheet, come up with your final verdict. Did the Colonists have a valid reason for including this grievance in the Declaration of Independence, or did the King have valid reasons for committing this "crime?" Is the grievance GUILTY or NOT GUILTY of falsely accusing the King? Be sure to use evidence from your sources to support your answer.

Excerpt from the Declaration of Independence

Grievance #1:

**He has kept among us, in times of Peace, Standing Armies, without the consent of our Legislatures.
For Quartering large Bodies of Armed Soldiers among us.**

Primary Sources:

- Quartering Act 1765
- Quartering Act 1775
- Commentary of Quartering Act

Secondary Sources:

- History of US "A Taxing King"
- Myths and Realities of the Quartering Act

Document Group 1B

Quartering Act of 1765

March 24, 1765

AN ACT to amend and render more effectual, in his Majesty's dominions in America, an act passed in this present session of parliament, intituled, An act for punishing mutiny and desertion, and for the better payment of the army and their quarters.

WHEREAS ... [by the Mutiny Act of 1765] ... several regulations are made and enacted for the better government of the army, and their observing strict discipline, and for providing quarters for the army, and carriages on marches and other necessary occasions, and inflicting penalties on offenders against the same act, and for many other good purposes therein mentioned; but the same may not be sufficient for the forces that may be employed in his Majesty's dominions in America: and whereas, during the continuance of the said act, there may be occasion for marching and quartering of regiments and companies of his Majesty's forces in several parts of his Majesty's dominions in America: and whereas the publick houses and barracks, in his Majesty's dominions in America, may not be sufficient to supply quarters for such forces: and whereas it is expedient and necessary that carriages and other conveniences, upon the march of troops in his Majesty's dominions in America, should be supplied for that purpose: be it enacted ...

Quartering Act of 1774

June 2, 1774

WHEREAS DOUBTS HAVE BEEN ENTERTAINED whether troops can be quartered otherwise than in barracks...

...it shall and may be lawful for the persons who...are....authorized by law...to cause any officers or soldiers in His Majesty's service to be quartered and billeted in such manner as is now directed by law where no barracks are provided by the colonies.

2. ... if it shall happen at any time that any officers or soldiers in His Majesty's service shall remain within any of the said colonies without quarters for the space of twenty four hours after such quarters shall have been demanded, it shall...be lawful for the governor of the province to order....so many uninhabited houses, outhouses, barns, or other buildings as he shall think necessary to be taken...and make fit for the reception of such officers and soldiers, and to put and quarter such officers and soldiers therein for such time as he shall think proper.

Document Group 1D

Myths and Realities of the Quartering Act

Parliament's Quartering Act has a lousy historical reputation. It was one of the "Intolerable Acts," according to Patriot politicians in 1774. A lot of us probably imagine that law forcing subjects to host soldiers in their homes. After all, the Third Amendment to the U.S. Constitution seems to have been written to forestall just such a law:

No Soldier shall, in time of peace be quartered in any house, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner to be prescribed by law.

At least, that's what I thought until I looked at the "quartering" conflicts that came up in the years before the Revolution, and at the texts of the Quartering Acts themselves.

Parliament first passed a Quartering Act in 1765.

So the first and most important part of this law required local authorities to "quarter and billet" royal troops "in the barracks provided by the colonies." Because of the long string of wars with France and the militia system, most large port towns colonies had such barracks. If no such barracks were available, then the law gave local authorities the responsibility to find soldiers accommodations in inns, livery stables, and taverns. The first two types of buildings were already taking in guests and their horses. All the liquor-selling establishments described by the law were licensed by the local authorities, so they were already beholding to the state and receiving the public. They were "public houses," in the period parlance.

Only after all those possibilities were exhausted, and only after jumping through a set of legal hoops that would take several breaths to describe, did the authorities have the power to requisition "uninhabited houses, outhouses, barns

or other buildings." The law said nothing about *inhabited* houses.

But what about the Quartering Act of 1774, the one that seemed "Intolerable"? It starts by reaffirming the previous law, and transferring that power to demand barracks to "the officer who, for the time being, has the command of his Majesty's forces in North America" –i.e., Gen. Thomas Gage, commander-in-chief. Then it adds this provision:

That if it shall happen at any time that any officers or soldiers in his Majesty's service shall remain within any of the said colonies without quarters, for the space of twenty-four hours after such quarters shall have been demanded, it shall and may be lawful for the governor of the province to order and direct such and so many uninhabited houses, out-houses, barns, or other buildings, as he shall think necessary to be taken, (making a reasonable allowance for the same), and make fit for the reception of such officers and soldiers, and to put and quarter such officers and soldiers therein, for such time as he shall think proper.

Again, this boosts the power of the royal governors – including Gen. Thomas Gage. But again, it's limited to "uninhabited houses, out-houses, barns, or other buildings." I haven't found a single case of the peacetime British army in North America demanding the use of a private home to quarter troops. Instead, as we saw in yesterday's posting about Boston in late 1774, the army rented buildings, mostly from friends of the royal government.

Document Group 1E

First hand account of the Quartering Act:

When troops were put into government buildings:

We now behold the Representatives' Chamber [in the Town House], Court-House, and Faneuil-Hall, those seats of freedom and justice occupied with troops, and guards placed at the doors; the Common covered with tents, and alive with soldiers; marching and countermarching to relieve the guards, in short the town is now a perfect garrison.

Document Group 2A

Directions for Jury #2:

- Read your grievance. Decide as a group what it is accusing the King of and record that information on your Evidence Worksheet.
- Read each of your primary and secondary sources. Complete the Primary Source Analyzing Sheet that goes with it and then record which side it seems to support on your Evidence Worksheet. This will go quicker if your jury divides the sources and then shares the information gathered as a group.
- Share all collected information and discuss which side is MORE supported by the evidence given.
- On your evidence Worksheet, come up with your final verdict. Did the Colonists have a valid reason for including this grievance in the Declaration of Independence, or did the King have valid reasons for committing this "crime?" Is the grievance GUILTY or NOT GUILTY of falsely accusing the King? Be sure to use evidence from your sources to support your answer.

Excerpt from the Declaration of Independence

Grievance #2:

For protecting [the bodies of armed troops] by mock trial, from punishment for any murders which they should commit on the inhabitants of these states.

Primary Sources:

- Administration of Justice (Document 2H)
- Accounts of the Boston Massacre (Documents 2I)

Secondary Sources:

- History of US "A Taxing King"
- Boston Massacre Facts

Document Group 2B

Administration of Justice Act

May 20, 1774

The Administration of Justice Act passed is one of the measures that were designed to secure Britain's jurisdiction over her American dominions.

To assure trials more to the liking of the Crown than the prejudices of local juries, the act granted a change of venue (trials could be moved out of the North American colonies) to another British colony or Great Britain in trials of officials charged with a crime growing out of their enforcement of the law or suppression of riots. Witnesses for both sides were also required to attend the trial and were to be compensated for their expenses.

(adapted from Wikipedia)

Document Group 2C

Captain Thomas Preston's Account of the Boston Massacre

It is a matter of too great notoriety to need any proofs that the arrival of his Majesty's troops in Boston was extremely obnoxious to its inhabitants. They have ever used all means in their power to weaken the regiments...by promoting and aiding desertions...and by grossly and falsely [spreading] untruths concerning them....

On Monday night about 8 o'clock two soldiers were attacked and beat. But the party of the townspeople in order to carry matters to the utmost length broke into two meeting houses and rang the alarm bells, which I supposed was for fire as usual, but was soon undeceived. About 9 some of the guard came to and informed me the town inhabitants were assembling to attack the troops, and that the bells were ringing as the signal for that purpose and not for fire, and the beacon intended to be fired to bring in the distant people of the country. This, as I was captain of the day, occasioned my repairing immediately to the main guard. In my way there I saw the people in great commotion, and heard them use the most cruel and horrid threats against the troops. In a few minutes after I reached the guard, about 100 people passed it and went towards the custom house where the king's money is lodged. They immediately surrounded the sentry posted there, and with clubs and other weapons threatened to execute their vengeance on him. I was soon informed by a townsman their intention was to carry off the soldier from his post and probably murder him. On which I desired him to return for further intelligence, and he soon came back and assured me he heard the mobb declare they would murder him. This I feared might be a prelude to their plundering the king's chest. I immediately sent a non-commissioned officer and 12 men to protect both the sentry and the king's money, and very soon followed myself to prevent, if possible, all disorder, fearing lest the officer and soldiers, by the insults and provocations of the rioters, should be thrown off their guard and commit some rash act.

Anonymous Account of the Boston Massacre

THE HORRID MASSACRE IN BOSTON, PERPETRATED IN THE EVENING OF THE FIFTH DAY OF MARCH, 1770, BY SOLDIERS OF THE TWENTY-NINTH REGIMENT WHICH WITH THE FOURTEENTH REGIMENT WERE THEN QUARTERED THERE; WITH SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE STATE OF THINGS PRIOR TO THAT CATASTROPHE.

It may be a proper introduction to this narrative, briefly to represent the state of things for some time previous to the said Massacre; and this seems necessary in order to the forming a just idea of the causes of it.

At the end of the late [French and Indian] war, in which this province bore so distinguished a part, a happy union subsisted between Great Britain and the colonies. This was unfortunately interrupted by the Stamp Act; but it was in some measure restored by the repeal of it. It was again interrupted by other acts of parliament for taxing America; and by the appointment of a Board of Commissioners...which was made for the relief and encouragement of commerce, but which in its operation...has had, a contrary effect. By the said act the said Commissioners were "to be resident in some convenient part of his Majesty's dominions in America."...Boston, being very far from the centre of the colonies, could not be the place most convenient for the whole [country].

The residence of the Commissioners here has been [bad]...[for] the commerce...but we can [also] trace from it the causes of the late horrid massacre. Soon after their arrival here in November, 1767, instead of confining themselves to the proper business of their office, they

became [supporters] of Governor Bernard...; and had the weakness...to infringe upon one of the most essential rights of the house of commons of this province-that of giving their votes with freedom...One of the members of that house, Capt. Timothy Folgier, having voted in some affair contrary to the mind of the said Commissioners, was for so doing dismissed from the office he held under them.

[They] have occasioned his Majesty's faithful subjects of this town and province to be treated as enemies and rebels, by an invasion of the town by sea and land...While the town was surrounded by a considerable number of his Majesty's ships of war, two regiments landed and took possession of it; and to support these, two other regiments arrived...

Thus were we, in aggravation of our other embarrassments, embarrassed with troops, forced upon us contrary to our inclination-contrary to the spirit of Magna Charta-contrary to the very letter of the Bill of Rights, in which it is declared, that the raising or keeping a standing army within the kingdom in time of peace, unless it be with the consent of parliament, is against law, and without the desire of the civil magistrates, to aid whom was the pretence for sending the troops hither; who were quartered in the town in direct violation of an act of parliament for quartering troops in America; and all this in consequence of the representations of the said Commissioners and the said Governor, as appears by their memorials and letters lately published.

As they were the procuring cause of troops being sent hither, they must therefore be the remote and a blameable cause of all the disturbances and bloodshed that have taken place in consequence of that measure.

Document Group 2D

Boston Massacre in Facts and Numbers

- The heavy military presence in Boston that lead to the Massacre was the result of British enforcement of the Townshend Acts of 1767.
- 4,000 troops were dispatched to Boston in October of 1768—not a small number, considering that Boston's population was only about 20,000 residents at the time.
- The Massacre occurred on the evening of March 5, 1770
- 5 civilians died as a result of the incident, 3 died on the scene and 2 died later. Some websites incorrectly add up the number of victims to be 7 in total.
- All victims of the Massacre, Crispus Attucks, Samuel Gray, James Caldwell, Samuel Maverick and Patrick Carr, were buried at Granary Burying Ground in Boston.
- The three years that followed the Massacre, from 1770 to 1772 passed rather quietly without any major confrontation between the British and the colonists.
- Before the "The Boston Massacre" name became common, the incident was also called The Bloody Massacre in King Street, from the title of the famous Paul Revere engraving. In the early 1800's it was also called the State Street Massacre.
- There were two separate Boston Massacre trials. The trial of Captain Preston started almost 8 months after the incident and lasted for one week, from October 24, 1770 to October 30, 1770. The second trial was for the soldiers. It started almost one month after Preston's acquittal, on November 27, 1770 and ended on Dec 14, 1770.
- 9 British regulars were charged during the Boston Massacre trials. Preston and six of his men were

acquitted, two others were found guilty of manslaughter.

Document Group 3A

Directions for Jury #3:

- Read your grievance. Decide as a group what it is accusing the King of and record that information on your Evidence Worksheet.
- Read each of your primary and secondary sources. Complete the Primary Source Analyzing Sheet that goes with it and then record which side it seems to support on your Evidence Worksheet. This will go quicker if your jury divides the sources and then shares the information gathered as a group.
- Share all collected information and discuss which side is MORE supported by the evidence given.
- On your evidence Worksheet, come up with your final verdict. Did the Colonists have a valid reason for including this grievance in the Declaration of Independence, or did the King have valid reasons for committing this "crime?" Is the grievance GUILTY or NOT GUILTY of falsely accusing the King? Be sure to use evidence from your sources to support your answer.

Excerpt from the Declaration of Independence

Grievance #3:

For cutting off our trade with all parts of the world

Primary Sources:

- Prohibitory Act (Document 2K)
- Boston Port Act (Document 2L)
- Boston Tea Party accounts (Document 2M)
- Political Cartoon (Document 2N)

Secondary Sources:

- History of US "A Taxing King"
- Boston Tea Party Facts

QuickTime™ and a
decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

[http://www.manhattanrarebooks-
history.com/prohibitory_act.htm](http://www.manhattanrarebooks-history.com/prohibitory_act.htm)

Document Group 3B

Reaction to the American Prohibitory Act of 1775

"It throws thirteen colonies out of the royal protection, levels all distinctions, and makes us independent in spite of our supplications and entreaties...It may be fortunate that the act of independency should come from the British Parliament rather than the American Congress."

—John Adams on the Prohibitory Act.

"That as to the king, we had been bound to him by allegiance, but that this bond was now dissolved by his assent to the late Act of Parliament by which he declares us out of his protection."

—Proceedings from the Second Continental Congress

The American Prohibitory Act of 1775 declared "all manner of (the American colonies') trade and commerce is and shall be prohibited;" that any ships found trading "shall be forfeited to his Majesty, as if the same were the ships and effects of open enemies;" and that "for the encouragement of the officers and seamen of his Majesty's ships of war" that "seamen, marines, and soldiers on board shall have the sole interest and property of all ships, vessels, goods and merchandise, which they shall seize and take."

Document Group 3C

Boston Port Act March 31, 1774

AN ACT to discontinue, in such manner, and for or such time as are therein mentioned, the landing and discharging...shipping, of goods...at the town, and within the harbour, of Boston, in the province of Massachusetts's Bay, in North America.

WHEREAS dangerous commotions and [rebellions] have been...raised in the town of Boston, *in the province of Massachusetts Bay, in New England, by divers ill affected persons...and to the utter destruction of the publick peace, and good order of the said town; in which commotions and [rebellion] certain valuable cargoes of teas, being the property of the East India Company, and on board certain' vessels lying within the bay or harbour of Boston, were seized and destroyed: And whereas, in the present condition of the said town and harbour, the commerce of his Majesty's subjects cannot be safely carried on there, nor the customs payable to his Majesty duly collected; and it is therefore expedient that the officers of his Majesty's customs should be forthwith removed from the said town:...*

... until it shall sufficiently appear to his Majesty that full satisfaction [has] been made by...the inhabitants ...of *Boston* to [the East India Company], for the damage sustained ...by the destruction of their goods sent to... *Boston*...and until it shall be certified to his Majesty,...by the governor...of the said province, that reasonable satisfaction [has] been made to the officers of his Majesty's revenue, and others, who suffered by the riots and [rebellions]...in the month December, in the year one thousand seven hundred and seventy three...

Document Group 3D

Boston Tea Party

Colonists were unhappy with the passage of the Tea Act in 1773. It gave the East India Company a monopoly on importing tea in the colonies, and it allowed for a duty (tax) to be paid for the tea. Bostonians did not want to pay the tax, despite the fact that the Tea Act actually called for colonists to pay less tax than they had previously. They believed that since they were not represented in Parliament, Britain had no right to tax them. Taxation without representation was still a major issue for the colonists.

Patriots were determined that the Dartmouth, a ship carrying tea would not be allowed to unload its cargo. Several meetings were held in the Old South Meetinghouse. The last meeting was held on December 16, 1773. At that meeting, there was a call for Mr. Rotch, the owner of the Dartmouth. Mr. Rotch reported that the governor refused him permission to send his vessel to sea before the tea should be landed. The governor was demanding the tea be unloaded and the duty paid. A murmur ran through the vast assemblage, but the rising excitement was hushed into silence when Samuel Adams arose, and in a clear voice said: "This meeting can do no more to save the country."

The Destruction of Tea

At that moment a person with painted face and dressed like an Indian gave a war-whoop in the gallery, which was responded to in kind from the door of the meeting-house.

Another voice in the gallery shouted: "Boston harbor a teapot to-night! Hurrah for Griffin's Wharf!" The meeting instantly adjourned and the people rushed for the street, and pushed toward Griffin's Wharf, following a number of men disguised as Indians. The populace cheered. Guards were posted to keep order. Among them was John Hancock.

The disguised men, including Paul Revere and Samuel Adams, then went on board the tea-ships moored at Griffin's Wharf, and in the course of three hours they emptied three hundred and forty-two chests of tea into the water of the harbor. The operation was performed in the presence of a multitude who were silent spectators of the scene. It was done at an early hour in the evening--a bright, cold, moonlit evening--and of the sixty men who went on board the tea-ships, only a part of them were disguised as "Mohawks."

When the work was done--when Boston harbor had been made a vast "teapot"--the streets of the town became as quiet. "All things," wrote John Adams to James Warren, "were conducted with great order, decency, and perfect submission to government."

The aftermath of the Boston Tea Party

Early the next morning the Committee of Correspondence appointed Samuel Adams chairman of a sub-committee to draw up a statement of what had been done with the tea, and then they sent Paul Revere as express to carry the document to the Sons of Liberty in New York and Philadelphia.

The work of the Bostonians was applauded throughout the colonies. But among the crown-officers in America and the ministers in Great Britain there was fierce wrath. The friends of the Americans in the British Parliament were silent for a moment, because they could not justify the destruction of private property. The East India Company was assured that the town of Boston would pay for every pound of tea destroyed.

The debates in the Parliament and the British response

The king asked Parliament that body devise means for the immediate suppression of rebellion in the colonies.

The House of Commons proposed an address of thanks to the king, and assurance that he should be sustained in efforts to maintain order in America. This address excited angry debates. "There is open rebellion in America, and it must be punished," cried the king's supporters. "Repeal your unjust laws and deal righteously with the Americans, and there will be peace and loyalty there," retorted the Opposition. After a long and stormy debate, the address was adopted by an overwhelming majority.

This vote strengthened Lord North, and stimulated the passions of the monarch. Urged by his sovereign, North submitted a bill, at the middle of March, for the severe punishment of Boston. It provided for the removal of the Custom-house, courts of justice and government offices of all kinds from Boston to Salem, and forbade every kind of shipping business in the harbor of Boston. It also provided that when the rebellious town should fully and humbly submit to royal authority, the king should have the power to open the port and restore the government business.

North justified the harsh measure by asserting that Boston was "the ringleader in every riot, and set always the example which others followed." He believed severe punishment of this rebellious town would strike terror throughout the colonies, and so bring the Americans into subjection to the crown. Many of his supporters in the House used very violent language, calling the Bostonians "mobocrats," and "vile incendiaries;" men who were "never actuated by reason, but chose tarring and feathering as an argument."

Document Group 3E

Boston Gazette Account

Photostat from the Dec. 20, 1773 issue of the Boston Gazette.

BOSTON, December 20.

On Tuesday last the body of the people of this and all the adjacent towns, and others from the distance of twenty miles, assembled at the old south meeting-house, to inquire the reason of the delay in sending the ship Dartmouth, with the East-India Tea back to London; and having found that the owner had not taken the necessary steps for that

purpose, they enjoin'd him at his peril to demand of the collector of the customs a clearance for the ship, and appointed a committee of ten to see it perform'd; after which they adjourn'd to the Thursday following ten o'clock. They then met and being inform'd by Mr. Rotch, that a clearance was refus'd him, they enjoye'd him immediately to enter a protest and apply to the governor for a pass port by the castle, and adjourn'd again till three o'clock for the same day. At which time they again met and after waiting till near sunset Mr. Rotch came in and inform'd them that he had accordingly enter'd his protest and waited on the governor for a pass, but his excellency told him he could not consistent with his duty grant it until his vessel was qualified. The people finding all their efforts to preserve the property of the East India company and return it safely to London, frustrated by the sea consignees, the collector of the customs and the governor of the province, DISSOLVED their meeting.--But, BEHOLD what followed! A number of brave & resolute men, determined to do all in their power to save their country from the ruin which their enemies had plotted, in less than four hours, emptied every chest of tea on board the three ships commanded by the captains Hall, Bruce, and Coffin, amounting to 342 chests, into the sea!! without the least damage done to the ships or any other property. The matters and owners are well pleas'd that their ships are thus clear'd; and the people are almost universally congratulating each other on this happy event.

Account by Joshua Wyeth

The first published account of the Boston Tea Party by a participant was recorded from the words of Joshua Wyeth. He was just sixteen when he joined other patriots in boarding the tea ships in Boston Harbor. Mr. Wyeth told his story to a journalist in Cincinnati where he lived during his later years. The account was published in 1826, 53 years after the event has occurred.

I had but a few hours warning of what was intended to be done... To prevent discovery we agreed to wear ragged clothes and disfigure ourselves, dressing to resemble Indians... Our most intimate friends among the spectators had not the least knowledge of us... At the appointed hour, we met in an old building at... the wharf, and fell in one after another, as if by accident, as not to excite suspicion. We placed a sentry at the end of the wharf, another in the middle, and one on the bow of each ship as we took possession. We boarded the ship moored by the wharf, and ordered the captain and crew to open the hatchways, and hand us the hoisting tackle and rope, assuring them that no harm was intended them. Some of our numbers then jumped into the hold, and passed the chests to the tackle. As they were hauled on deck others knocked them open with axes, and others raised them to the railings and discharged their contents overboard. All who were not needed on this ship went on board the others where the same ceremonies were repeated. We were merry, in an undertone, at the idea of making so large a cup of tea for the fishes but we used not more words than absolutely necessary. I never worked harder in my life. While we were unloading, the people collected in great numbers about the wharf to see what was going on. They crowded around us. Our sentries were not armed, and could not stop any who insisted on passing.

Eyewitness Account by George Hewes

George Robert Twelve Hewes, a Boston shoemaker, participated in many of the key events of the Revolutionary crisis. Over half a century later, Hewes described his experiences to James Hawkes. When Parliament passed the Tea Act in 1773, colonists refused to allow cargoes of tea to be unloaded. In the evening of December 16, with Hewes leading one group, the colonists dressed in "the costume of a Indian." They boarded the ships in Boston harbor and dropped the tea overboard. Hewes' account shed light on how resistance became revolution. The "Boston Tea Party," as it became known in the 19th century, became a powerful symbol of the Revolution. And Hewes, artisan and ordinary citizen, was celebrated as a venerable veteran of the struggle for Independence.

The tea destroyed was contained in three ships, lying near each other at what was called at that time Griffin's wharf, and were surrounded by armed ships of war, the commanders of which had publicly declared that if the rebels, as they were pleased to style the Bostonians, should not withdraw their opposition to the landing of the tea before a certain day, the 17th day of December, 1773, they should on that day force it on shore, under the cover of their cannon's mouth.

On the day preceding the seventeenth, there was a meeting of the citizens of the county of Suffolk, convened at one of the churches in Boston, for the purpose of consulting on what measures might be considered expedient to prevent the landing of the tea, or secure the people from the collection of the duty. At that meeting a committee was appointed to wait on Governor Hutchinson, and request him to inform them whether he would take any measures to satisfy the people on the object of the meeting.

To the first application of this committee, the Governor told them he would give them a definite answer by five o'clock in the afternoon. At the hour appointed, the committee again repaired to the Governor's house, and on inquiry found he had gone to his country seat at Milton, a distance of about six miles. When the committee returned

and informed the meeting of the absence of the Governor, there was a confused murmur among the members, and the meeting was immediately dissolved, many of them crying out, "Let every man do his duty, and be true to his country"; and there was a general huzza for Griffin's wharf.

It was now evening, and I immediately dressed myself in the costume of an Indian, equipped with a small hatchet, which I and my associates denominated the tomahawk, with which, and a club, after having painted my face and hands with coal dust in the shop of a blacksmith, I repaired to Griffin's wharf, where the ships lay that contained the tea. When I first appeared in the street after being thus disguised, I fell in with many who were dressed, equipped and painted as I was, and who fell in with me and marched in order to the place of our destination.

When we arrived at the wharf, there were three of our number who assumed an authority to direct our operations, to which we readily submitted. They divided us into three parties, for the purpose of boarding the three ships which contained the tea at the same time. The name of him who commanded the division to which I was assigned was Leonard Pitt. The names of the other commanders I never knew.

We were immediately ordered by the respective commanders to board all the ships at the same time, which we promptly obeyed. The commander of the division to which I belonged, as soon as we were on board the ship appointed me boatswain, and ordered me to go to the captain and demand of him the keys to the hatches and a dozen candles. I made the demand accordingly, and the captain promptly replied, and delivered the articles; but requested me at the same time to do no damage to the ship or rigging.

We then were ordered by our commander to open the hatches and take out all the chests of tea and throw them overboard, and we immediately proceeded to execute his orders, first cutting and splitting the chests with our tomahawks, so as thoroughly to expose them to the effects of the water.

In about three hours from the time we went on board, we had thus broken and thrown overboard every tea chest to be found in the ship, while those in the other ships were

disposing of the tea in the same way, at the same time. We were surrounded by British armed ships, but no attempt was made to resist us.

We then quietly retired to our several places of residence, without having any conversation with each other, or taking any measures to discover who were our associates; nor do I recollect of our having had the knowledge of the name of a single individual concerned in that affair, except that of Leonard Pitt, the commander of my division, whom I have mentioned. There appeared to be an understanding that each individual should volunteer his services, keep his own secret, and risk the consequence for himself. No disorder took place during that transaction, and it was observed at that time that the stillest night ensued that Boston had enjoyed for many months.

The next morning, after we had cleared the ships of the tea, it was discovered that very considerable quantities of it were floating upon the surface of the water; and to prevent the possibility of any of its being saved for use, a number of small boats were manned by sailors and citizens, who rowed them into those parts of the harbor wherever the tea was visible, and by beating it with oars and paddles so thoroughly drenched it as to render its entire destruction inevitable.

-- George Hewes

QuickTime™ and a
decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Document Group 3F

Detail of *The Bostonians Paying the Excise (tax) Man* (1774), a color engraving by an unknown artist; John Carter Brown Library at Brown University, Providence, RI. The sign on the Liberty Tree is upside down and reads "Stamp Act". The pot has the word "TEA" printed on it.

Document Group 4A

Directions for Jury #4:

- Read your grievance. Decide as a group what it is accusing the King of and record that information on your Evidence Worksheet.
- Read each of your primary and secondary sources. Complete the Primary Source Analyzing Sheet that goes with it and then record which side it seems to support on your Evidence Worksheet. This will go quicker if your jury divides the sources and then shares the information gathered as a group.
- Share all collected information and discuss which side is MORE supported by the evidence given.
- On your evidence Worksheet, come up with your final verdict. Did the Colonists have a valid reason for including this grievance in the Declaration of Independence, or did the King have valid reasons for committing this "crime?" Is the grievance GUILTY or NOT GUILTY of falsely accusing the King? Be sure to use evidence from your sources to support your answer.

Excerpt from the Declaration of Independence

Grievance #4:

For imposing taxes on us without our consent

Primary Sources:

- Stamp Act
- Townshend Act
- Tar and Feathering instructions
- Political Cartoon

Secondary Sources:

- History of US "A Taxing King"

QuickTime™ and a
decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Document Group 4B

The Stamp Act, March 22, 1765

An act for granting and applying certain stamp duties, and other duties, in the British colonies and plantations in America, towards further [paying] the expenses of defending, protecting, and securing the same...

[Description and price of stamp duty on different types of paper, including]:

For every pack of such cards, the sum of one shilling.

And for every pair of such dice, the sum of ten shillings.

For every pamphlet and paper being larger than one whole sheet, and not exceeding six sheets...a duty after the rate of one shilling for every sheet of any kind of paper which shall be contained in one printed copy thereof.

For every advertisement to be contained in any gazette, news paper, or other paper, or any pamphlet which shall be so printed, a duty of two shillings.

[Commissioners are allowed to hire people to help collect the duty]

[Anyone caught forging the stamp shall be guilty of a felony and shall suffer death]

Document Group 4C

An Act Repealing the Stamp Act; March 18, 1766

Whereas an Act was passed in the last session of Parliament entitled, [The Stamp Act] and whereas the continuance of the said Act would be attended with many inconveniencies, and may be productive of consequences greatly detrimental to the commercial interests of these kingdoms; may it therefore please your most excellent Majesty...by and with the advice and consent of ...Parliament...that from and after the first day of May, one thousand seven hundred and sixty-six, the above-mentioned Act... shall be, and is and are hereby repealed...

Document Group 4D

THE TOWNSHEND REVENUE ACT

June 29, 1767

The Townshend Acts were a series of acts passed beginning in 1767 by the Parliament of Great Britain. The acts are named for Charles Townshend, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who proposed the program. Historians vary slightly in which acts they include under the heading "Townshend Acts", but five laws are frequently mentioned: the Revenue Act of 1767, the Indemnity Act, the Commissioners of Customs Act, the Vice Admiralty Court Act, and the New York Restraining Act.

The purpose of the Townshend Acts was to raise revenue in the colonies to pay the salaries of governors and judges so that they would be independent of colonial control, to create a more effective means of enforcing compliance with trade regulations, to punish the province of New York for failing to comply with the 1765 Quartering Act, and to establish the precedent that the British Parliament had the right to tax the colonies. The Townshend Acts met with resistance in the colonies, prompting the occupation of Boston by British troops in 1768, which eventually resulted in the Boston Massacre of 1770.

Document Group 4E

Tar'd and Feather'd'

Beginning in 1765 with colonial opposition to the Stamp Act and continuing through the Revolutionary War, a number of men were "tar'd and feather'd." The statements in this resource describe what was typically done to someone who underwent this punishment. These descriptions reveal that being tarred and feathered was rarely all that was done to the person. Often they were paraded about the town or treated with disrespect in other ways. Although rare, women were also subjected to this treatment. There is no record of the total number of Tories (i.e., Loyalists) or rebels who were treated in this way. Consequently, we cannot accurately estimate the number who were killed because of the tarring and feathering process or the acts subsequent to feathering.

"First strip a person naked, then heat the Tar until it is thin, and pour it upon the naked Flesh, or rub it over with a Tar Brush. . . . After which, sprinkle decently upon the Tar, whilst it is yet warm, as many Feathers as will stick to it. Then hold a lighted Candle to the Feathers, and try to set it all on Fire; if it will burn so much the better. But as the Experiment is often made in cold Weather, it will not then succeed--take also an Halter and put it round the Person's neck, and then cart him the Rounds [meaning around to certain places in the community and put on public display]."

At this point the person was usually taken about the streets of the town in a cart surrounded by shouting people. In some cases he might be placed in the stocks, hanged or beaten. If he survived, he was finally left on his own. Most who got this far were barely alive, exhausted

and severely burned. The tar was extremely difficult to get off the badly burned skin, which often got infected. Those that survived could not be helped by anyone. Giving comfort or first aid to a survivor often would result in the helper being attacked.

Tarring and feathering was done not only by people who opposed the Crown and actions of Parliament. For example, in March 1775 Crown troops and Loyalists in Boston tarred and feathered a countryman. Holt's New York Journal, March 30, describes the events a reporter witnessed followed by his opinions of what took place:

"After stripping him naked and covering him with tar and feathers, they mounted him on a one-horse truck, and surrounding the truck with a guard of twenty soldiers with fixed bayonets, accompanied with all the drums and fifes of the regiment and a number of officers, negroes, and sailors, exhibited him as a spectacle through the principal streets of the town. They fixed a label on the man's back, on which was written AMERICAN LIBERTY, or A SPECIMEN OF DEMOCRACY; and to add insult they played Yankee Doodle:--Oh Britain, how art thou fallen? Is it not enough that British troops, who were once the terror of France and Spain, should be made the instruments of butchering thy children! But must they descend also to exploits too infamously dirty for any but the meanest of the mobility to practice? What a wretched figure will the Boston expedition hereafter make in the historic page!"

Questions:

1. What might cause a person or a group to tar and feather another human being?
2. What would be the purpose of tarring and feathering another human being?

QuickTime™ and a
decompressor
are needed to see this picture.

Document Group 5A

Directions for Jury #5:

- Read your grievance. Decide as a group what it is accusing the King of and record that information on your Evidence Worksheet.
- Read each of your primary and secondary sources. Complete the Primary Source Analyzing Sheet that goes with it and then record which side it seems to support on your Evidence Worksheet. This will go quicker if your jury divides the sources and then shares the information gathered as a group.
- Share all collected information and discuss which side is MORE supported by the evidence given.
- On your evidence Worksheet, come up with your final verdict. Did the Colonists have a valid reason for including this grievance in the Declaration of Independence, or did the King have valid reasons for

committing this "crime?" Is the grievance GUILTY or NOT GUILTY of falsely accusing the King? Be sure to use evidence from your sources to support your answer.

Excerpt from the Declaration of Independence

Grievance #5:

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments

Primary Sources:

- Jamestown Charter
- Massachusetts Government Act

Secondary Sources:

- History of US "A Taxing King"

Document Group 5A

Massachusetts Government Act

May 20, 1774

AN ACT for the better regulating the government of the province of the Massachusetts's Bay, *in* New England.

[Because Massachusetts has behaved badly, his Majesty can no longer trust Massachusetts to elect its councilors] Be it therefore enacted ..., that from and after August 1, 1774, so much of the charter ... [of 1691] ... which relates to the time and manner of electing the...counsellors for the said province, be revoked, ... and that the offices of all counsellors, elected and appointed... shall from thenceforth cease and determine: And that, from and after the said August 1, 1774, the council...of the said province for the time being, shall be composed of such of the inhabitants or proprietors of lands within the same as shall be thereunto nominated and appointed by his Majesty . . . , provided, that the number of the...counsellors shall not, at any one time, exceed thirty six, nor be less than twelve.

II

...[The] counsellors...to be appointed as aforesaid, shall hold their offices respectively, for and during the pleasure of his Majesty....

III

That from and after July 1, 1774, [the governor can remove judges without the consent of council].

VI

... That, upon every vacancy of the offices of chief justice and judges of the superior court of the said province, from and after July 1, 1774, the governor [will appoint all judges]

VII

...[No town meeting may be held without the permission of the governor]

1606
 (3).
 Came by the Grace of God &c. Whereas our
 Loving and well Disposed Subjects Sir Thomas Gates and Sir George
 Somers Knights Sir Richard Hakluyt Clerk Robt. Dowling of London
 and Edward Maria Wingfield Thomas Mannasse and Raleigh
 Gifford Esqrs William Parker and George Abham Gent and
 Divers Others of Our Loving Subjects have been humbly Vnto
 unto us that we would Donthwaite unto them our Licence to
 make habitation Plantation and to D.D. a Colony of
 Sundry of Our people into that part of America Commonly
 called Virginia and Other parts and Territories in America
 either Appertaining unto us or which are not now actually
 Possessed by any Christian Prince or people's Vertuals Lying
 and being all along the Sea Coast between four and thirty
 Degrees of Northern Latitude from the Equinoctial Line and
 five and forty Degrees of the same Latitude and in the more
 lying between the same four and thirty and five and forty
 Degrees and the Islands thereunto adjacent and within
 one hundred miles of the Coast thereof and to that End
 for the more speedy accomplishment of their said intended
 plantation and habitation there we Do give to Divers
 themselves into two Several Colonies and Companies the
 One Consisting of Certain Knights Gentlemen Merchants
 and Other Adventurers of Our City of London and elsewhere
 which are and from time to time shall be added unto
 them which we Do give to begin their plantation and
 habitations in some full and convenient place between
 four and thirty and five and forty Degrees of the said
 Latitude all along the Coast of Virginia and Coast
 of America aforesaid And the Other Consisting of

http://www.americaslibrary.gov/jb/colonial/jb_colonial_jamestown_3_e.html
 1

CREDIT: "Charter for the Virginia Company of London, 1606," 1606.
 Manuscript Division, Library of Congress

Document Group 5B

The First Charter of Virginia

The Charter of 1606, also known as the First Charter of Virginia, is a document from King James I of England to the Virginia Company assigning land rights to colonists for the stated purpose of propagating the Christian religion. The land is described as coastal Virginia and islands near to the coast, but the surveying numbers correspond to modern day South Carolina to Canada. The land itself would remain the property of the King, with the London Company as the King's tenant, and the settlers as subtenants. The colony's government at first consisted of a council residing in London. The document designated the London Company as responsible for financing the project, which included recruiting settlers and providing for their transport and supplies.

King James I formed the Virginia Company, which itself consisted of a pair of separately managed companies called the London Company and the Plymouth Company. Both of these companies were to operate under the Charter of 1606, but in different regions within the same range, and without building colonies within 100 miles (160 km) of each other. The London company was a group of entrepreneurs from London to live and rule in North America. The Virginia Company started its settlement in Chesapeake, Virginia. King James has granted the Virginia Company the power and authority to operate and run their lives and to enjoy many freedoms, as indicated in

"which shall dwell and inhabit within every or any of the said several Colonies and Plantations, and every of their children, which shall happen to be born within any of the Limits and Precincts of the said several Colonies and Plantations, shall HAVE and enjoy all Liberties, Franchises, and Immunities, within any of our other Dominions, to all Intents and Purposes, as if they had been abiding and born, within this our Realm of England, or any other of our said Dominions."

The King has specified exactly where the colonists will reside. "between four and thirty Degrees and five and forty

Degrees of the said Latitude, all amongst the said Coasts of Virginia and America, as that Coast lyeth". This is all the territory between South Carolina and Canada. He also specified the activities and rights that they may exercise, such as enjoying the "Lands, Woods, Soil, Grounds, Havens, Ports, Rivers, Mines, Minerals, Marshes, Waters, Fishings" amongst others.

Document Group 6A

Directions for Jury #6:

- Read your grievance. Decide as a group what it is accusing the King of and record that information on your Evidence Worksheet.
- Read each of your primary and secondary sources. Complete the Primary Source Analyzing Sheet that goes with it and then record which side it seems to support on your Evidence Worksheet. This will go quicker if your jury divides the sources and then shares the information gathered as a group.
- Share all collected information and discuss which side is MORE supported by the evidence given.
- On your evidence Worksheet, come up with your final verdict. Did the Colonists have a valid reason for including this grievance in the Declaration of Independence, or did the King have valid reasons for committing this "crime?" Is the grievance GUILTY or NOT GUILTY of falsely accusing the King? Be sure to use evidence from your sources to support your answer.

Excerpt from the Declaration of Independence:

Grievance #6:

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavored to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian savages whose known rule of warfare is an undistinguished destruction of all ages and conditions.

Primary Sources:

- Dunmore's Proclamation offering freedom to slaves
- Reactions to Dunmore's Proclamation
- Proclamation of 1763

Secondary Sources:

- History of US "A Taxing King"

Document Group 6B

Dunmore's Proclamation

I do hereby . . . declare all indented servants, Negroes, or others [belonging to the Rebels,] free, that are able and willing to bear arms, they joining His Majesty's Troops, as soon as may be, for the more speedily reducing the colony to a proper sense of their duty, to His Majesty's crown and dignity.

John Murray, Earl of Dunmore,
Royal Governor of Virginia
7 November 1775

Summary of Dunmore's Proclamation

- Earl of Dunmore fled to British ship following removal of gunpowder from Magazine
- Dunmore issued proclamation freeing slaves to join British forces
- Proclamation created mistrust between masters and slaves
- Fear of slave revolt spread throughout Virginia
- Martial law declared

Dunmore issued proclamation November 15, 1775

June 8, 1775, in the wake of strong colonial protests following his removal of gunpowder stored in the public magazine, John Murray, fourth Earl of Dunmore and the last royal governor of Virginia, fled Williamsburg for the ship H.M.S. Fowey. November 15, after a series of raids on Norfolk, Dunmore issued a proclamation decreeing martial law and declaring "all indentured Servants, Negroes, or others (appertaining to Rebels) free, that are able and willing to bear Arms, they joining his Majesty's Troops."

Taken together, the proclamation and Dunmore's military actions had several important implications that contributed to the inevitability of war.

Proclamation intensified mistrust

First, the proclamation intensified a growing distrust between masters and slaves by offering freedom to those slaves willing to fight for the king. The fear of slave revolts ran deep among white Virginians. Although the colony had been spared a major uprising, other colonies had not. Virginians considered the possibility to be very real, because they frequently experienced passive resistance, such as work slowdowns and feigned illness, from their slaves. If the slaves actually acted on Dunmore's promise, Virginians knew they would be hard-pressed to meet the threat.

Martial law declared

Second, Dunmore declared martial law. This reminded Virginians that, since the king's standard had been raised, all persons capable of bearing arms were to come forward and swear their loyalty to the king. Those not doing so were presumed traitors subject to execution and the confiscation of their property. The proclamation also noted that King George III had declared the colonies in open rebellion, upping the stakes and polarizing the colony into two camps, loyal and rebel.

Proclamation reminded moderates of the ideals of freedom

Moderate burgesses had acted as an effective brake on their more hot-tempered compatriots at earlier flash points, and Dunmore hoped that they would do so again, but he misjudged the effect of the proclamation. For some, Dunmore's offer of freedom to the slaves was seen as one more attack on private property. For others, the social disruptions inherent in the emancipation proclamation were far worse than anything proposed by the more radical Virginians. In the end, the proclamation reminded the moderate leadership that they believed in the same ideals as did the radicals. It also brought them to a point the radicals had been pressing for some time: that protection of these ideals was worth fighting for.

**Virginia's Response to Dunmore's Proclamation in the
Pennsylvania Gazette, 13 December 1775**

WILLIAMSBURG, November 29.

* * *

Lord Dunmore's cruel policy begins at length to be discovered by the blacks, who have lately deserted from him to a considerable number. When his Lordship first went down to Norfolk he gave great encouragement to unwary Negroes, but, such was his baseness, some of them, it is confidently said, he sent to the West Indies, where these unfortunate creatures were disposed of to defray his Lordship's expences; and others, such as he took any dislike to, he delivered up to their masters, to be punished. Since the troops under Col. Woodford's command began their march, Lord Dunmore issued a proclamation inviting the slaves of rebels, as he pleased to say, to repair to his standard. A considerable number at first went to him, but upon their masters taking the oath of allegiance, they were immediately told they must return. Some runaways, however, remained, but these were kept constantly employed in digging entrenchments in wet ground, till at length the severity of their labour forced many of them to fly. Those that were left behind have made several attempts to get off, but such is the barbarous policy of this cruel man, he keeps these unhappy creatures not only against their will, but intends to place them in the front of the battle, to prevent their flying, in case of an engagement, which, from their utter ignorance of firearms, he knows they will do.

Last Tuesday night a party of men, chiefly blacks, from a tender, came up to Mr. Benjamin Wells's, at Mulberry island, pillaged his house of every thing valuable, such as bedding, wearing apparel, liquors, a watch, the stock of poultry, and carried off two negroe girls. They told Mrs. Wells, that they had orders to burn the house; which they would certainly have put in execution, had it not been for her earnest entreaty to spare it that time, as she had some sick children in bed, who must perish in the flames.

Dec. 2. Since Lord Dunmore's proclamation made its appearance here, it is said he has recruited his army, in the counties of Princes Anne and Norfolk, to the amount of about 2000 men, including his black regiment, which is thought to be a considerable part, with this inscription on their breasts:Ñ-"Liberty to Slaves."—However, as the rivers will henceforth be strictly watched, and every possible precaution taken, it is hoped others will be effectually prevented from joining those his Lordship has already collected.

* * *

Nine Negroes (two of them women) who had been endeavouring to get to Norfolk in an open boat, and put ashore on Point Comfort, were fired upon by some persons in pursuit, taken, and brought here on Thursday; two of the fellows are wounded, and it is expected the rest will soon be made examples of.

* * *

From Newspaper Response, the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, 13 December 1775, in Accessible Archives CD ROM, Folio III (1766-83).

After Orders, Headquarters near York, 25 October 1781.

* * *

It having been represented that many Negroes and Mulattoes the property of Citizens of these States have concealed themselves on board the Ships in the harbor; that some still continue to attach themselves to British Officers and that others have attempted to impose themselves upon the officers of the French and American Armies as Freemen and to make their escapes in that manner, In order to prevent their succeeding in such practices All Officers of the Allied Army and other persons of every denomination concerned are directed not to suffer any such negroes or mulattoes to be retained in their Service but on the contrary to cause them to be delivered to the Guards which will be establish'd for their reception at one of the

Redoubts in York and another in Gloucester. Mr. David Ross will have the superintendency and will give passes to enable them to return to their Masters or where that is not practicable will have directions to make other provision for them. Any Negroes or mulattoes who are free upon proving the same will be left to their own disposal. The Gentlemen of the American Army who have made return to the Orderly Office of negroes in their possession agreeably to the Order of the 9th. instant are desired to deliver them to the above mentioned Mr. David Ross this day or tomorrow.

* * *

From George Washington, *The Writings of George Washington from the Original Manuscript Sources 1745-1799*, vol. 23, ed. John C. Fitzpatrick (Washington, DC: GPO, 1937), pp. 264-65.

Document Group 6E

The Royal Proclamation - October 7, 1763

BY THE KING. A PROCLAMATION GEORGE R.

Whereas We have taken into Our Royal Consideration the extensive and valuable Acquisitions in America, secured to our Crown by the late Definitive Treaty of Peace, concluded at Paris [French and Indian War] the 10th Day of February last; and being desirous that all Our loving Subjects, as well of our Kingdom as of our Colonies in America, may avail themselves with all convenient Speed, of the great Benefits and Advantages which must accrue therefrom to their Commerce, Manufactures, and Navigation, We have thought fit, with the Advice of our Privy Council. to issue this our Royal Proclamation, hereby to publish and declare to all our loving Subjects

And whereas it is just and reasonable, and essential to our Interest, and the Security of our Colonies, that the

several Nations or Tribes of Indians with whom We are connected, and who live under our Protection, should not be molested or disturbed in the Possession of such Parts of Our Dominions and Territories as, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are reserved to them. or any of them, as their Hunting Grounds.--

And We do further declare it to be Our Royal Will and Pleasure, for the present as aforesaid, to reserve under our Sovereignty, Protection, and Dominion, for the use of the said Indians, all the Lands and Territories [west of the Appalachian Mountains].

And We do hereby strictly forbid, on Pain of our Displeasure, all our loving Subjects from making any Purchases or Settlements whatever, or taking Possession of any of the Lands above reserved.

And. We do further strictly enjoin and require all Persons whatever who have either wilfully or inadvertently seated themselves upon any Lands within the Countries above described. or upon any other Lands which, not having been ceded to or purchased by Us, are still reserved to the said Indians as aforesaid, forthwith to remove themselves from such Settlements.

And whereas great Frauds and Abuses have been committed in purchasing Lands of the Indians, to the great Prejudice of our Interests. and to the great Dissatisfaction of the said Indians: In order, therefore, to prevent such Irregularities for the future, and to the end that the Indians may be convinced of our Justice and determined Resolution to remove all reasonable Cause of Discontent, We do. with the Advice of our Privy Council strictly....require that no private Person ... make any purchase from the said Indians ...

Given at our Court at St. James's the 7th Day of October 1763. in the Third Year of our Reign.

GOD SAVE THE KING

Annotated Bibliography

Primary Sources

The American Declaration of Independence. Jefferson, Thomas, c. 1776. Charters of Freedom Division, National Archives.
Retrieved from

<http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration.html>

Summary: Drafted by Thomas Jefferson in 1776, the Declaration of Independence summarized the philosophy of individual liberty and brought forth grievances against the King in order to justify breaking away from England and setting forth being their own country. Students will have the opportunity, by examining this document, to draw their own conclusions regarding the justification of the American Colonies breaking ties with England.

Quartering Act. Parliament of Great Britain, 1765.
Retrieved from:

<http://www.ushistory.org/declaration/related/quartering.htm>

Summary: This act was used by the British to ensure their standing army in the American Colonies had proper housing and provisions. Students can use this document along with other information to decide if this particular act was a fair one and, ultimately, if this act was a legitimate complaint that caused one of the grievances in the Declaration of Independence.

Quartering Act. Parliament of Great Britain, 1774.
Retrieved from:

<http://www.ushistory.org/declaration/related/q74.htm>

Summary: This act was passed as part of a group of laws that became known as the Intolerable Acts. This new act was in response to uncooperative colonists and said that if housing was unavailable, the Governor could house the soldiers in other buildings. This, along with the act of

1765, can be used to decide if this act was a legitimate complaint that caused one of the grievances in the Declaration of Independence.

Captain Thomas Preston's Account of the Boston Massacre.
Preston,

Thomas, 1770. Retrieved from:

<http://odur.let.rug.nl/~usa/D/17511775/bostonmassacre/prest.htm>

Summary: Captain Preston was a key figure in the Boston Massacre and subsequent trials. Preston was one of the British soldiers who shot at the crowd. He was charged, tried, and eventually acquitted of all charges. His account gives students the British perspective of the story to let them to decide for themselves who was more at fault and whether this incident should be the basis for a grievance in the Declaration.

Anonymous Account of the Boston Massacre. 1770. Retrieved from:

<http://odur.let.rug.nl/usa/D/1751-1775/bostonmassacre/anon.htm>

Summary: This account, clearly from the Patriot's perspective is useful for comparison purposes. Students could compare and contrast the Thomas Preston account and this anonymous account to determine which they think is most reliable.

Boston Gazette Account of the Boston Tea Party. Boston Gazette, 1773.

Retrieved from: <http://www.boston-tea-party.org/accounts.html>

Summary: This account of the Boston Tea Party is clearly biased towards the Patriots, but is useful in comparing with other accounts, especially of those who were actual participants. It puts into question the objectiveness of

newspapers and allows students to judge for themselves the validity of these types of sources.

Joshua Wyeth account of the Boston Tea Party. Wyeth, Joshua, 1826.

Retrieved from: <http://www.boston-tea-party.org/accounts.html>

Summary: Joshua Wyeth was just sixteen when he joined other patriots in boarding the tea ships in Boston Harbor. Mr. Wyeth told his story to a journalist in Cincinnati where he lived during his later years. The account was published in 1826, 53 years after the event had occurred. This source is valuable in comparing and contrasting with other accounts to determine the reliability of the sources as a whole.

Eyewitness Account of the Boston Tea Party. Hewes, George.
Retrieved from:

<http://www.boston-tea-party.org/accounts.html>

Summary: George Hewes was a Boston shoemaker who participated in many of the key events leading up to the Revolutionary War. He described his experiences over a half a century later. This source, like the other tea party accounts, is valuable in comparing and contrasting to determine the validity of the sources as a whole and to also determine what really happened.

The Bostonians Paying the Excise (tax) Man. 1774.
Retrieved from:

<http://www.historymatters.gmu.edu/d/6806>

Summary: This is a color engraving by an unknown artist. This document will allow students to readily identify the

subject, while still offering new information to students studying the picture, as well as introducing differing perspectives.

Tarring and Feathering. Iams, J. Howard. Courtesy of
Westmoreland Museum of American Art .

Summary: This picture, when looked at with the description of tarring and feathering, really allows students to see the cruelty behind the attacks. Perhaps by seeing this they are able to infer that the Patriots were not completely innocent bystanders during the revolutionary crisis in the American colonies.

Secondary Sources:

Hakim, Joy (1999). *A Taxing King. A History of US: From Colonies to Country* (Vol. 3) (pp. 50-53). New York. Oxford University Press.

Summary: "A Taxing King" gives students more information on the events that eventually led to the American Revolution. While reading it, students can begin to understand that the colonists were not happy with Britain.